The National Consortium
of Interpreter Education Centers

Current Practices in Mentoring

Synthesis of 2007 Focus Group Discussions

A Report of the National Consortium of

Interpreter Education Centers

Prepared by Patty Gordon

March, 2008

NCIEC Effective Practice in Mentoring Workteam

Pauline Annarino	Paula Gajewksi Mickelson
Diana Doucette	Anna Witter-Merithew
Beverly Hollrah	Betsy Winston

Project Liasion

Paula Gajewski Mickelson

Focus Group Coordinator and Lead Writer

Patty Gordon

Consultants

Christopher Robinson

Marty Taylor

Kirk Vandersall

Focus Group Facilitator

Lisa Bolding	Margaret Murphy
Jeanne Dillon	Julie Simon
Cindy Farnham	Susan Tiller
Jill Gaus	Cynthia Williams
Jo Linda Greenfield	Stephanie Winslow
Allisun Kale	

Readers

Ginger Thompson	Betsy Winston
Christopher Robinson	Anna Witter Merithew

Additional Support

Cathy Cogen	Rosa Ramirez
CM Hall	Sarah Wedman
Carole Lasorisak	
Richard Laurion	

Table of Contents

Introduction

This report is a summary and analysis of data collected from focus groups of mentors, mentees and administrators of mentoring programs. This report may be used to publicize mentoring practices that are currently in use in multiple programs and identify ways to assist programs and mentors in designing measurement tools to identify those practices that might be proven to be effective.

In the field of sign language interpretation, mentoring has become a popular means of managing the gap in competencies interpreters have upon graduation from a program and entering the work force. The discoveries in this report indicate that the primary outcomes for mentoring programs that work with pre-certified interpreters are increased confidence in the provision of interpreting services and a stronger ability to look at, analyze and discuss interpreting work. While these outcomes may indeed be closing that gap, allowing new interpreters to increase the speed at which they develop deeper competence, it is unclear if mentoring leads to quicker achievement of national certification or how mentoring may contribute to long-term success in the interpreting field. Participants in the focus groups thought they were having success in the mentoring process even without clear data as to how mentoring truly impacts a new interpreter's career or the quality of services provided to the Deaf and hearing communities.

Data indicates mentoring of experienced interpreters into areas of specialization such as legal interpreting is focused less on self-analysis and more on specific skills and knowledge germane to the specialty area. Measurement of success is the mentee's continued employment in the specialty area as well as the achievement of specialized certification when available.

Other data collected indicates that current mentoring programs have readily identifiable systems that make them sustainable. Systematic program design, and management as well as committed funding sources contribute to the success of mentoring programs.

Mentors indicate a need for opportunities for professional development and connection with other mentors. Mentors are developing skills primarily through a hodge-podge of workshops and personal experiences and wish to have access to more standardized materials for activities and diagnostic assessment, more education about linguistics and mentoring approaches, as well as opportunities to network with colleagues. Mentoring program administrators want connection with other administrators in order to share resources, ideas and strategies for managing a program.

There is a severe lack of data about less formalized mentoring relationships and mentoring done within the communities of interpreters of color. Mentoring taking place within minority interpreting communities, but it may be framed differently than the mainstream and therefore overlooked by data collection systems such as this one. Those practices that are used effectively in mentoring that is less formal, that operates without monetary exchange, or that focuses on minority communities in the field are not represented in this data. Very little data in this report speaks to the experiences of Deaf mentors and mentees as well as male interpreters. In essence, this report is a synthesis of practices of mentors affiliated with more formal, majority (i.e. White, female, hearing) run mentoring programs.

Background

In June 2006 the National Interpreter Education Center (NIEC) held a gathering of professionals with experience mentoring ASL-English interpreters. Discussion centered on current and best practices in mentoring. Since that time, the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC) has formed a workteam focused on collecting additional data on best and effective practices in mentoring. The aim of the workteam is to help the NCIEC identify and promote effective mentoring practices that address NCIEC's objectives to increase the number of qualified interpreters in the US and to provide quality educational opportunities for interpreters and interpreting educators.

This document is a summary and synthesis of data collected in focus groups of mentors, mentees and mentoring program administrators. Focus groups were held around the United States and on-line from August to December 2007.

Terminology

Certain terms used in the report are broad and can be defined in many ways. Here are definitions of terms as identified either to or by the participants.

Mentor:

A person who is providing support and guidance to an interpreter with lesser experience or with a specific skill-development need. Forty-one of the mentors reported they provided mentoring as part or all of a staff position. Twenty-three said they provided mentoring as an independent contractor affiliated with a formal program or on their own. Mentors in the focus groups were Deaf, hearing and DeafBlind.

Mentee

A person working with a mentor. Twenty-six of the focus group participants

identified themselves as a mentee, either currently or in the past. Mentors work

with mentees of all experience levels including ASL students, recent graduates of

interpreting programs, experienced interpreters looking to move into

specialization, and Deaf people who are working towards interpreter certification.

Program Administrator

A person who is responsible for coordination of a systemized mentoring process.

Program administrators may or may not be providing mentoring services and may

or may not be interpreters themselves. Some administrators worked in their

position full-time, while others coordinate mentoring as a portion of their job

duties. Program administrators were sometimes also agency managers or

directors Program administrators train and support mentors, recruit mentees and

manage the necessary documentation that proves mentoring services have been

provided. Twenty-four of the focus group participants identified themselves as

program administrators.

Mentee-Driven Approach

A pedagogy based on adult-learning theories that adults learn best when directing

their own learning process. The assumption in a mentee-driven approach is that

the goals, activities and determination of progress are largely set by the mentee.

Although the process does rely on interaction between the mentor and mentee to

help the mentee focus their energies and discover their own needs, a mentee-

driven approach is viewed as different than a teacher-student relationship.

Predominant in the mentoring work of the focus group participants is the use of

social learning theories, primarily those based on the work of L.S. Vygotsky

Methodology

The NCIEC Effective Practices In Mentoring Workteam (referred to as the "workteam" for the rest of this report) instructions were to conduct focus groups to help verify current practices in mentoring programs. A similar methodology was used successfully by the NCIEC to collect data on current practices in medical interpreting. The workteam was seeking information about what is happening "on the ground" in mentoring. Several other data sources had been collected by the workteam and were shared with the researcher over the course of this data collection. These other data sources informed the design, questions and protocols for the focus groups as well as the summary and analysis of the data.

Original data sources:

- Summaries from mentee and mentor surveys conducted in 2006 by NCIEC

- Literature Review and White Paper from workteam (Anna Witter-Merithew)

- Thoughts and questions of the workteam participants solicited directly

- Protocols developed by Dr. Marty Taylor for focus groups on effective

    practices in medical interpreting (2007 report to NCIEC)

Later data sources:

- Summary of notes from Northeastern University Summer Symposium, Effective Practices in Mentorship Track, 2006
- Draft Statement of Work for the workteam (NCIEC)

Thirteen focus groups, including three pilot groups, were held between August and December of 2007 with a total of 72 participants. The workteam identified the following demographic groups as targets for data collection:

- RID funded mentorship efforts

- Mentors and mentees of color

- Deaf and DeafBlind people

- Graduates of the ProjectTIEMOnline Master Mentor Program

- Other regional mentoring initiatives of significance - including perspectives of policy-makes and administrators who are funding the initiatives

The intent of a focus group is to have a small group of practitioners respond to questions through discussion. Focus groups allow researchers access to information quickly and effeciently. By having an in-depth discussion with a small group, questions can be explored more deeply than in large group discussion and with more breadth than a one-on-one interview. With that in mind, each focus group discussion took place face-to-face with a facilitator, two to six participants and a notetaker. One exception was made to the protocols for DeafBlind mentors. The NCIEC found in other data collection efforts, DeafBlind participants preferred data be collected electronically rather than arranging a face-to-face discussion.

The directive from the NCIEC workteam was to complete as many focus groups as possible by the end of the fiscal year (September 30, 2007). Because the process of arranging groups began late in the year (July, 2007), the deadline was extended to December in order to have this report completed in early 2008.

Three pilot focus groups were conducted at the 2007 Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) national conference in San Francisco. Based on the pilot groups and reviews from Kirk Vandersall (NCIEC's contracted evaluation specialist) and Dr. Marty Taylor (NCIEC consultant on other projects), focus groups protocols and questions were revised for the remaining groups. Revisions to questions and demographic forms were

made for clarity. For example, an early draft of the demographic form asked if the person

filling out the form was certified but did not specify if state certification qualified as a

"yes". In addition, demographic forms for specific targeted groups were altered to

conform to the group's information (e.g. mentees were asked what their interpreter

education and other training that prepared them for interpreting while mentors were asked

about training that prepared them to be mentors). These adaptations resulted in four

slightly different versions of the demographic forms and focus group questions; program

administrator/mentor, Deaf mentor, DeafBlind mentor and mentee versions. The

demographic forms, questions and adaptations appear in the Appendix of this report.

The original work plan included focus groups in Boston, Denver and Sacramento.

Because the western region is so large, Pauline Annarino from the Western Region

Interpreter Education Center (WRIEC) offered funding support for additional groups.

The national workteam supported this idea of a collaborative approach to data collection

as well as gathering data from a broad geographic area; therefore, each regional director

of a NCIEC site was offered the opportunity to sponsor additional focus groups in their

areas. With the collaboration of the directors and their staff, additional groups were added

in Ohio, California, Texas, Missouri, New Jersey (paid for in 2008), Oregon, and Utah.

Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center (GURIEC) did not have the

resources to sponsor a group in their region at the time. The locations for the groups were

based on regional staff recommendations, the original demographic targets, availability of

a facilitator, and presence of active mentoring programming.

On September 24, 2007, an initial report was submitted to the workteam. The

document was intended to give the workteam members some idea of initial findings and

also to identify demographic groups not represented in the data, including Deaf mentors,

mentees, and mentor/mentees of color. While mentors and mentees of color were on the

original list of targeted demographic groups, representation in the initial round of groups

was minimal at best. Mentees and Deaf mentors/mentees were not part of the original

target demographics and the workteam felt more data from these groups would be

informative.

October 1, 2007 began a new fiscal year and the workteam approved four more

focus groups targeting the underrepresented demographic groups. One mentee group, one

Deaf mentor group and a survey of DeafBlind mentors took place between October 10,

2007 and December 16, 2007. The DeafBlind mentor group was facilitated on-line, the

Deaf mentor group met in conjunction with already established meetings of Deaf

interpreters in New York, (in collaboration with Northeastern University Regional

Interpreter Education Center (NURIEC).) A focus group of mentees was convened in St.

Paul because the Collaboration for the Advancement of Teaching Interpreter Excellence

(CATIE) region lacked geographic representation and because the Twin Cities has a

variety of mentoring programs in the area.

Efforts to run focus groups of mentors/mentees of color were not successful.

There seemed to be few resources and even fewer geographic locations with a critical

mass of the target demographic. Contact was made with Lynne Weisman, a contracted

mentor working with GURIEC for assistance. Lynne was working with a group of

mentees that have experienced her unique online mentoring program (STEP), including

mentees of color. Weisman agreed to send an introductory e-mail to the group inviting

them to participate in a discussion about mentoring. None of the mentees chose to follow up on the invitation.

A conversation with Chris Robinson at Boston University also re-directed the original plan to conduct focus groups for mentors and mentees of color that would use the protocols and questions as currently designed. An African-American/Black interpreter, Robinson had insights into ways to successfully gather data on how interpreters of color are mentored into the field and specialty areas. He pointed out that conducting a focus group comprised of "interpreters of color" was not particularly meaningful. One Black, one Asian and one Hispanic interpreter do not a focus group discussion make. Robinson knows mentoring is happening within the communities of color, but it may not be being recognized as such because it is framed (at least within the African-American/Black community) as developing leadership and informal relationships are more the paradigm of practice. It is clear a different approach to data collection must be used to get insight into how skill development occurs within specific communities. The CATIE center and the mentoring workteam will continue to investigate and work with interpreters of color to gather data separate from the scope of this report

Data from the focus groups included:

- Demographic forms (that included some essay answers)

- Discussion notes

- Resource lists created by the group members

Demographic information was collated in table form. The focus group notes were randomly labeled as RG (meaning "regional group") 1 through RG-13. Demographic forms were also labeled with RG1-RG13 for later cross-referencing. Other identifying

information such as location of the meeting, names of facilitators, notetakers or participants and specific program names are not included in this report in order to maintain anonymity of the participants.

Discussion notes from the groups were collated following questions contained in a larger document titled "NCIEC Effective Practices Team Draft Statement of Work: Mentoring", created by Arroyo Research Services in conjunction with the mentoring workteam of the NCIEC.

The questions from the NCIEC draft statement of work are:

1. What are appropriate outcomes for measuring the effect of mentoring programs on mentees/protégé's?

2. What are appropriate outcomes for measuring the effect of mentoring programs on mentors?

3. What degree of progress toward mentor and mentee outcomes is reasonable to expect within the typical mentoring time period?

4. What is the level of involvement/intensity of mentors/mentees within the various mentoring programs?

5. How can consumer input best be included in the process of determining interpreter quality, and thereby mentoring program quality?

6. What leads to a sustainable mentoring program?

7. How can mentoring programs be funded and designed to promote sustainability?

8. How should mentoring programs track participants during and after their participation?

9. What are the most common elements of interpreter mentoring programs? How are they structured within mentoring programs? Do these different ways of structuring the mentoring programs affect program quality?

10. What artifacts are most commonly developed and/or used in the mentoring process?

11. How can the effects of mentoring programs be isolated from other mentee/protégé' experiences and program participation?

