

**AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE SCHOLAR'S MENTORSHIP PROGRAM**

by

GWENETH M. LLOYD

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Social Welfare, The City University of New York**

2004

UMI Number: 3127894

Copyright 2004 by
Lloyd, Gweneth M.

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3127894

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2004

GWENETH M. LLOYD

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare.

April 26, 2004
Date

Michael J. Smith
Chair of Examining Committee

April 26, 2004
Date

Yida Fabrice
Executive Officer

Anthony Sainz

Robert Salmon

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE SCHOLAR'S MENTORSHIP PROGRAM

by

Gweneth M. Lloyd

Adviser: Professor Michael Smith

The purpose of this study was to monitor and evaluate an ongoing mentoring program for students of color at a public university. The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) was designed to help high achieving students of color who were not admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) make a positive transition to campus life and continue at the university through graduation. The evaluation of SMP was based on the goals and objectives of the program.

The program evaluated for this project, SMP, is a retention program. Its goals are to “encourage high academic achievement and good social adjustment” among student participants of color and to “encourage the retention and persistence of general admit” students of color. The CIPP—context, input, process, and product—model of evaluation (Stufflebeam, 2002) proposes asking four questions about the program to be evaluated: (a) What needs to be done, (b) How should it be done, (c) Is it being done, and (d) Did it succeed (p. 1)? The need to be met was retaining generally

admitted students of color through graduation. It was determined that it should be done through a bi-level mentoring program including both a faculty/staff mentor and a peer mentor for each protégée with one required course, *Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students*, and several additional elective courses. The SMP program has been in place since 1988-1989, and it has had minor revision since then and no formal monitoring or evaluation. As a result, the remaining question is, “Did it succeed?”

To respond to this question, 126 out of approximately 225 enrolled SMP student participants, called protégées, answered a lengthy researcher-designed questionnaire that offered both Likert-type levels of agreement with statements about the program and open-ended questions about the effectiveness of SMP. While nine research questions guided the analysis of the data, the discussion focuses on the effectiveness of SMP as a retention program for students of color.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A dissertation is the culmination of a long process that, in my case at least, required the help and support of many. With me throughout has been my advisor, Dr. Michael Smith, at the Hunter College School of Social Work. I can not thank him enough. My committee, composed of Dr. Anthony Sainz and Dr. Robert Salmon, were present for the final hurrah! I thank them both.

Supporting me in the Scholar's Mentorship Program at the State University of New York-New Paltz were the director of the Psychological Counseling Center, Dr. Pam Atkins, and the chair of the Black Studies Department, Dr. Margaret Wade-Lewis, along with many other colleagues. I acknowledge and thank them all.

Always my staunchest supporter is my husband, Dr. Jesse Stevens. He, along with our daughters Olivia and Carúmey, have with love and kindness put up politely with my many nights away from home. I thank them for helping me persist with limited interruption.

My new "angel," my editor Marsha Kobre Anderson, Ph.D., The Document Doctor, rescued me from the throes of perfection and forced me to stop obsessing. I can never thank her enough for her patience and insistence that I finish.

My sisters—Patsy, Bernadette, Sonia, and Virginia—nurtured and fed me. They believed that I could finish the dissertation and helped prepare the initial document. When they didn't know what else to do, they prayed and offered emotional support. I thank them for the love and attention they continue to provide.

Dr. Edward L. Hunt, my pastor, has functioned as my surrogate father and my spiritual leader. His wife, Aurelia, has been helpful as well in providing additional emotional and spiritual support. My church family at Bethel Missionary Baptist Church offered ongoing prayers, encouragement, and emotional support. I thank them for keeping me grounded and focused on God.

To all those I have mentioned as well as those I may have inadvertently forgotten, I give my thanks and appreciation for helping me do a job well done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES		xii
LIST OF FIGURES		xiv
Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Overview of the Problem	1
	Social Work in Higher Education: A New Frontier for Practice	2
	The Higher Education Perspective	6
	The Combined Perspective of Social Work and Higher Education ...	8
	The Life Model and Social Work in Higher Education:	
	A Theoretical Framework	12
	Contextual Background of the Problem of High Achieving	
	College Students of Color	20
	Statement of the Problem	21
	Overview of the Establishment and Operations of the Scholar's	
	Mentorship Program (SMP)	25
	Historical Background of the Development of the Scholar's	
	Mentorship Program (SMP)	27
	Purpose of the Study	30
	Summary	31
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	33
	Introduction	33
	Historical Perspective	33
	History	33
	Historically Black Colleges and Universities	34
	The Status of Minority Students in Higher Education	35
	Current National Trends	35
	Problems of Access to Higher Education for Minority Students	36
	Problems in Recruitment of Minority Students	39
	Problems of Retention of Minority Students in Higher Education ..	41
	Problems in Timely Graduation of Minority Students	42
	One Solution: Mentoring Programs	43