12. Does mentoring work better/differently depending on whether the participants are current interpreters seeking additional specialization or certification, or are new to the interpreting field?

13. Does mentoring work better/differently in different institutional settings (e.g. academic vs. other settings)? Within different specialties?

14. To what extent can we distinguish "mentoring" programs from supervised work?

15. Can we establish recommendations for mentoring program duration? What is the current norm for interpreter mentoring?

16. What logs or other ways of recording mentor/protégé' interaction are kept in mentoring programs?

17. How are mentors identified, vetted, and selected for participation?

18. In what aspects of mentoring do mentors believe they are particularly effective or believe they need additional opportunities for growth?

19. Do programs charge mentees to participate in the program? What differences in both process and outcomes can be determined between programs that do or do not charge fees to mentees?

20. How do mentors go about their work of mentoring? Within the structure of each
program, what is the range of approaches that mentors take?

21. To what extent do mentor practices align with best practices identified in
interpreter mentoring and education? With best practices related to mentoring
from other fields? *

* Question 21 from the draft "EPT Statement of Work" document is not
summarized in this report. Answering that particular question is a separate project that
requires taking this report and other data to do a comparison.

Questions asking for similar data were combined (e.g. questions six and seven
were both related to sustainability). The rough compilation was reviewed for themes and
specific data. The data was then divided into the following broad categories:

1. Outcomes

2. Programs

3. Mentors

4. Mentees

These broad categories were further sub-divided:

1. Outcomes

2. Programs

   2.1. Sustainability

   2.2. Fees

   2.3. Duration

   2.4. Artifacts

   2.5. Consumer Input

Findings

The following section is a summary of the focus group notes, and comments written on demographic forms. Each sub-section of findings is structured in the following way:

- Title of section or sub-section

- Specific questions from the workteam draft Statement of Work relating to the data

- Bulleted summary and narrative analysis

While some demographic tables and charts are included in the Findings section, all the demographic tables can be found in Appendix A.

A caveat to the readers of this report is to remember the participants of the focus groups were somewhat self-selected and would naturally represent the most motivated and visible mentors in their areas. They had been providing service long enough or visibly enough to be identified and invited to participate. They chose to come to a two and a half hour meeting for minimal compensation (gift cards) and they followed through with outside questions and paperwork. While their participation does help us identify what the more visible and/or mainstream mentor community is doing, less visible, yet very effective mentoring is occurring in other communities with less recognition by the mainstream. Interpreters of color support and mentor one another in powerful ways that are not necessarily tied to a formal program. Deaf interpreters mentor each other informally as they navigate the complex (and generally hearing-oriented) certification process. Male interpreters in the groups indicated that they sought other male interpreters

and Deaf men to help them into the field. This report contains very little data from these

underrepresented groups.

Findings

1. Outcomes

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

1) What are appropriate outcomes for measuring the effect of mentoring

   programs on mentees/protégé's?

3) What degree of progress toward mentor and mentee outcomes is reasonable

   to expect within the typical mentoring time period?

18) What aspects of mentoring do mentors believe they are particularly

   effective or believe they need additional opportunities for growth?

Summary

Mentee outcomes mentioned most often (in rough rank order):

   Increased confidence

   Self-Analysis Skills

   Self-Awareness (the "ah-ha" moment)

   Becoming an independent learner

   Achievement of mentee-established goals

   Achievement of certification/testing standard

Full outcomes list

- Knowledge outcomes:

   Knowing how to analyze work

   Aware of interpreting issues and process

Becoming an independent learner

Decision-making (in interpreting and in ethics)

Linguistics (ASL, English features, register)

Comfort and awareness with Deaf culture

- Skill outcomes:

Improved competence in ASL (unspecified)

Management of the interpreting process

Professional behaviors (dress, interpersonal skills)

Improved English competence (unspecified)

Expanded use of different registers in ASL and English

Ability to work independently

ASL-English interpretation (also called receptive or voicing)

Outcomes mentioned only a few times:

Self-care

Learning specific job responsibilities

Discourse mapping

 Relationship-building

Induction into the field

Excitement about the field

Use of space

Classifiers

Teaming strategies

Endurance

Expansion

Prosody

"Framing"

Turn-taking strategies (in VRS work).

Measures of achievement:

Passing a standardized test

Attaining and/or maintaining employment

Mentee determines goals have been achieved

Completion of required program sessions

Pre-Post videos demonstrating progress (no specific instrument noted)

Outside diagnostic testing

Mentee returns for additional services

Mentee refers others to the program

Evaluations that indicate mentee satisfaction

Expanded practice (taking harder assignments, moving into specialization)

Mentee choosing to leave the field of interpreting; moving into a different

or related field

When asked how they knew their programs were successful, mentors and program administrators named many different kinds of outcomes and measurements. Some outcomes, such as certification or other testing, are easily measurable. Other outcomes such as completing all mentoring sessions, or referring the program to others are measurable, but not necessarily proof that the mentoring is resulting in improved interpreting skills. Several people mentioned that they felt lost about how to measure the

outcomes they see. How do you measure confidence, self-esteem, awareness, or even

excitement? Subjectively, mentors know they are having a positive impact on the

mentee, but have a difficult time proving it objectively. This does not mean that the

mentorships are not successful, but that it is hard for the mentors to quantify the progress

they see. This may indicate a knowledge deficit on the part of the mentors in designing

evaluations or a deficit in program planning that fails to include pre and post evaluations

that address outcomes other than specific skills related to the interpreting process and

product.

Mentees also mentioned outcomes related to confidence, and cited additional

measures such as accepting harder jobs, working with a team interpreter and working

without mentor supervision. Mentees felt mentoring was a benefit, but much of their

interpreting skill development came from the actual interpreting work they were doing.

Mentees were pleased to discover that they often "taught" the mentors in the process of a

program. Specific skills mentioned by mentees as improved were: moderating "weird"

habits (like constantly having one sign parameter wrong), learning to fingerspell with the

non-dominant hand and richer use of space. A subject for future discussion is whether or

not these kinds of specific skills should be in place upon graduation from an interpreter

education program, or are simply a natural process of applied skill development. The

question remains what skills can successfully be mastered in an academic setting versus

skills that can only be mastered and enhanced through the actual work process.

For the DeafBlind mentors, activities focus on mentees' desires to increase their

comfort with and ability to interpret for DeafBlind people. Learning some SSP skills and

increasing knowledge of the unique DeafBlind experience are also measures of success.

No other specific interpreting skill outcomes were mentioned, however DeafBlind mentors feel they are able to "tweak" the mentee's skills over time to get the outcomes they want as consumers who are DeafBlind.

Deaf mentors also see confidence and self-awareness increases as the main outcomes of their work with mentees. One mentor also emphasized that a successful outcome for them was an interpreter who becomes more humble and motivated.

Mentors working in specialized areas identify more specific outcomes. For example, in VRS interpreting, mentees must demonstrate particular skills related to interpreting and managing calls while mentees working on legal interpreting must understand and follow protocols of the court.

All the focus group participants say they see mentee development and growth. Some mentees already have interpreting skills but are unsure of their own competence, how to look at, discuss, or make decisions about their work. Most of the programs represented in the focus groups worked with newer interpreters, so this begs the question of what happens in mentoring programs for more experienced interpreters. Do they, too, find the most salient outcome is a growth in self-awareness and self-confidence? A few comments from the groups suggest that to be true. However, we do not have clear data that teases out the outcomes of experienced interpreters from newer interpreters, so no strong conclusions can be drawn so far.

Goals related to specific interpreting skills are measured through certification or external testing (such as a state Quality Assurance screening) rather than by the mentor or mentoring program. It may be that the actual interpretation work is being improved through the mentoring programs, but either it is not being measured or is not changing in

a significant enough manner to be highlighted by the focus group participants. In the instance of language competence, the data supports current thinking in the field that new graduates of programs often lack full fluency in ASL, or at least are not competent at the level necessary for the work they are doing.

Interpreting skills may be measured in programs through pre and post analysis of mentee work. Participants mention pre-post videos as key to demonstrating growth but do not usually describe the measurement tool they are using. Given that 10 of the 13 focus groups mentioned Marty Taylor's books: I*nterpretation SKILLS: American Sign Language to English* and *Interpretation SKILLS: English to American Sign Language* as a key resource, we can speculate that the skills outlined in the texts are being measured. Only one or two groups had participants that mentioned a specific instrument.

If they are working with new interpreters, mentors are not expected to provide diagnostic assessments that will be used to decide if the mentee has achieved a certain benchmark. Exceptions to this are in VRS, legal and DeafBlind interpreting where the mentors do have some authority to decide whether or not the mentee continues working in that environment. When working with new interpreters, mentors generally use a collaborative process of assessment, with the mentee contributing to the process, leaving the decision about a mentee's qualifications to administrators, outside diagnostic assessments, or achievement of certification. That being said many mentors say they wish they had more training in diagnostic skills and that mentors need to have skills in diagnostic assessment. It is unclear if mentors are expected to do evaluations and do not feel competent or if they simply want a means to identify and label things in order to

teach the mentee how to more objectively look at their work and/or develop a common vocabulary for discussions.

Participants across the groups note that an effective outcome of mentoring could be counseling people out of the field. A few people told stories of mentees who, as a direct result of their mentoring program, decided to divert into related professions such as teaching in Deaf education programs.

Finally, many mentors pointed out that a truly mentee-driven program means that measurement of outcomes must, by definition, be determined by the mentee. Does the mentee feel they have improved? Is he or she satisfied with the progress towards their goals? If the mentee experiences improvement but the improvement is not directly related to documented goals, does he or she still consider it a success? In other discussions, mentors reinforced the idea that the mentees are individuals, with very unique needs and goals. The mentor is there to serve that mentee in whatever way the mentee needs. Therefore, external measures like tests or mentor evaluations are not necessarily a valid measure of the effectiveness of the mentorship; rather, it is the mentee's perception and experience that is the valid measure of outcomes. These comments beg the question of how programs are to be evaluated if the evaluation is only in the perception of the mentee. Programs must be accountable to funders and to find measurable means to demonstrate that accountability. It is quite possible that current evaluations given to mentors and mentees at the end of a mentorship provide the evidence of mentee satisfaction, therefore allowing programs to document the mentee-driven outcome. Because specific evaluation forms were not shared in the focus groups, it is not possible to conclude that the data that measures outcomes such as mentee satisfaction

(regardless of achievement of specific goals) is not available and in use by programs. It

also may be that programs, mentors and mentees need to be educated in types of

evaluations that can include evidence of progress clear enough to satisfy quality

assurance expectations and funders' requirements.

2. Programs

2.1 Sustainability

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

6)   What leads to a sustainable mentoring program?

7)   How can mentoring programs be funded and designed to promote

sustainability?

19)   Do programs charge mentees to participate in the program? What

differences in both process and outcomes can be determined between

programs that do or do not charge fees to mentees?

Summary

Keys to sustainable programs are:

Funding, funding and more funding

Ongoing commitment from administrations particularly to funding, (whether or

not the program "makes" money)

Mentor training (before), pay (equitable to working) and support (share shops,

workshops, networking opportunities)

Incentives for mentees: quality assurance expectations (laws, standards), potential

employment, pay increases, and professional expectations

Presence of a coordinator (preferably full time)

Consistent pipeline of mentees (graduates looking for work, interpreters looking

to become certified, meet a standard or move into a specialization)

Structure and approach for the process that is consistent and has expectations for

all parties

Timelines with regular meetings and established ending date of mentorship

Added elements that contribute to sustainability

Opportunities for mentees to have more mentoring after completing a cycle

Recruitment of mentees to become mentors.

Presence of Deaf mentors.

Creativity with mentoring delivery (offering online mentoring programs or

resources).

Funding sources for current programs:

Administration/ operating funds (primary funding source for most programs).

Donations (corporate and individual)

Grants

Volunteer time (mentors working for stipend or free)

Fundraising activities

Fees paid by mentees (least used funding source except by for-profit agencies

who then still have to supplement with operating funds to cover costs)

Sustainability can be boiled down to three major factors: *funding*, *structure*, and

presence of *external pressure* on the system.

Funding

Wherever a formal program exists, supplemental funding will have to be a part of

the process. Whether it is funding built into an operating budget or outside funding

sources, mentoring lives or dies by the consistent commitment of the program

administration to support it. The cost of running an effective program that has a

coordinator, structure (meaning a specific set of requirements related to meetings and

activities) and accountability (meaning documentation of activities and provision of reports) cannot be covered through fees paid by mentees. The program administration needs to see a benefit in some other way in order to make that commitment (e.g. high quality employees, being in compliance with a standard, increasing retention or availability of interpreters).

Structure

Once funding is committed, programs need a dedicated coordinator who has at least part of his or her job time assigned to the program. Mentors need to be recruited, trained, and offered ongoing support. Mentees need to be recruited, supported and possibly evaluated. Creative funding options need to be explored, resources purchased and maintained (books, DVDs, cameras, etc). Deaf mentors need to be recruited specifically for language enhancement work with mentees who graduate from programs without necessary fluency in ASL and for continued growth for mentees demonstrating higher levels of fluency. A dedicated coordinator can spend time on these activities so that mentors and mentees can be as productive as possible.

Programs with set beginnings and endings, expectations around number of meeting times, and specified roles and responsibilities for the mentor and mentee felt they were able to sustain the program easily as long as they had funding. At least one program had strong structure for many years and was well known around the country, but a change in administration led to the elimination of a coordinator and loosening of the structure of the program. As a result, the program today is nominal at best with no way to measure the effectiveness of what little is being done.

In discussion program structure, participants referred more to logistics than focus of the work. In other words, mentors in post-secondary environments described how often they work with mentees, what kind of paperwork they submitted, and whether or not they used videotape or relied on live observation to prompt discussion. The context of the mentoring influences the mentee's goals but in general mentors still say they rely on the mentee to determine the specific goals within that context. However, in certain narrow specialty areas, particularly VRS, legal interpreting and DeafBlind interpreting, the focus of the mentoring drives the overall activities and mentors may dictate the goals of the mentee more forcefully. For example, one mentor working with interpreters moving into the legal system has a fairly prescribed list of goals in place (understand court protocols, demonstrating skills in register). While this means the mentoring being done in that instance may not be entirely mentee-driven, the mentor does rely on the mentee to determine a starting place for the mentoring and for direction as to which of the skills the mentee needs help with.

External pressure

Mentoring has become more prevalent in the interpreting world, but new interpreters may not choose to commit fully to the process if they do not have some sort of external stake in the outcome. While some people are highly motivated, the majority of mentor and administrators said that it was important that mentees have to meet a standard (such as a test of some kind), be offered a reward (such as employment or additional pay), or be indoctrinated to believe mentoring is an expected part of their progression in the field in order to secure the level of commitment necessary. The

number of mentees who achieve the minimum standard and attribute the achievement to mentoring (at least in part) is not revealed in the data.

Along with external pressures, sheer lack of linguistic competence may be the motivator for some mentees. Deaf people are not integrated into many programs, yet many mentors and administrators said that basic ASL skills are often what mentees need to develop most. The few Deaf mentors in the first round of focus groups indicated that mentees enjoy working with them and that they feel their mentoring had a significant impact on the mentee, yet many mentoring programs do not seem to include Deaf mentors, often for financial reasons.

While some informal mentoring relationships (those that occur outside of a program) were discussed during the focus groups, interpreters of color indicate that an informal mentoring system may be much more prevalent within minority communities and therefore be overlooked by potential funders and researchers

2.2 Fees

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

19)   Do programs charge mentees to participate in the program? What

differences in both process and outcomes can be determined between

programs that do or do not charge fees to mentees?

5)   How can consumer input best be included in the process of determining

interpreter quality, and thereby mentoring program quality?

6)   What leads to a sustainable mentoring program?

Summary

- Most programs do not charge a fee.

- Most programs offer mentoring as a condition, perk, or legal requirement of

  employment.

- Some programs operate with volunteer or poorly paid mentors.

- There is indication that people paying for mentoring may demonstrate more

  commitment to the mentoring work, but whether fees effect the outcome is

  unclear.

- All programs indicate outside funding is necessary to run a program even if

  the mentees are paying a fee.

Forty-one of the participants provided mentoring as part of a staff position while

23 said they did not. All six mentees in the targeted demographic group received

mentoring as part of a staff position. This indicates that most mentoring is provided

within an employment context. In some cases it is a perk of the job (particularly for

referral agencies who are recruiting staff). In other, such as K-12, there may be a legal

requirement for mentoring. Because demand for interpreters outpaces supply

(particularly in the fast-growing VRS arena), employers are looking at pre-certified

interpreters as possible job candidates. Given that interpreter education programs

graduate students without a valid standardized measure of skills (such as a national

certification), employers rely on mentoring programs as part of their screening process

for potential employees. In a few cases, the employer also offers mentoring to certified

interpreters as part of their ongoing professional development package.

Several participants mentioned that they had been a part of programs that were

informally run (i.e. through a state RID chapter) that required people to go over and

above their normal work hours. The programs either were not very effective or

completely failed, supporting the claim that funding for a dedicated coordinator may be

critical for the future success of programs run out of all-volunteer organizations.

Some mentoring programs offer mentoring for a fee or incorporate mentoring in a

larger program that charges the mentees (e.g. the Educational Interpreter Certificate

Program (EICP) from the DO IT center). There is no clear indication that charging a fee

results in better or worse outcomes for the mentees. Some comments demonstrated that

motivation may be impacted depending on the context and an assumption can be made

that more motivation leads to better outcomes.

In determining program costs, administrators are uncertain how to establish pay

rates for Deaf language mentors compared with hearing interpreter mentors. If language

mentors do not have an equitable education and experience as interpreter mentors, should

they earn the same income from mentoring? In addition, programs that cannot afford to

pay an interpreter mentor at the same rate the interpreter would earn for freelance work

create a disincentive for the interpreter to choose mentoring as part of their practice.

In the fee-for-service programs, fees ranged from "nominal", to $300-$450 for

eight sessions, and $200+ for diagnostic services. The for-profit agency managers in the

groups are highly motivated to offer mentoring and try to set a fee that is reasonable for

the potential mentee (often a newer interpreter with limited finances) yet able to support

operating the program. For-profit entities are frustrated with the lack of opportunities to

financially collaborate with non-profit entities or directly apply for federal and state

grants to support programs.

Mentors who are DeafBlind: did not mention fees, but since many of the mentees

are actually providing interpreting services to the mentor, the mentees themselves may be

earning income off the process.

In the end, we do not have a clear indicator of whether or not programs that

charge mentees have different outcomes, better or worse, than those that do not. What is

clear is mentoring programs are not self-sustaining. All programs rely on additional

funds whether committed from the administration as part of the budget or from external

sources such as grants and donations.

2.3 Duration

Statement of Work question relating to the data

15)   Can we establish recommendations for mentoring program duration? What

is the current norm for interpreter mentoring?

Summary

- Average mentorship lasts 38 hours

- Predominate meeting duration is 1.5 hours

- Participants recommend weekly meetings or not more than two weeks

  between meetings

- Most programs have requirements for work outside of face-to-face meetings

- Mentors with a large number of mentees combine or alternate one-on-one

  sessions with group meetings

- Mentoring in formal programs should be time-limited

- Informal mentoring relationships may continue for many years

Mentoring program schedules are often dictated by the setting of the program. K-12 and post-secondary mentoring programs work in semester or school year segments. Agency-based mentoring programs primarily operate in an 8-12 week range (16-20 hours). One specialized environment ha a 60-hour mentoring process while another has 25 hours. One agency sells different mentoring packages but requires a minimum of three sessions.

There is consensus that mentoring sessions should last no more than 2 hours with 90 minutes optimal for face-to-face work. Sessions in programs ranged from 60 to 120

minutes. One program has shorter meetings with interpreting mentors (1 hour) and longer meetings with Deaf language mentors (2 hrs). The exception to this standard is in settings where the mentee is an employee and mentoring happens throughout the workday. For example, a mentor and mentee working in a school may meet in regular but brief sessions after a class.

In general, programs with more formal systems and staff mentors require weekly mentor-mentee meetings. A few meet every two weeks. Meetings more than two weeks apart cause a decrease in motivation for both mentor and mentee and lack of cohesion in the mentoring process.

Mentoring activities are not limited to meeting time. Mentees are expected to do outside work, sometimes with a specific hourly requirement (usually around 1-2 hours a week), or with a specific assignment to be completed before the next session. Mentors noted that if the mentee has a language deficit, any standard duration of mentoring might not be enough time to make up for the lack of fluency, raising a question about mentoring's role and responsibilities in closing the gap between graduation and competence.

Mentors support setting an "end-point" for the mentorship, meaning a specific number of sessions, weeks or hours agreed on in advance. Timelines are dictated more by the structure of the program than by the specific goals of the mentee. For mentees learning skills in working with individuals who are DeafBlind, mentoring primarily is tied to either one or a continuing set of interpreting assignments. In some mentorships, the time-line is tied to a specific event (such as interpreting for an upcoming conference).

A few programs offer additional "cycles" of mentoring, presumably for mentees to either finish work towards and initial goal or focus on a new goal.

Only a few people indicated what they actually do during mentoring sessions. A few programs offer sessions with a strict timeline breakdown. For example, one program divides a 60-minute session into 5-10 minutes for opening discussion, 15-20 minutes of looking at work, 15-20 minutes of specific skill development and 15 minutes for the mentee to journal and write a plan for the next week. Another program breaks their process into three phases of specific hours with the mentee first observing, then working while being supported and finally working with minimal supervision.

The only distance mentoring experience mentioned is the EICP program. Signs-of-Development is another distance mentoring program but was not mentioned specifically by participants. Because distance mentoring is not tied to a specific geographic region, face-to-face focus groups may not be able to capture the experiences of distance mentors and mentees. Agencies do incorporate technology. One agency is branching into offering resources and materials on-line. A mentee can subscribe to the service and regularly gets access to new stimulus materials, but there is not an actual mentor meeting as a component of the process.

2.4 Artifacts

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

> 10)   What artifacts are most commonly developed and/or used in the mentoring
>
> process?
>
> 16)   What logs or other ways of recording mentor/protégé' interaction are kept
>
> in mentoring programs?

Summary

Artifacts mentioned most often were:

- A video work sample before and after the mentoring program (referred to as a

   pre and post video)

- Contract/agreement form (with the program and sometimes the mentor)

- Written goals

- A log sheet that may track activities and schedule, or just the schedule

- Video work samples created throughout the process

- Evaluations and/or reports,

- Informal notes

All formal mentoring programs rely on documentation but may use documentation for different reasons. Forms are often used for verifying or tracking activities rather than as a tool for skill development itself (with the exception of notes and journals). While participants say it is good to have some documentation (for accountability), too much documentation can be problematic and confusing.

Documentation is sometimes used to report to a higher authority such as a grantor, a state agency, an administration and, in one case, to the special education director (as a way to prove student IEP goals were being met). In this case, the mentor said the report they provide had to be as non-specific as possible so they don't get "stuck saying anything that can get us into trouble" (they did not elaborate on what the trouble might be).

Documentation is used to direct the steps in the mentoring program. Agreements and contracts confirm commitment and hold the mentee accountable. Written goals give the mentor and mentee a target and direction for their activities. Logs mainly document hours while some programs also have forms that track specific activities and work to be completed before the next session. Mentors working in education and VRS often rely on handwritten notes either during observation or while teaming with a mentee. The notes are usually given to the mentee to keep or throw away. Regular videotaping of the mentee is the norm and most programs have some sort of formative evaluation system, although we do not know what those evaluations consist of or if they might yield helpful data supporting the program's mentoring practices.

A few programs require a report from the mentor, some after every session, others monthly, quarterly or mid-program. Participants did not specify what was in these reports other than a summary of hours and activities. It is not clear whether or not the mentors were doing an evaluation activity as part of the report. Only one administrator specified that all the reporting in their program is done electronically. It is unclear whether other programs are relying on handwritten reports or electronic ones.

Many programs rely on a pre and post video sample of the mentee's work to demonstrate progress. It is not clear how programs evaluate the pre and post videos to determine progress. It also was not clearly specified what the sources are for these pre and post videos, whether or not the same source is used both times, or what instrument might be used to determine progress. Programs often rely on something developed "in-house" rather than commercially available materials. In fact, several mentors feel there is nothing available for some of their needs.

DeafBlind mentors reported they do not set "goals" per se and do no formal evaluations. In the case of interpreters learning to work with people who are DeafBlind the only "artifact" of the process is whether or not the mentee continues to be hired in that capacity.

2.5 Consumer Input

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

> 5)   How can consumer input best be included in the process of determining
>
>   interpreter quality, and thereby mentoring program quality?

Summary

- Direct consumer feedback is done in very few programs.

- The opportunity for consumer feedback is available but consumers are not
  solicited directly.

- Consumer "input" is sometimes measured through observation of the
  consumer's response to the mentee's work.

- Video sources that incorporate a range of consumers (grass roots, local,
  national, diverse) are helpful and in short supply.

- More needs to be done to make Deaf people and their perspectives an integral
  part of mentoring programs.

- Deaf mentors are extremely helpful in serving as mock consumers,
  particularly if they are certified.

- ASL language skills are a major skill development area for mentees

Focus group participants, assumed "consumers" meant Deaf people who are the
recipient of interpretations. Participants did not view hearing people involved in the
interpreted interaction as consumers or at least only discussed Deaf people when talking
about consumer input.

In some cases, consumers who are recipients of interpreting services are solicited directly for feedback, including one case where the mentor, mentee and Deaf person fill out evaluations and then meet to discuss them. In other cases, particularly in educational settings, mentors are looking at Deaf student behaviors to determine the effectiveness of the interpretation (does the student nod, follow instructions, succeed in the course), The mentors did indicate that a Deaf student may have behaviors that indicate understanding when they do not understand the interpreter, and interpreters are not solely responsible for a student's learning progress and class participation efforts.

Mentees working in VRS and with some agencies may be able to get feedback from consumers because these programs have a system for general consumer feedback. Consumers are not directly contacted, but that the opportunity is there for a mentee to get feedback as part of the customer service process.

Deaf mentors often serve as the stand-in for consumers, monitoring quality assurance and intervening in skill areas. Deaf mentors who are CDIs feel particularly effective because they look at both process and product. Deaf mentors see improvement in ASL skills including expanding mentee's cultural knowledge and skill, range of register, and overall language competence. Language mentors are a critical need in mentoring programs. Participants think the Deaf perspective and Deaf people need to be more strongly represented in their work. This thinking reinforces other research (such as the Entry-to-Practice Competencies Project from he DO IT Center) that indicates a continued lack of language competence in program graduates.

Deaf community member are an informal resource for mentoring programs. Mentors rely on community members to confirm questions about ASL and Deaf culture.

Deaf people allow themselves to be videotaped for use in mentoring, and some members of the Deaf community offer informal sign-coaching services as a way to help the mentee (much as it was done in the years before interpreting became a profession).

In the realm of DeafBlind mentoring the mentors *are* the mentee's consumers so all feedback, evaluation and education is coming directly from the consumer. DeafBlind consumers/mentors are also determiner as to whether or not the mentee will continue to work, a powerful form of consumer input.

There was concern expressed that Deaf consumers are vulnerable in mentoring situations where the mentee is providing interpreting services (such as a college classroom). Does the Deaf person get appropriate service? Who is watching out for the consumer? Will mentoring be used as a replacement for hiring more qualified interpreters? Even with mentoring programs, is it really making a difference "in the chair", i.e. is the interpreter actually demonstrating skill improvement that benefits the consumer? Why do some mentees fail to follow through on opportunities to work with Deaf language mentors?

An offshoot of the consumer discussion is a frustration with not being able to convince people to hire Deaf people as interpreters (mostly due to increased cost). CDIs are out there, but not able to access opportunities to team with hearing interpreters and possibly mentees. Deaf interpreters in the group wish to mentor other potential Deaf interpreters, but there is a lack of support and opportunity to do so.

2.6 Post-mentorship tracking

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

> 8)   How should mentoring programs track participants during and after their participation?

Summary

- Most programs do no formal tracking of mentees beyond the program

- Mentors sometimes track mentees informally; through report from mentees, mentor follow-up, looking on web sites for evidence of passing a test and general community contact

- A few programs have mentoring as part of the employment process; therefore they could track mentees who become employees (although they do not do so).

- In the few programs that did formal tracking, follow-up ranged from six months to two year

The focus groups generated almost no data that documents program participants' long-term outcomes from mentoring. While mentoring programs for new interpreters appear to have a larger impact on self-awareness and self-analysis than interpreting skills per se, it is unknown if mentoring programs are significantly contributing to the closing of the "gap" between graduation and effective service delivery. We do not know how many mentees remain interpreters, achieve national or state certification, work as uncertified interpreters, or leave the profession. One of the clearest ways to determine the effectiveness of programs would be through longitudinal tracking of mentee's career

progress or by focusing data collection on newly certified interpreters to determine what role mentoring played in their progress.

Mentors are informally tracked by their mentors. Deaf mentors also keep informal contact with many former mentees, but they also are checking to see if the mentees continue an involvement with the Deaf community as well as if they advance as interpreters. At the same time, Deaf mentors also expressed a need to establish some boundaries with former mentees, discouraging dependence and making sure the mentees don't "own us". DeafBlind mentors use the ongoing hiring of the mentee to provide interpreting services as a means to know what the mentee is doing over time. Other mentors monitor certification announcements to see if former mentees become certified.

Employers with mentoring programs are best able to track mentees who become employees. While programs provide job reviews, none seem to be keeping data specific to the career and interpreting success of former mentees.

3. Mentors

3.1: Mentor training and standards

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

17) How are mentors identified, vetted and selected for participation?

18) What aspects of mentoring do mentors believe they are particularly effective or believe they need additional opportunities for growth?

4) What is the level of involvement/intensity of mentors/mentees within the various mentoring programs?

2) What are appropriate outcomes for measuring the effect of mentoring programs on mentors?

Summary

Direct data is limited although participants indirectly answered these questions,

- Many mentors began as mentees.

- Only one program outlined a specific requirement set for mentors.

- Fifty-six participants believe mentors should have some structured training and supervision (particularly in formal programs).

- Caution needs to be taken to ensure opportunities for informal mentoring and to make sure any standards are not exclusionary.

Mentors' training includes a wide-ranging set of courses, workshops personal experiences and internships. Table 1 lists the types of training mentors had.

Table 1
Types of mentor training (by number of participants)

Workshops	45
Related College Courses	19
Certificate Program	10
None	6
Other	2

There is a self-disclosed deficit in mentors' knowledge related to assessment and evaluation. This is interesting because 39 participants identify one of their work-related roles as "teaching". This indicates a larger issue within the field of interpreter education; mainly that interpreter and ASL educators as well as mentors may not have competence in designing and conducting evaluations. As indicated in the Table 2, the type of workshops participants have taken offer opportunities to learn skills in evaluation and assessment but no one training topic was mentioned in all 13 groups. In fact, only five of the groups had at least one person who had taken specific training in teaching/pedagogy

Table 2
Workshop topics
(counted by number of groups where at least one person mentioned the topic)

Mentoring: short workshop	9
Mentoring: intensive training	8
Assessment	6
Teaching/Pedagogy	5
"Feedback" (unspecified)	5
Interpreting models (Cokely, Colonomos)	4
Interpreting (unspecified)	4

Diagnostics	4
Master Mentor Program	3
ASL	3
Setting goals (using Taylor text)	2
Self-Assessment	2
Supervisor training	2
Demand-Control Schema (Dean and Pollard)	2
Mentoring Conference (2004)	2
General professional development	1
Interpreting in DeafBlind settings	1
Support Services Personnel (SSP)	1
Culture/Identity	1
Deaf Mentor Panel	1
Legal mentoring	1

Although mentors indicated a great deal of training taken, Figure 1 shows that over half of the participants said they did not feel prepared when they began mentoring.

Table 3
Did you feel prepared when you began mentoring?

Yes	25
No	36
N/A	5

Although many mentors understand and apply basic concepts of Vygotskian learning, they do not feel fully competent in determining what the mentee might need next in their development. Many mentors rely on other mentors, supervisors and even mentees themselves to help fill in these gaps in their knowledge. Some mentors feel less

knowledgeable than the new graduates of interpreter education programs and wish they had access to the current content being taught. Mentors who do feel prepared indicate it is because of work they had done with other mentors, training, and having had exposure to some sort of diagnostic assessment training. Mentors working in specialization feel prepared and confident in the work they are doing.

Mentors indicate a need for ongoing support and feel a particular need for more easily accessible resources. Some want a workbook, others wanted access to online source materials targeted to specific skill development areas (i.e. classifiers, use of space). Participants emphasize the need for continued workshop offerings, conferences with mentoring tracks, and a network of other mentors to tap into.

Most of the DeafBlind mentors have no training in mentoring per se, but have taken workshops on Deaf Blindness and SSP work. All said their own life experiences as DeafBlind people were the strongest training they had.

When asked about standards for mentors, 56 participants emphasize the need for either supervision or a feedback system for mentors working in formal programs. There is not strong support for either licensure or an advanced degree in mentoring. See Tables 4 and 5 for the breakdown in responses regarding supervision and education.

Table 4
Should mentors be screened and/or supervised
(by number of participants who responded)

Yes	56
No	9
No Answer	9

Table 5

Should mentors be required to have the following education?
(by number of participants who responded)

Post BA training	30	18
Master's degree	21	23
Certificate program	44	11

Participants stress that informal mentoring continues to have a place in the field. In

informal mentoring, it is the mentee who would judge if they were satisfied with the

mentor's skill and the outcomes of the mentoring. In addition, any standard or criteria

that limits opportunities for Deaf people to work as mentors or that fails to recognize the

potential for a different paradigm in a particular ethnic community would not be a good

decision.

Mentees feel mentors should have high levels of national certification (CI/CT,

NAD 4 or 5) as well as some training on the mentoring process. In addition, mentees

working to achieve NIC certification would like their mentors to have taken the test

themselves.

3.2 Mentor skills

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

2)   What are appropriate outcomes for measuring the effect of mentoring

programs on mentors?

18)   In what aspects of mentoring do mentors believe they are particularly

effective or believe they need additional opportunities for growth?

Summary

- Mentoring role is seen as supportive, guiding, collaborative and mentee-
driven

- Mentors need knowledge in content areas and mentoring pedagogy

- Mentoring involves skills in human relations such as empathy, openness,
patience, honesty and respect

- Mentoring done poorly can cause emotional harm to mentees

- Mentors need to be supported, given structure, standards and evaluations

When asked about mentor attributes, participants emphasized "soft" skills (such as human relations) over" hard" skills (such as linguistics). While they mentioned mentors needed to be good interpreters, it was more important to the participants that mentors are focused on the mentee needs. Mentoring is seen as something different than teaching, although a mentor may need to do teaching as part of their work.

Participants stressed the importance of personal relationship skills, understanding human psychology, motivation, leadership and support. Mentors also should have

knowledge of current interpreting theories, jargon, and diagnostic systems as well as strong self-awareness.

Participants indicate that the number one skill necessary for mentors to possess is "motivation" (primarily meaning the mentor's personal motivation to the work although a specific definition was not provided in the demographic form). Because mentors have to seek training, learn new skills associated with learner-centered processes, manage schedules, and deal with the psychological needs of the mentee, it takes a great deal of motivation and commitment to the work to be successful.

When asked about the role of the mentor, participants said mentors should encourage, guide, support, respect, and collaborate with the mentee. The mentor should attune themselves to the mentee's goals and be flexible with the mentee's process. Mentors need to be open to new ideas and continually educate themselves in order to respond to the needs of the mentee. Mentors need to be accountable to complete what the program expects (paperwork, reporting, etc.) and have the time to commit to the process (an argument that supports paying mentors for their work). DeafBlind mentors said it was important to have an in-depth knowledge of DeafBlindness.

More than one participant mentioned that a mentor who is not respectful, or who is harsh or controlling could cause significant harm, particularly to newer interpreters. Participants indicate a rationale for a mentor standard and supervision is to prevent this kind of harm, although it is unclear who would be providing the screening and monitoring. Mentees are seen as valuable commodities and participants do not want any of them to have a bad experience. There is also acknowledgement that not all good interpreters can be good mentors. Mentees feel mentors should be the "best of the best",

meaning that they should be highly skilled and well regarded interpreters. While mentees

do not expect mentors to have advanced degrees, they do expect mentors to have

significant experience in the field.

Mentors need someone to support them administratively and within a peer

network. Coordinators can help mentors by offering them observation, feedback, making

sure evaluations are completed by the mentee, and monitoring the relationship between

the mentor and mentee. Many participants mention how important it is to them to have

other mentors in their lives. They like having colleagues for practice, share resources,

techniques, and to offer support. Some programs are large enough to have several

mentors who support each other. Other mentors are trying to take advantage of whatever

networks they have, either from training experiences or conferences. Some mentors

belong to e-groups or use technology to connect although there is an indication that this

has not been particularly effective. Mentors do rely on resources available on the web

including the Project TIEM materials, EIPA materials, and conference proceedings.

Not only do mentors need support and a peer network, program administrators

emphasized their own need to find resources and support from other administrators.

None of the comments indicate that mentors themselves should be held

responsible for mentees achieving certification or meeting a particular standard.

Evaluation of mentor outcomes seems to be focused on mentee perception and

experience, more than achievement of a particular standard.

3.3 Mentor process

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

4A)   What is the level of involvement/intensity of mentors within the various

mentoring programs?

9)   What are the most common elements of interpreter mentoring programs?

How are they structured within mentoring programs? Do these different

ways of structuring the mentoring programs affect program quality?

15)   Can we establish recommendations for mentoring program duration?

What is the current norm for interpreter mentoring?

16)   What logs or other ways of recording mentor/protégé' interaction are kept

in mentoring programs?

10)   What artifacts are most commonly developed and/or used in the mentoring

process?

Summary

- A typical mentor process includes:

    An initial meeting

    Collaboration on goals,

    Activities with mentor guidance on assessment

    An ending that may involve an evaluation

- Mentors are using a mentee-lead approach, although they may lead more

    strongly in the beginning of the process and then back off.

- Mentors are extremely committed to developing their own skills as a mentor.

Mentors outlined a plethora of activities around their work. Preparation includes formal and informal training as well as orientation to the specific program they work with (see section 3.1 for discussion of mentor preparation). The process and paperwork from the various programs have common elements. Most have an official orientation, anywhere from a half-day to a two-day meeting or training. Mentors are often part of mentee orientation but sometimes have a separate orientation/training. Mentors meet with the mentee and take time to discuss and set initial goals. There is not a lot of clarity as to how the goals are chosen, other than it generally is lead by the mentee. Some mentors mentioned using EIPA results, others seem to set goals based on a work sample or simply relying on the mentee to indicate what they need to work on.

Once goals are set (all the formal programs have sort of goal documentation), the mentoring process diverges mostly based on setting. In educational settings, the mentor is often teamed with a mentee and has many opportunities for observation and de-briefing. They may or may not have mentoring sessions outside of the live environment. In community settings the mentor/mentee worked primarily with recorded work samples for analysis and designing skill-building activities. A few mentors say they lead the process and designed the activities, but most mentors report they guided the mentee in self-analysis and deciding an activity or resource to use.

Interestingly, at the same time mentors say they do not feel fully competent with diagnostic assessment, linguistics or even the Vygotskian approach to dialogue, mentors report that they apply all these elements within their mentoring process. Maybe mentors need the same confidence-building and self-awareness of their mentoring work that mentees do about their interpreting work!

Mentees understand the concept of a mentee-driven approach and agree that they get out of mentoring what they put into it. That being said, they did express frustration with mentors who do not provide them with direct and immediate correction. They want to know if they are doing something "wrong" as soon as possible and do not mind being told directly by mentors (Deaf or hearing). Mentees do not want to unknowingly establish a bad habit. In a parallel response, Deaf mentors feel newer interpreters and students have to be guided fairly strongly and sometimes told outright what their issues are.

Anna Witter-Merithew, a member of the mentoring workteam had this comment regarding the learner/mentee direct approach:

"In some ways, this addresses the shift in paradigm that mentees have to make from being told versus self-monitoring skills. But I think it also speaks to the need to be clear about what point in a learning process the learner can in fact self-monitor and correct.... If the learner is to self-monitor, their knowledge and recognition of language features and their use must be significant, as well as self-assessment skills. If the learner simply does not yet have a sufficient language foundation from which to engage in feature analysis, then expecting them to self-monitor is not productive. Ultimately, however, for interpreters to function in a competently autonomous fashion (meaning without direct supervision—which they do whether they need to or not) they must be able to self-monitor and self-correct."

Videotaping (whether or not it is digital or VHS is not clear) is often part of the mentoring process. Some mentors say mentees tape their work outside of the mentoring

sessions, some say it can be part of the mentoring session. In at least one case, a mentor created a taped sample of her own work and used it as both a teaching and recruitment tool for the program. She offered a free workshop where she modeled self-analysis to show both the process and the approach used in the mentoring program. A handful of mentors say they do not have regular access to cameras or other technology and the lack of access limits the effectiveness of the work they can do.

When working with a mentee actually providing interpreting services, some mentors only observe although most also serve as the team interpreter for the mentee. In a case of mentoring into courtroom interpreting, the mentor does quite a bit of observation and has the mentee spend time in courtrooms without interpretation in order to predict issues and become familiar with the protocols.

Interpreters and students often approach DeafBlind mentors directly and ask for feedback or training. The DeafBlind mentors engage in a screening process, usually focused on the motivation of the potential mentee (are they interested in working with DeafBlind people or just curious about the specialty?). All of the mentors who are DeafBlind have the mentee work for and with them and provide ongoing feedback as both mentor and consumer. A couple of the DeafBlind mentors also do workshops as their "mentoring" process.

In the few cases where mentoring is mandatory, mentors are frustrated by lack of motivation or action on the part of the mentee. One noted that as soon as mentees see there is no real reward for their participation (pay raise, job advancement), they disengage from the process. Another mentor tells of going to an appointment to work with an educational interpreter and having to track down the mentee (dodging volleyballs

in the gym in the process). Once the mentor found her, the mentee initially refused to

even acknowledge her presence! Tales of reluctant mentees and interpreters who do not

take advantage of mentoring opportunities surfaced in all the groups, although it seems to

happen only a small percent of the time.

The final component of involvement for the mentors is the relationship they have

with the mentee after the mentorship is done. As noted in section 2.6, many mentors

keep in touch with former mentees. Some work with former mentees, some just track

mentees informally through the community and through checking online to see if the

mentee has passed a test or been licensed. Mentors see mentoring as development of a

relationship; there is a lot of trust, intensity and commitment within the process and

mentors expect that they will maintain that relationship over time.

3.4 Mentor diversity

There are no specific questions in the draft Statement of Work addressing diversity. The following question was asked during the focus groups:

"What specific issues must interpreters who are underrepresented in our field) mentors and mentees of color, Deaf interpreters, male interpreters) address to be successful in their work?"

Summary

- Ninety-five percent of the focus group participants are White/European American and 89% are women. Many of the mentors feel they do not have either experience or skills to work with mentees of color.

- Participants assume that mentors of color would prefer to mentor with people of similar background just as male mentors felt it was important to for them to work with male mentees.

- Mentors struggle to include CDIs in their general work and therefore do not feel they have an opportunity or realistic need to mentor CDIs.

- The few mentors who worked with people of a different ethnic background or gender felt there was a difference in the mentoring process and relationship.

The following tables illustrate how almost all of the data in this report related to underrepresented groups is based on speculation and a handful of direct experiences.

Table 6
Ethnicity (by number of participants

Native American/American Indian	0
Asian/Pasicific Islander	1
African American/Black	0
Hispanic/Latino	2
White/European American	69
Other	1

Table 7
Gender of participants (number and percent)

Female	64	88.89
Male	8	11.11

Table 8
Hearing status of participants (number and percent)

Deaf	9	12.5
Hearing	58	80.56
DeafBlind	5	6.94
Hard of Hearing	0	0

Mentors believe that mentees would benefit and perhaps be more successful if they worked with a mentor who was similar in gender or ethnicity. Male participants say they feel it is a difficult for males to feel comfortable in the field in general. In one case, a mentor said that he was reluctant to go into the field because it is so strongly associated with the female gender and that the work itself (dealing with emotions, using your hands and body in a somewhat artistic way) was "feminine". He overcame his reluctance because of the support from a male Deaf roommate.

Deaf mentors recognize the need for a diverse pool of interpreters and recognize how difficult (and oppressive) it is for Deaf people of color to always have white interpreters working with them. In terms of mentoring, it appears that Deaf mentors feel comfortable having direct conversation about diversity and differences. Deaf mentors tell interpreters the focus of mentoring is always about skill and that mentees need to maintain an open mind and be willing to learn about different cultures and perspectives as part of their work.

Some programs wished they could work with Deaf mentors (both interpreting and bringing them into the profession), but they did not feel opportunities were available for Deaf interpreters to work. The main barrier is the perception that it costs more to have both a Deaf and hearing interpreter and hiring agencies won't pay for Deaf interpreters. Some programs said they did not have plans or the capability to work with Deaf interpreters. This is interesting in light of mentor comments that language competence is a strong developmental need for mentees. It may be that because new interpreters do not have full competence to work, Certified Deaf Interpreters are more necessary than currently recognized. In the workforce, a CDI may be able to compensate for the new interpreter's weakness and it may be critical to successful interpretations to have both interpreters part of the process. This also speaks to another issue, namely, when faced with limited resources, it may be a more productive investment to provide ASL language mentors rather than interpreting mentors.

White mentors who worked with mentees of color did feel there was a need to be aware of cultural differences, understand issues of oppression, and to connect mentees with other interpreters or Deaf people who shared their gender and/or ethnicity. In a

couple of cases, mentors felt that there were issues of trust when they worked with African-American/Black mentees. One mentor went to an African-American/Black friend for advice and found that helpful. Another mentor said she felt the mentee did not succeed because of skill issues, while the mentee felt there was a cultural reason for the mentorship failing, indicating a strong difference in perception of the success of the work. A VRS mentor said they experience no difference in approach or outcomes with mentees of color because their evaluation system is very focused on demonstration of specific interpreting skills.

Mentors acknowledge a problem with recruitment of interpreters of color into the field. They also feel there is a lack of resources for interpreter education programs, mentoring programs and mentors for both interpreters of color and Deaf interpreters. Mentors recognize they do not know the perspective or experience of interpreters of color and that they may need to work harder to gain trust.

Coordinating focus groups exclusively made up of mentors/mentees of color, raised questions as to the process and dynamic of such a group .As a leader in the African-American/Black Black interpreting community pointed out, there is a different norm for mentoring and even coming into the field for interpreters of color - one that has a less formal structure and therefore not easily tapped into for this kind of data collection. Additionally, the structure and even the label of "focus groups" for data collection may be one of the barriers to drawing mentors of color into discussion. For example, mentoring in our field is generally (and accurately) perceived under the realm of the mainstream in funding, design, and operation. Mentoring in the African-American/Black Black community is provided and discussed in the context of leadership. Future data

collection must be designed thinking about how to adapt methodologies to include

culturally relevant processes. Communities of color have been historically overlooked in

both funding and data collection because the processes did not respect the paradigms of

people in the minority.

4. Mentees

4.1 New interpreters or specialization

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

> 12)   Does mentoring work better/differently depending on whether the
>
>   participants are current interpreters seeking additional specialization or
>
>   certification, or are new to the interpreting field?

Summary

- Most mentoring work is focused on interpreters new to the field.

- Interpreters working into specialization (performing arts, legal) have more
  measurable successes than interpreters mentoring for general goals. (Although
  the data set is small).

- Many interpreters only mentor to meet a credential (certification) and stop.

- Both new and experienced interpreters do not always take advantage of
  mentoring opportunities.

- Through mentoring, some interpreters learn they are not qualified and leave
  the field.

It appears that interpreting into specialized fields doesn't necessarily result in
"better" mentoring programs, but the targeted goal and the fact that the interpreters
already have skills in interpreting means that specialized mentoring operates differently
than other kinds of mentoring. The mentor has an ability to screen the mentee to
determine a base aptitude before taking them on. The specific knowledge/skill area is
very narrow and mostly related to vocabulary and protocol. Success is very measurable;

they get the legal certificate or not, they do a performing arts job, or a conference job etc. and the work is fairly short term.

There does not seem to be a difference in programs focused on mentoring towards certification/test and those focused on employment skills or other general skills except the former uses primarily videotaped work samples and the latter often includes live work done by the mentee.

Mentees in the focus groups were almost all interpreters with less than five years of experience in the field. Some had been mentored right after graduation; some were mentoring into VRS or other specialty areas. They repeated their belief that a lot of their growth in skills was due to work and exposure to Deaf people rather than the mentorship itself. As new interpreters, mentees feel they "don't know what they don't know" and would like more direct guidance and feedback about their work from mentors.

Table 9
Why did you get involved in mentoring? (from the targeted mentee group)

	Number of Mentees
Becomes skilled enough to feel comfortable interpreting gin the community	2
Need to pass NIC or other certification	3
Become a better interpreter	2
Learn and later become a mentor	1

DeafBlind mentors are working with new interpreters and ASL students as well. Mentors who are DeafBlind say some mentees are interpreters who have been scared to

work in the arena, implying they work with experienced interpreters although it is not said outright.

Several mentors said that a viable outcome for mentoring is for the mentee to decide to change course and either leave the field of interpreting/deafness or shift into a career that involves sign language but not interpreting.

4.2 Mentee Process

Statement of Work questions relating to the data

4B)   What is the level of involvement/intensity of mentees within the various

mentoring programs?

9)   What are the most common elements of interpreter mentoring programs?

How are they structured within mentoring programs? Do these different

ways of structuring the mentoring programs affect program quality?

10)   What artifacts are most commonly developed and/or used in the mentoring

process?

16)   What logs or other ways of recording mentor/protégé' interaction are kept

in mentoring programs?

Special Note

In our focus groups, 26 of the participants identified themselves as mentees; although

many of them indicated they were mentors as well. Because of the small representation

of mentees, most of the responses to the mentee experience are from mentors, so this

summary needs additional information directly from mentees to confirm what the original

participants said. In other words, this analysis is based more on what the mentors

perceive than what the mentees experience.

Summary

- Mentees must be self-motivated or see some valued reward in order to

succeed in mentorship

- Mentees sometimes lead the entire mentoring process but more often gradually take the lead as the mentorship progresses

- Mentees sometimes need explicit information on the mentoring approach and why it is not the same as what they experienced in school

- Mentees are the main focus for the mentor - mentors truly want them to feel the mentoring work as helpful and relevant

Mentees are the heart, soul and focus of mentoring programs. Mentors said over and over again that the process and outcomes belong to the mentee. However, some participants (and former mentees) said it was a tough transition into taking the lead as the mentee. Some mentees were operating under a teacher-student paradigm, some feel they have no idea what they wanted and do not get enough structure to help them take the lead. Many mentors said they start in control of the process and gradually cede, cajole, and (sometimes) force the mentee to be the one driving the process.

It may seem obvious, but participants emphasized that "mentee-driven" learning can only work when the mentee is highly motivated. The best mentor in the world cannot help a reluctant mentee improve unless they can determine an overlooked reward of value to the mentee. In addition, the mentee may need to have a baseline linguistic competence in order to find a self-directed discussion meaningful (see section 3.3 for further discussion).

Mentees are sometimes given a lot of documentation that can both help and confuse them. One program provides a thumb drive to the mentor and mentee. All the required documents are on the drive and the administrator regularly checks in with the mentee to make sure they understand what forms they need to be using. In other cases,

external requirements for data lead to a paperwork overload for both mentors and mentees.

As mentoring progresses mentees described having a problem managing relationships and ethical boundaries with the Deaf community. Once they started integrating and socializing regularly with Deaf people, mentees felt awkward if they had to interpret for someone they knew. Mentees felt they had to "draw a line" and, in essence, distance themselves from the very people who provide them with the most opportunity for growth and improvement.

Mentors say their greatest reward is when they see a mentee have what many refer to as an "Ah-ha!" experience. It can be that the mentee finally understands how to take charge of their own learning, a specific issue more clearly, or has a breakthrough in their work. Mentors say this experience takes time and that mentors need to be patient with the mentee while they (the mentee) goes through the learning process. Mentees who analyze themselves were then able to apply the approach of "asking instead of telling" when they became mentors.

Recommendations

The following section contains recommendations for actions to be taken or continued to be supported by the NCIEC and collaborative partners. As a general "what's next" step, these recommendations and the findings section of this report should be cross-referenced with the results of the 2006 mentor/mentee surveys, the 2007 literature review and the discussion notes from the 2006 mentor meeting in Boston in order to identify competencies and standards for generic mentoring programs. In addition, the workteam can identify mentoring practices that need further research, continued support and new recognition.

Recommendations: Outcomes

1. Work "backwards" to collect data from newly certified interpreters who experienced mentoring to tease out the effectiveness and role mentoring played in their achievement of a minimum standard.

2. Collect evaluation tools used by mentoring programs into a central, national repository and for review for potential measurable evidence of effectiveness.

3. Make a concerted effort to gather data related to mentoring processes and successes of interpreters of color, Deaf interpreters and male interpreters. Care needs to be taken to listen to cultural minorities to understand how the target topic might manifest in that community and how information is best collected. The African-American/Black interpreting community is looking for stronger commitment and efforts in providing legitimacy to their specific activities and may best be approached through efforts that offer visibility and viability of them and their work.

4. Gather more information from mentors working with experience interpreters to see how the process works compared with data already collected on new interpreters.

5. Offer and/or support regular training (perhaps through on-line videos mentors can access) in designing assessment and evaluation tools, linguistics, and current interpreting theories.

Recommendations: Programs

6. Develop evidence-based educational and outreach materials for programs to use to promote both programs and encourage administrative commitment to mentoring.

7. Support programs in tracking long-term results of mentoring with an eye towards answering the question of whether or not the mentee-driven approach is creating skilled and long-term interpreters. This could include developing a database system for mentoring programs to use to track mentees. Survey programs that have mentoring as a component of employment to see how many of the mentees are hired and continue to be employed by the company.

8. Explore creative funding options such as collaboration between funding entities (allow non-profit/for-profit connection), creating fellowships that will provide financial support for mentoring participants or offering distance mentoring or technology-based resources for a subscription fee that supports mentoring activities.

9. Offer connection and support opportunities to program administrators (i.e. national linkage, conferences).

10. Advocate and support legislative standards for interpreters that include funding sources for mentoring.

11. Ask programs that receive grant funds to document the fees (if any) that mentees pay into the program as well as the costs to operate the program in order to get a clearer picture of how much a standard mentoring program "costs" to run.

12. Survey mentees and ask whether paying a fee, paying no fee or even getting paid to mentor had an impact on the mentee's progress and outcomes.

13. Continue to investigate the perception that mentoring had to last at least five weeks or so for the mentee to start to change and even longer for the mentee to internalize their learning.

14. Support exploration of mentoring through technology. Perhaps establish and provide technical support for an on-line center for mentors and mentees to access (like a "BlackBoard" system) to share materials, video work samples and to do live video chats. Programs or mentors and mentees pay a fee to access the site and can use it to expand their practice to outside their geographical area.

15. Improve marketing and outreach to let new mentors and programs know about resources.

16. Create templates for the most common forms for programs can take and modify them to suit their needs (agreements, logs, activity reports and evaluations)

17. Promote the definition of "consumer" to include hearing people involved in the interpreted interaction.

Recommendations: Mentors

18. Form and encourage a variety of mentoring support systems that could include formation of a national organization, regular mentoring conferences, share shops, electronic connection opportunities and on-line resource banks/libraries

19. Develop and support training specifically for Deaf people working as language mentors.

20. Publish standards that outline mentor competencies, training, skills and personal characteristics for to new and continuing programs to incorporate in their recruitment and supervision process.

21. Support the continuation of the Master Mentor Program and market MMP graduates to programs and mentors.

22. Develop and/or support development of materials that support and promote the work of Certified Deaf interpreters.

23. Work with interpreters of color, to develop support materials for mentors working in and with their communities

Recommendations: Mentees

24. Track mentees to see if the interpreter achieves certification and remains in the field.

25. Focus on mentee experience when collecting additional data (we have a lot of information from administration and mentors, not a lot from mentees themselves).

26. Support recruitment efforts that focus on increasing diversity in the student

    population.

27. Focus less on programs and "how" they run and focus more on tracking mentee's

    progress in the interpreting field longer term.

28. Conduct a study of new interpreters working in VRS to determine how a diverse

    consumer pool impacts mentoring strategies and outcomes.

Remaining Questions

Questions still remain to be answered about the effectiveness of mentoring practices. Some of these questions may be answered in the other data sources already gathered by the workteam or prompt further exploration of mentoring practices and evaluation systems..

Remaining Questions: Outcomes

1. If mentorship programs are mentee-driven, is success then defined and determined by the mentee alone? How can programs document progress for themselves and external stakeholders?

2. If mentoring seems to have a greater impact on intangibles such as self-confidence, what kind of measurement tools can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the mentoring?

3. Does mentoring speed up a process that would naturally occur (new interpreters feeling more confident) or would the advances occur naturally anyway? Or does mentoring truly add a component of development that would otherwise go missing from a new interpreter's growth?

4. Is the limited money available or mentoring best placed in generic mentoring or should it be focused on ASL and English competence?

Remaining Questions: Programs

5. How can we continually develop, advocate for and publicize funding options and opportunities for programs?

6. How can we (and should we) define "mentoring" for both programs and the field to help distinguish between formal and informal systems as well as mentoring of new interpreters versus mentoring into specialization?

7. Can we align mentoring more closely with interpreter education programs to foster a connection or bridge from graduation to mentoring and access to program funding and resources?

8. How can video and distance technology work to bring mentors and mentees together, particularly offering the opportunity for Deaf language mentors to expand their practice and potentially make it financially viable and a career?

9. How do we make consumers (Deaf and hearing) part of a mentorship evaluation system?

10. How can we increase the number and skills of Deaf mentors for both Deaf and hearing interpreters?

Remaining Questions: Mentors

11. How can mentor standards recognize different mentoring configurations and not become too restrictive?

12. How can programs screen mentors for the "people skills" needed as well as their hard competencies. How can standards reflect the former skill set may even be more important than the latter?

13. How do we encourage flexibility within the mentor skill set to address the needs of different learning styles, personality types and cultural differences?

14. What exactly does the Vygotskian approach impact: self-awareness, confidence, etc, or specific skills or both? Is this approach mainly means to induct mentees into our field with a certain mind-set (self-awareness, responsibly, individual accountability, or does the approach really impact skills; i.e. make them better in the chair? Are we creating a generation of critical-thinking interpreters that still don't have the skill set to actually do the job?

15. How can resource material that includes minority ethnic groups be developed, promoted and perhaps part of the evaluation system of mentoring efforts?

Remaining Questions; Mentees

16. Given that VRS is such a large sector of interpreter employment, new interpreters must assume they will be working with diverse clients even if their geographic region is not particularly diverse. How can we best prepare them for this work?

17. What is the experience of mentees who are male and/or people of color?

18. Does the mentee-driven approach work more efficiently with newer interpreters or those going into specialization?

19. What do mentees perceive makes a "good" mentor?

APPENDIX A

Demographic Tables

Total participants in the groups: 72.

(Not all tables reflect responses from 72 individual people)

Table 10

Gender

Female	64
Male	8
Total	72

Table 11

Age

18-29	11
30-39	15
40-49	27
50-59	15
60-69	3
70+	0
No answer	1

Table 12

Ethnicity   (by number of participants)

Native American/American Indian	0
African American/Black	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1
Other	1
Hispanic/Latino	2
White/European American	69

One participant marked both "Hispanic/Latino" and "Other" causing the total responses in this table to be 73 instead of 72.

Table 13

Highest Education level completed (by number of participants)

High School Diploma	2
PhD	3
Certificate/Diploma program	4
No answer	7
Associate's Degree	15
BA	21
MA	26

Table 14

State of Residence (rank order)

CA	10
MN	8
TX	6
OH	6
CO	5
UT	5
MA	5
MO	4
OR	4
NY	4
KS	3
WI	2
WA	1
MI	1
FL	1

Table 15

State of Residence (alphabetical order)

CA	10
CO	5
FL	1
KS	3
MA	5
MI	1
MN	8
MO	4
NY	4
OH	6
OR	4
TX	6
UT	5
WA	1
WI	2

The states in Tables 14 and 15 were not the states in which the focus groups were held, however the demographics of the focus groups were heavily influenced by the location of the groups.

Table 16

Hearing Status

Deaf	9
Hearing	58
DeafBlind	5
Hard of Hearing	0

Table 17

Years interpreting

-3	7
3-5 years	3
6-10 years	13
11-15 years	7
16-20 years	11
21-30 years	15
30+ years	4
N/A	2

Table 18

Years interpreting (rank order)

21-30 years	15
6-10 years	13
16-20 years	11
-3 years	7
11-15 years	7
30+ years	4
3-5 years	3
N/A	2

Tables 17 and 18 are a reflection of the respondents who were interpreters, not the total participants in the group.

Table 19

Certified?

Yes	6
No	5
No Answer	7

Table 20

Certifications

National	99
State	28
Total Certifications	127

In the demographic form, the question for Tables 19 and 20 was; "Are you a certified interpreter?" Participants decided themselves whether to represent state quality assurance standards as well as national certifications. Participants were asked to list all the certifications they had. The total of 127 certifications represents total certifications held by the 60 interpreters who said they were certified.

Table 21

National Certifications held by participants

RID Certificate of Interpretation (CI)	31
RID Certificate of Transliteration (CT)	31
RID Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI)	5
RID Transliteration Certificate (TC)	4
RID Specialized Certificate: Legal (SC:L)	4
National Association of the Deaf (NAD) Level 5	4
RID National Interpreter Certification (NIC)	4
RID Comprehensive Skills Certificate (CSC)	3
RID Interpreting Certificate (IC)	3
National Association of the Deaf (NAD) Level 3	3
Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) (level unspecified)	3
RID National Interpreter Certification- Advanced (NIC:A)	2
RID Oral Transliteration Certificate (OTC)	1
National Association of the Deaf (NAD) Level 4	1
Total National Certifications held	**99**

Table 22

Role

Mentor	52
Interpreter Educator	31
Mentee	26
Administrator	24
ASL teacher	8
Consumer	5
Other	5

In Table 22, "Consumer" was not available in all the demographic forms. Participants were asked to check all categories that applied to them. Under the "Other" category, participants wrote in the following descriptions: company owner, consultant, workshop trainer (general), workshop trainer (working with DeafBlind children).

Table 23

Did/do you provide mentoring as a staff position?

Yes	41
No	23

T*he question on the demographic form was; " Did/do you provide mentoring as a staff position? " Although fifty-four people labeled themselves as "mentors" (Table 22), sixty-four responded to the question in Table 23. It is likely that in response to Table 22, only people who were currently working as a mentor checked that role, where in Table 231, anyone who had done mentoring at all responded to the question. Each participant decided if they were representing themselves at the moment they filled out the form or if they were including past work. There were no specific instructions in either the protocols or the demographic forms dictating a fixed point in time to respond to.*

Table 24

If mentoring was part of your job, did you mentor full or part-time?

Full Time	11
Part Time	26
N/A	7

Table 25

Setting where mentoring took place

Community Setting	34
Post-secondary	28
K12	25
Medical	12
VRS	11
Legal	6
Performing Arts	5
Minimal Language Skills	1

Table 26

Do you train other mentors?

No	31
Yes	25
N/A	1

Table 27		*Table 28*	
Number of years working informally as a mentor		*Number of years working formally as a mentor*	
-3	6	-3	15
3-5 years	11	3-5 years	15
6-10 years	12	6-10 years	13
11-15 years	13	11-15 years	9
16+ years	12	16+ years	5
N/A	5	N/A	9

For Tables 27 and 28, participants decided for themselves what "informally" and "formally" meant.

Table 29

Frequency of mentoring sessions

Less than once a month	4
One to two times a month	8
Three to five times a month	20
Six to ten times a month	4
More than ten times a month	14
Used to mentor but do not now	19
Not a mentor	5

Table 30

Mentor preparation/training

Workshops	45
Related college courses	19
Certification program	10
None	6
Other	2

The question in the demographic form for Table 30 was; "What type of education/training did you have that prepared you to mentor?" Participants were asked to check all the categories that applied. There was no specific definition of a "Certificate program". Participants who had attended the Master Mentor Program earned a certificate on completion and were awarded graduate level credit. Other immersion programs may not have had a graduate level curriculum yet awarded a certificate to participants, so the category does not represent a specific academic level. Preparation listed under the "Other" category included: in-house training, apprenticeship under another mentor, interpreter education programs, DO IT Center, the Master Mentor Program and "the school of hard knocks". A listing of specific workshop/training topics can be found in Table 31.

Table 31

Workshop topics

Mentoring: short workshop	9
Mentoring: intensive training	8
Assessment	6
Teaching/Pedagogy	5
"Feedback" (unspecified)	5
Interpreting models (Cokely, Colonomos)	4
Interpreting (unspecified)	4
Diagnostics	4
Master Mentor Program	3
ASL	3
Setting goals (using Taylor text)	2
Self-Assessment	2
Supervisor training	2
Demand-Control Schema (Dean and Pollard)	2
Mentoring Conference (2004)	2
General professional development	1
Interpreting in DeafBlind settings	1
Support Services Personnel (SSP)	1
Culture/Identity	1
Deaf Mentor Panel	1
Legal mentoring	1

Table 31 is not a tally of all participants, but rather a tally of groups. If a topic was mentioned once in a group (even if it was mentioned by several participants in that group), it was given a single check mark. The check marks were then tallied. The participants wrote the workshop/training titles into the demographic forms.

Table 32

Did you feel prepared when you began mentoring?

Yes	25
No	36
No Answer	5

Table 33

Should mentors be screened and supervised?

Yes	56
No	9
No Answer	9

The terms "screening" and "supervision" were not defined, Many respondents felt either screening or supervision might be necessary, but were not given the choice to respond to each category separately

Table 34

Should mentors be require to have the following educational credentials and/or training?

	Yes	No
Post- BA training	30	18
Master's Degree	21	23
Certificate Program	44	11

In Table 34, respondents could check as many of the educational categories they felt should apply and several chose to leave the section blank and write in a comment instead.

Table 35

Top four mentor competencies (from a fixed list)

Motivation	18
Diagnostic assessment	17
Know resources	15
Understand learning styles	15
Ethics and decision making	13
Adult learning theory	11
Flexible schedule	9
Professional Development	8
Interpreting Process*	7
Leadership	6
Other	6
Linguistics*	6
Cultural competence	5
Knowledge of Deaf/Blindness*	5
Culture and diversity	4
Deaf Culture *	1
Knowledge of laws	0
Hearing culture*	0

* denotes competencies that were not present in all the demographic forms

Mentee Tables

One focus group consisted only of mentees. There were six participants in this targeted focus group. These participants were given a specialized demographic form along with the regular demographic form, therefore Tables 34-41 include this group's responses. Mentee Tables reflect the responses to the specialized demographic form.

Table 36

What was your interpreter education program?

Certificate	A.A.	B.A.	Additional workshops
1	3	2	4

Table 37

Why did you get involved in mentoring?

Become skilled enough to feel comfortable interpreting in the community	2
Need to pass NIC or other certification	3
Become better interpreter	2
Learn and become a mentor	1

Table 38

Was mentoring provided as part of your job?

Yes	6
No	0

Table 39

Were you working full or part-time when you were getting mentoring?

Full time	2
Part time	3
N/A	1

Table 40

How long have you been informally mentored?

-3 years	5
3-5 years	1

Table 41

How long have you been formally mentored?

-3 years	6

Table 42

Were your mentors Deaf or hearing?

Deaf only	0
Hearing only	1
Worked with both	5

Table 43

How long since you completed your mentoring?

Still in mentoring	3
4-8 months	1
1-2 years	2

APPENDIX B

Findings Summary

This appendix contains a bulleted synthesis of the focus group data. The overall data is not different than the bulleted sections in Part I of this report, however the data for all categories is combined into one list and framed more strongly in the language of "what is working" This information can be seen as an executive summary or a short version of the entire report.

Outcomes

Mentees (particularly newer interpreters) demonstrate increases in:

- Confidence

- Self-awareness

- Self-analysis skills

- Skills in teaming and dialoguing with peers

- Ability to gradually take over the process of their professional development

- Connection to the larger interpreting community

- Employment

Mentors mention the following increases as well, although not as often as the first list:

- Certification

- Improved ASL comprehension and production

- More effective management of the interpreting process

- Development of decision-making skills

- Extension of career options into specialty areas

Programs

Programs that have sustained over time have:

- A consistent pool of mentees

- A coordinator

- Mentor standards and support

- Mentor training

- Mentee orientation

- Structure that includes

    Meeting times (once a week to once every two weeks)

    Meeting lengths (one and a half hours)

    Activities/assignments

    Resources (for mentor and mentee)

    Documentation

    Beginning and end dates (at least 8 weeks)

- Deaf people as mentors, language models (live and in source texts) and

    cultural informants

- Administrators that value, support and advocate for mentoring programs and

    who understant benefits of a mentorship program beyond generating income

What makes programs even more effective:

- Access to technology, particularly digital media

- Mentor peer support system

- Program administrator support system

- Deaf people as resources for the mentor and/or as consumer providing input

- Pay equity - Deaf/hearing as well as interpreting/mentoring

- Access to a range of source texts - different registers, ethic groups and situations

- Pre and post video work samples

- Mandates that trigger support for programs (i.e. QA laws)

Mentors

Mentors are more effective when they:

- Understand and support a mentee-driven approach

- Are willing to continually seek training

- Are committed to the program and mentee

- Demonstrate "emotional intelligence": (empathy, caring, support, self-awareness)

- Understand the interpreting process

- Have knowledge of adult learning and basic pedagogical techniques

- Have (if relevant) knowledge and connection to resources in area of specialization

- Are flexible in their approach, sometimes taking the lead through coaching, modeling and directly teaching if it supports the mentee in their process.

- Are strongly motivated and motivating

Mentors are even more effective when they have:

- Training in diagnostic assessment

- Knowledge of linguistics (ASL and English)

- Connection to resources, both material and other mentors

- Sensitivity to ethic, cultural and gender differences

- Strong organizational skills

- Good reliability

- Willingness to model their own work and analysis process

- Experience with current national testing systems

- Are seen as having unique skills that are valuable and worth adequate compensation.

Mentees

Mentees are more successful when they have:

- Incentive (job, pay raise, certification, meeting a standard)

- High personal motivation

- Experience interpreting (if seeking specialization)

- Orientation and acceptance of a learner-driven approach to the work

- Access to technology

- Willingness to videotape and review their work

- Assertiveness in seeking Deaf mentors, particularly for ASL development and consumer input

- Commitment to the schedule and activities

Mentees can be even more effective when they:

- Do actual interpreting work and have immediate feedback/dialogue

- Participate in evaluations with the mentor and consumer(s).

- Get feedback that is specific and direct

APPENDIX C

Demographic Forms

This appendix contains the demographic questions used in the focus groups. The standard demographic form is shown first. The targeted focus group participants answered most of the same questions. Questions unique to the Deaf mentor, DeafBlind mentor and mentee groups are listed at the end of the standard form.

Effective Practices: Mentoring Focus Group Demographic Questions

1. Gender: Female   Male

2. What is your hearing status? (please circle one)

    Hearing   Deaf   Hard of Hearing   Deaf Blind

3. What is your age?

    _____18 - 29 years old

    _____30 - 39 years old

    _____40 - 49 years old

    _____50 - 59 years old

    _____60 - 69 years old

    _____70 or better

4. What is the highest educational level you have achieved?

    _____High school

    _____Certificate/diploma

    _____AA degree

_____Bachelor's degree

_____Masters degree

_____Doctorate

5. Ethnicity

_____Native American/American Indian

_____Asian/Pacific Islander

_____African-American/Black

_____Hispanic/Latino

_____White Non-Hispanic/European American

_____Other Please specify_____

6. Which of the following characterizes your role in relation to mentoring? (check all that apply).

_____ Mentor

_____ Mentee

_____ Interpreter educator

_____ Language instructor

_____ Mentoring Program administrator

_____ Other: _____

7. What state do you live in? _____

8. How many years have you been interpreting? _____

9. How long have you been informally mentoring?

　　　　_____ Less than 3 years

　　　　_____ 3-5 years

　　　　_____ 6-10 years

　　　　_____ 11-15 years

　　　　_____ 16+ years

　　　　_____ I do not mentor

9. How long have you been formally mentoring (not including supervised internships)?

　　　　_____ Less than 3 years

　　　　_____ 3-5 years

　　　　_____ 6-10 years

　　　　_____ 11-15 years

　　　　_____ 16+ years

　　　　I do not formally mentor

10. How often do you mentor? (please check one)

　　　　_____ Less than once per month

　　　　_____ 1-2 times per month

　　　　_____ 3-5 times per month

　　　　_____ 6-10 times per month

_____ More than 10 times per month.

_____I am currently not mentoring, but I have in the past.

_____ I am not a mentor

10. Did/do you provide mentoring as a staff position? Yes ____ No____

(If yes, part-time or full-time?) _____

11.Do you mentor or train other mentors? Yes ____ No____

20.   In what settings do you mentor? (check all that apply)

_____K12   _____Medical

_____Postsecondary   _____Legal

_____Performing Arts   _____Community

_____VRS   _____MLS

_____Other: Specify

12. Are you a certified interpreter?   Yes ____ No____

If yes, how long have you been certified?

If yes, what certification(s) do you hold (including state and national)?

13. What type of education/training did you have that prepared you to mentor? (check all
that apply)

____ None

_____ Certificate Program

_____ College courses on related topics (education, etc.)

_____ Workshops (what topics?)

_____ Other: Describe

14. When you first started mentoring, did you feel appropriately prepared?

Yes _____ No_____

Please explain:

16. Place a check next to the FOUR competencies that are most important for mentors to

have.

_____ Adult learning theory understanding

_____ Culture and Diversity awareness

_____ Flexible schedule

_____ Awareness of resources

_____ Ethical and Professional Decision Making

_____ Diagnostic skills

_____ Awareness of different learning styles

_____ Knowledge of laws that effect interpreters

_____ Leadership

_____Cultural competence

_____ Motivation

_____ Professional Development and Continuing Education

_____ Other (describe) _____

19. Do you see a need for specific advanced education in mentoring?

Post baccalaureate certificate   Yes _____No _____

Masters degree   Yes _____No _____

Certificate Program   Yes _____No _____

Why or why not?

20.   Do you feel mentors should be screened and supervised – perhaps even

licensed?

Yes_____ No_____

Why or Why not?

Unique Demographic Elements for Deaf Mentors

How do you identify yourself?

Deaf   Hard of Hearing   Deaf Blind

What are your roles in educating interpreters? (check all that apply).

_____ Mentor

_____ Interpreter educator

_____ ASL instructor

_____ Mentoring Program   administrator

_____ Other: _____

Are you a Certified Deaf Interpreter?   Yes _____ No_____

        If no, have you passed the CDI written test? Yes _____ No_____

        If yes, how long have you been certified?

Place a check next to the FOUR competencies that are most important for Deaf mentors

to have.

_____Adult learning theory understanding

_____Knowledge of Deaf culture

_____Knowledge of hearing culture

_____Knowledge of linguistics

_____Understand the interpreting process

_____Flexible schedule

_____ Awareness of resources

_____Ethical and Professional Decision Making

_____Diagnostic skills

_____Awareness of different learning styles

_____Motivation

_____Professional Development and Continuing Education

_____ Other   (please describe)

Unique Demographic Elements for DeafBlind Mentors

Note: because this focus group was conducted through e-mail, the demographic and

focus group questions were combined into one document that was sent to the facilitator.

The facilitator then adapted the document format to fit the needs of the DeafBlind mentor

responding to the questions.

How do you identify yourself?

Deaf

Hard of Hearing

Deaf Blind

What are your roles related to interpreters? (check all that apply).

Consumer

Mentor

Interpreter educator

ASL instructor

Other (please specify)

Do you only mentor interpreters to provide services to DeafBlind people?

If "no" what other settings do you mentor interpreters to work in?

What are the top FOUR competencies that are most important for DeafBlind mentors to have?

Adult learning theory/learning styles understanding

Knowledge of Deaf culture

Knowledge of DeafBlindness

Knowledge of hearing culture

Knowledge of linguistics

Understand the interpreting process

Flexible schedule

Awareness of resources

Ethical and Professional Decision Making

Diagnostic skills

Motivation

Professional Development and Continuing Education

Other (describe)

Unique Demographic Elements for Mentees

How often do/did you connect with your mentor (in person, phone or digitally)? (please check one)

_____ Less than once per month

_____ 1-2 times per month

_____ 3-5 times per month

_____ 6-10 times per month

_____ More than 10 times per month.

If you have already completed a mentoring program, how long has it been since you

finished?

_____ I am still in a program

_____ Less than 1 month

_____ 1-3 months

_____ 4-8 months

_____ 9-12 months

_____ 1-2 years

_____ 1-2 years

_____ 2+ years

Did you work with mentors who are

Deaf   Hearing   Worked with both

Are you certified?   Yes _____ No_____

If yes, how long have you been certified?

If yes, what certification(s) do you hold (including state and national)?

 If no, please explain why not (didn't pass, scheduled, waiting for results, etc)

What type of education/training did you have that prepared you to interpret? (check all that apply)

    ____ None

    ____ Certificate Program

    ____ AA program

    ____ BA program

    ____ Workshops (what topics?)

    ____ Other: Describe

What was your reason for working with a mentor – what were your initial goals?

APPENDIX D

Focus Group Questions

Focus group questions were almost the same in every group. Several questions were deleted for the DeafBlind focus group in order to keep the total number of questions managable for e-mail responses. Some questions for the mentee group were modifications of the original and some questions were added. There were no modifications to the questions for the Deaf mentor group. Below are the standard questions followed by the questions unique to the mentee group.

Mentoring Effective Practices

Focus Group Questions

FORM A

Current practice means survey results or what mentors are doing that is known

Best practice means focus group's "ideal" or accepted/consensus of ideal or good

practice; practices with reasonably strong data to support them

Effective practice - practices with research proven results of some kind

For the facilitator – we have listed questions below. In some cases, we've offered a series of "prompts" you may use to begin or focus the discussion. You do not have to ask the prompts, they are there just to help you.

If a question has already been answered as part of an earlier question, you do not need to repeat the question.

REMEMBER – WE ARE LOOKING FOR RESPONSES THAT EXPLAIN WHAT "WORKS" NOT JUST WHAT A REPORT ON WHAT THEY DO, WHAT THEY WISH WOULD HAPPEN OR A LIST OF PROBLEMS

1. How do you define "success" in your mentoring programs?

2. Describe you or your program's mentoring philosophy and process.

   [prompt] Who decides what happens in the mentoring process? How do you set goals? How are skill development activities created and done? Who is the "final say" on whether or not something is working?

3. If observations have been used or helpful, what do you try to observe [in terms of live work]? How do you conduct those observations and the subsequent feedback/conversation with the mentee?

4. Are you seeing consistent, tangible, measurable results in your mentorship? If so, how do you identify them? What evidence would you offer to demonstrate those results to others? (i.e. what can you "prove" works and how?) If people stay in the program – why?

5. What barriers make it difficult for you or the mentee to have a program as effective as you would like?

   [prompt] – What makes you think; "If not for xyz, my mentoring could work better

6. If you have had experience with this, what specific issues must interpreters who

   are underrepresented in our field (mentors and mentees of color, Deaf interpreters,

   male interpreters) address to be successful in their work?

   > [prompt:] both as mentors/mentees and as interpreters. What strategies do

   > you use to address these issues?

7. What support systems have you relied on to get help and resources for yourself?

   > [prompt] other mentors, supervisors, on-line network, etc

8. If your program is on going (at least two cycles), what makes it "sustainable"?

   > [prompt: secure, and/or multi-source funding? Solid mentor training?

   > Well defined pipeline of prospective mentees? Or what?]

9. What skills are you most successfully able to impact through mentorship?

   > [prompt] What do you actually see mentees getting better at during the

   > course of the mentorship process?

10. What has been the optimal schedule for your work with mentees, both in

    terms of overall length and the scheduling of the mentorship activities? Why?

11. Are mentees given an orientation in your programs and how does it

    contribute to the effectiveness of the mentorship?

12. (If not answered already) What formal documentation of the mentoring

    process is used in your mentorship? Is this by choice, or is it a requirement of the

    program? How does this paperwork help your own approach to mentoring?

   > [prompt: agreements, logs, evaluations?]

13.   Do you (or your programs) track participants after mentorship? What do

you look for, and how do you keep track? - and for how long? If you don't track

mentees, do you find out informally how they are doing after it's over – and how?

14.   What kind of training was most important for you as a mentor?

[prompt] What was it that was so important – content, length, other?

15.   Given our goal of finding out what really works in the "real world" of

mentoring - what am I not asking that you think is important for us to know?

16.   Who else should we be talking to?

[prompt] You can name specific people, organizations or stakeholders.

FORM B (questions if there is time left)

1. What has surprised you as a mentor?

[prompt] What makes you think "wow" I didn't realize this would be so

important to the success of mentoring"?

2. What additional training and/or support do you need now to continue to improve

your work as a mentor? What do you wish you had now?

3. Mentors in the survey indicated that their most successful mentorship happened

when they did observations in real life settings, face-to-face meetings and

reviewing videos and DVDs of the mentee's work. To what extent do you agree

with this? And Is there another approach you have used with success (e.g.

distance, small group, etc)

4. Do you have additional resources to list that are your "go to" books, articles,

DVDs etc?

5. Who is the "typical" mentee you work with and what are mentees

asking/expecting from mentoring?

6. For Betsy - is anyone interested in being part of a portfolio design group? (collect

contact info for interested participants)

Questions unique to mentee focus group

Was/is your mentoring experience a "success"? What made it that way?

How were your "outcomes" measured?

What degree of progress do you thing is reasonable to expect within a mentoring time

period of 8-15 sessions?

If you can, separate out for me what effects the mentoring had separate from your other

learning experiences after graduation.

How did you pay for your mentoring?

What skills and/or knowledge are you still using after your mentorship?

What additional training and/or support do you need now to continue to improve your

work as an interpreter? What kind of mentoring do you wish you had now? to?

Question unique to DeafBlind focus group

What are the unique elements of your mentoring work; skills; approaches; outcomes?

Why is working as a DeafBlind mentor different than a hearing/sighted or Deaf mentor?

APPENDIX E

Resources

This appendix contains a list of resources that focus group participants shared with their facilitators. All participants were asked to name the resources they use the most during their interpreting work. Not all participants responded and at least two groups had no responses at all. Each resource was counted once for a whole group whether or not it was listed several times in the group. The resources were sub-divided into publications, videotapes, CD-ROMs, DVDs, web sites and "others".

Whenever possible, the table contains information about the author or source of the resource as well as the name. In some cases, a general resource is named that might be of interest so it was kept in the list. This is not meant to be a bibliography, just a snapshot of some of the resources in use throughout mentoring programs.

Because the list of publications is very long, it is presented here in three formats; ranked (Resource Table 1), alphabetical by author (Resource Table 2) and finally shortened to the resources mentioned by at least two groups (Resource Table 3). Tables listing the videotape, CD-ROM, DVD, Web sties and other resources are each sorted in rank order.

RESOURCES: PUBLICATIONS

Resource Table 1
Publications ranked by number of groups that mention the resource

Resource (publication)	Number of groups
Taylor M. Interpretation Skills: English-ASL	9
Taylor, M. Interpretation Skills:ASL-English	9
Colonomos, B. and Cokely, D. models of interpretation (from workshops)	4
Dean, R. and Pollard, R. Demand-Control Schema	4
Patrie, C. Effective Interpreting Series	4
Colonomos - various handouts	3
Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment information (unspecified)	3
Gish, S. A Vygotskian Perspective on Interpreter Education	3
Gish, S. Goal-to-Detail;Detail-to-Goal	3
Gordon, P. and Magler, M. The Mentor's Companion	3
Mindess, A. Reading Between the Signs	3
Witter-Merithew, A. Diagnostic tools (ASI)	3
Baker-Shenk, C. and Cokely, D. American Sign Language ("Green Books")	2
Boinis, et. al: Self-Paced Modules for Interpreter Skill Development	2
Harbour, W. and Von Nostrand, C. Charting the Way (University of MN)	2
Vygotsky, L.S. (unspecified publication)	2

Resource (publication)	Number of groups
Witter-Merithew, A. Newman-Solo, S. and Fant, L. Interpreting in the American Legal System.	2
Bailey, J. and Feyne, S. RID Views articles (unspecified)	1
Baker-Shenk article about facial grammar	1
Bowen Bailey, D. et al. Independent Study Packets - (CATIE center)	1
Bridges, B. and Metzger:, M. Deaf Tend Your (book and video)	1
CIT Proceedings - 1986	1
Cokely, D.: Interpretation: A Sociolinguistic Model	1
Colonomos, B Foundations course work handouts	1
Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education, A Guidebook for Interpreters: Making Accommodations for Individuals with Dual Sensory Impairments (S. Morgan, 2004)	1
Covey, S. The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People	1
Humphrey, J. So You Want to be an Interpreter?	1
Humphries, T., Padden, C., and O'Rourke, T. A Basic Course in American Sign Language	1
Kelly, J. Transliteration: Show me the English	1

Resource (publication)	Number of groups
Metzger, M. et al From Topic Boundaries to Omission: New Research on Interpretation	1
Meyers, P. "Optimizing Observation"	1
Mikos, K.,Smith, C. and Lentz, E.M. Signing Naturally (books and videos)	1
Murry, M. Beyond the Myths and Magic of Mentoring	1
Ruiz, Don Miguel: The Four Agreements (book and workbook)	1
Selsekovich, D. Interpreting for International Conferences	1
Smith, T. Dissertation (not named)	1
Smith, T. Guidelines for working with DB people	1
Stewart-Mills, K. and Witter-Merithew, A. The Dimensions of Ethical Decision-Making	1
The National Curriculum for Training Interpreters Working with People Who Are Deaf-Blind (Program 1: "The Deaf-Blind Community Experience") (National Interpreter Education Project, 2001)	1
Tolle, E. The Power of Now	1
Winston, E. and Monikowski, C. Discourse Mapping	1
Witter-Merithew, A. Cohesion and Deixis	1

Resource Table 2
Publications in alphabetical order

Resource (publication)	Number of groups
Bailey, J. and Feyne, S. RID Views articles (unspecified)	1
Baker-Shenk article about facial grammar	1
Baker-Shenk, C. and Cokely, D. American Sign Language ("Green Books")	2
Boinis, et. al: Self-Paced Modules for Interpreter Skill Development	2
Bowen Bailey, D. et al. Independent Study Packets - (CATIE center)	1
Bridges, B. and Metzger:, M. Deaf Tend Your (book and video)	1
CIT Proceedings - 1986	1
Cokely, D.: Interpretation: A Sociolinguistic Model	1
Colonomos - various handouts	3
Colonomos, B Foundations course work handouts	1
Colonomos, B. and Cokely, D. models of interpretation (from workshops)	4
Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education, A Guidebook for Interpreters: Making Accommodations for Individuals with Dual Sensory Impairments (S. Morgan, 2004)	1
Covey, S. The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People	1
Dean, R. and Pollard, R. Demand-Control Schema	4
Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment information (unspecified)	3

Resource (publication)	Number of groups
Gish, S. A Vygotskian Perspective on Interpreter Education	3
Gish, S. Goal-to-Detail;Detail-to-Goal	3
Gordon, P. and Magler, M. The Mentor's Companion	3
Harbour, W. and Von Nostrand, C. Charting the Way (University of MN)	2
Humphrey, J. So You Want to be an Interpreter?	1
Humphries, T., Padden, C., and O'Rourke, T. A Basic Course in American Sign Language	1
Kelly, J. Transliteration: Show me the English	1
Metzger, M. et al From Topic Boundaries to Omission: New Research on Interpretation	1
Meyers, P. "Optimizing Observation"	1
Mikos, K.,Smith, C. and Lentz, E.M. Signing Naturally (books and videos)	1
Mindess, A. Reading Between the Signs	3
Murry, M. Beyond the Myths and Magic of Mentoring	1
Patrie, C. Effective Interpreting Series	4
Ruiz, Don Miguel: The Four Agreements (book and workbook)	1
Selsekovich, D. Interpreting for International Conferences	1
Smith, T. Dissertation (not named)	1

Resource (publication)	Number of groups
Smith, T. Guidelines for working with DB people	1
Stewart-Mills, K. and Witter-Merithew, A. The Dimensions of Ethical Decision-Making	1
Taylor M. Interpretation Skills: English-ASL	9
Taylor, M. Interpretation Skills:ASL-English	9
The National Curriculum for Training Interpreters Working with People Who Are Deaf-Blind (Program 1: "The Deaf-Blind Community Experience") (National Interpreter Education Project, 2001)	1
Tolle, E. The Power of Now	1
Vygotsky, L.S. (unspecified publication)	2
Winston, E. and Monikowski, C. Discourse Mapping	1
Witter-Merithew, A. Cohesion and Deixis	1
Witter-Merithew, A. Diagnostic tools (ASI)	3
Witter-Merithew, A. Newman-Solo, S. and Fant, L. Interpreting in the American Legal System.	2

Resource Table 3
Publications mentioned in at least two groups

Resources (publications)	Number of groups
Taylor M. Interpretation Skills: English-ASL	9
Taylor, M. Interpretation Skills:ASL-English	9
Colonomos, B. and Cokely, D. models of interpretation (from workshops)	4
Dean, R. and Pollard, R. Demand-Control Schema	4
Patrie, C. Effective Interpreting Series	4
Colonomos - various handouts	3
Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment information (unspecified)	3
Gish, S. A Vygotskian Perspective on Interpreter Education	3
Gish, S. Goal-to-Detail;Detail-to-Goal	3
Gordon, P. and Magler, M. The Mentor's Companion	3
Mindess, A. Reading Between the Signs	3
Witter-Merithew, A. Diagnostic tools (ASI)	3
Baker-Shenk, C. and Cokely, D. American Sign Language ("Green Books")	2
Boinis, et. al: Self-Paced Modules for Interpreter Skill Development	2
Harbour, W. and Von Nostrand, C. Charting the Way (University of MN)	2
Vygotsky, L.S. (unspecified publication)	2

Resources (publications)	Number of groups
Witter-Merithew, A. Newman-Solo, S. and Fant, L. Interpreting in the American Legal System.	2

RESOURCES: VIDEOTAPE

Resource Table 4
Resources: Videotape

Resource (videotape)	Number of groups
Patrie, C. Effective Interpreting Series	4
National Clearinghouse of Rehabilitation Training Materials (NCRTM)	3
Pursuit of ASL: Interesting Facts using Classifiers (Interpreting Consolidated)	3
Public School in Action	2
Baker-Shenk, C. and Cokely, D. American Sign Language ("Green Books")	2
Interactive Dialogues and Advanced Stimulus Materials (SMI)	2
Sign Enhancers materials (general)	2
Travis County Services for the Deaf "in-house" videos	1
Texas Preparation materials for state certification test (BEI)	1
Bonnie, B., Guby, G. Video-tape series from DO-IT Center	1
DO-IT 1999 activities (FRCC)	1
Kansas School for the Deaf Visual Story Reading Series	1
Witter-Merithew, A. Newman-Solo, S. and Fant, L. Interpreting in the American Legal System.	1

Resource (videotape)	Number of groups
Sign Language Associates "in-house" English narratives	1
Kraft, B.: Tomorrow Dad will Still be Deaf	1
Deaf Culture Autobiographies - Seago, Eastman and Bienvenu (Sign Enhancers)	1

RESOURCES: CD-ROM

Resource Table 5
Resources: CD-ROM

Resources (CD-ROM)	Number of groups
CATIE Center (general)	3
Various: (Signs-of-Development)	2
Lessard, P. Classifiers (Treehouse Videos)	1
Lazorisak, C. Classifiers (Signs-of-Development)	1
Hernandez, M. Classifiers (Signs-of-Development)	1
Bruce, J. Classifiers (Signs-of-Development)	1
Behan, B. and Suppala, S. Birds of a Different Feather	1
Mirrored Math (Digiterp)	1
Life in Parallel (Digiterp - also in DVD)	1

RESOURCES:

DVD

Resource Table 6
Resources: DVD

Resources (DVD)	Number of groups
Pursuit of ASL: Interesting Facts using Classifiers (Interpreting Consolidated)	2
NIC preparation DVD (RID)	2
ASL Expansion/Compression (NTID)	1
K-12 interpreting (Sign Enhancers)	1
Interpreter Discourse: English to ASL Expressions and ASL to English Comprehension (unknown distributor)	1
He Said/She Said (Digiterp)	1
Signs of Minnesota (MADC/Digiterp)	1
Nathie Marbury (Sign Enhancer)	1
Legal preparation (Signs-of-Development)	1

RESOURCES: WEB SITES

Resource Table 7
Resources: Web sites

Resources (Web sites)	Number of
Fingerspelling web sites (unspecified)	1
www.asl.neu.edu/TIEM.online (mentoring section in particular)	2
http://www.ncrtm.org (resource library)	1
www.deafread.com (aggregate site for deafness-related blogs)	1
www.aslpro.com (ASL dictionary)	1
http://commtechlab.msu.edu/Sites/aslweb/browser.htm (ASL	1

Resources (Web sites)	Number of
Video logs (Vlogs) with Deaf speakers	**2**

RESOURCES: OTHER

Resource Table 8
Resources: Other

Resources (Other)	Number of
Recording and playback equipment	**3**
Personal notes from Master Mentor program	**2**
National Public Radio programs (as source material)	**2**
Helen Keller National Center	**1**
Deaf consumers	**1**
Guest speakers (consumers, teachers, etc.)	**1**
Feedback process called "I Heard/I Saw"	**1**