	Theoretical Framework	51
	Student Development	52
	Summary	55
III.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN	57
	Introduction	57
	The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP)	57
	Recruitment	60
	Orientation and Reception	62
	Role of the Mentor	63
	SMP Program Limitations	64
	Operational Definition of Terms	66
	Concepts	66
	Faculty/Staff Mentor Function	67
	Peer Mentor Function	67
	Research Design	68
	Population	71
	Recruitment of Evaluation Participants	72
	Description of the Sample	74
	Data Collection	79
	Instrumentation	79
	Variables	80
	Data Analysis	81
IV.	RESULTS	82
	Introduction	82
	The Mentoring Experience	82
	The Faculty/Staff Mentor	85
	The Peer Mentor	87
	Research Questions	91
	Research Question #1	92
	Grade Point Average (GPA)	92
	College Integration	93
	College Persistence	95
	Research Question #2	97
	Research Question #3	97
	Research Question #4	97
	Research Question #5	98

Research Question #6	99
Correlation Between Type of Mentoring and Impact on Academic Growth, Career Planning, and Plans for Graduate School	99
Relationship Between Faculty/Staff Mentoring, Influence, and Positive Impact of Faculty/Staff Mentoring	102
Relationship Between Peer Mentoring, Influence, and Positive Impact of Peer Mentoring	107
Research Question #7	112
Research Question #8	112
Research Question #9	114
Academic Advising by the Faculty/Staff Mentor Use of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center	115
Required and Voluntary Coursework	120
SMP Activities	122
The Effectiveness of SMP in Retaining Students at SUNY-NP	123
Impact of Mentoring	127
Ideas for Improving the Scholar's Mentorship Program	137
Summary of the Open-Ended Responses	153
Chapter Summary	154
V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE	155
Discussion	155
Retaining Students of Color in Higher Education	157
The Scholar's Mentorship Program: A Successful Program for Retaining Students of Color at SUNY-NP	160
The Quality of the Mentoring Experience	163
Conclusion	166
Recommendations for the Future	168
Improving the Scholar's Mentorship Program	168
Research on Mentoring	170
A Final Word	172

Appendixes

A.	Freshman Protégée Agreement and Informational Letter	175
B.	Questionnaire	178
C.	Informed Consent	199
	REFERENCES	201

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity Nationally, 1990 and 1999, and for SUNY-New Paltz, 2001	37
2.	Summary of Research on Mentoring Programs for Undergraduate College Students	44
3.	Census 2000 Data by Race/Ethnicity for New York and the United States	73
4.	Description of the Respondents	75
5.	Academic Achievement and Persistence of the Respondents: Self-Report	76
6.	Academic Achievement and Persistence of the Respondents: Transcript Report	77
7.	Description of the Respondents' Faculty/Staff Mentors and Their Relationship	83
8.	Description of the Respondents' Peer Mentors	88
9.	Graduation Rate, Enrollment Status, and Average GPA Summary as of Fall 2003 for Students Who Enrolled Between Fall 1998 and Fall 2002	94
10.	The Effect of Mentoring on College Integration	96
11.	Breakdown of Research Question #6 into Answerable Questions .	100
12.	Correlation of Academic Performance and Perception of Impact of Faculty/Staff and Peer Mentoring	102
13.	Relationship Between Who Protégées Believe Has Influenced Them and the Impact of Faculty/Staff Mentoring	104

14.	Relationship Between Who Protégées Believe Has Influenced Them and the Impact of Peer Mentoring	109
15.	Relationship of Gender and Ethnic Heritage to Academic Performance	113
16.	Relationship Between Contact with Mentor and Academic Performance	114
17.	Helpfulness of SMP Activities	116
18.	Impact of Mentoring	128
19.	Profile of 62 Current Faculty/Staff Mentors	143

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	The Scholar's Mentorship Program: Description from the SUNY-NP Web Site (http://www.newpaltz.edu/counseling/mentors/htm).	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Problem

The need to provide culturally relevant and competent services to historically under-represented groups (African American, Asian, Latino, Native American) has been and continues to be an enduring challenge for human service providers. As one of the most theoretically sound and firmly established professions within the field of human services, social work practice has long struggled with the task of developing culturally appropriate interventions that are specifically designed to correspond to the needs of its diverse client base.

Higher education has faced a similar struggle. Since the 1970s, public and private colleges and universities have actively sought to attract a diverse student body. Citing equal opportunity and affirmative action legislation, many institutions of higher education have professed to increase access and tailor academic and social programs specifically for historically under-represented students of color (African American, Asian, Latino, Native American) and women.

Both the profession as a whole and social workers who practice within higher education must address the inherent challenges of learning to work effectively with culturally and ethnically diverse and historically under-represented students. It is one thing to accept them as clients or students; another, to meet their needs. The focus of this research is the interplay between the practice of social work and the impetus from

students of color to improve their ability to graduate from those colleges and universities that accept them. According to Graham B. Spanier, President, The Pennsylvania State University,

The United States and its institutions of higher education have come a long way in the last 25 years in expanding educational opportunity for students and citizens who had not been well represented--women, minorities, non-traditional students, students with disabilities, older students and the poor. Now we must do more. (1998, p. 1)

Social Work in Higher Education: A New Frontier for Practice

Unlike many of the other human service-oriented disciplines, social work has the distinct social mission of ensuring social justice in the form of equality, equity, and accessibility to those deemed the less fortunate members of society. Since its inception as a field, social work has represented society's social conscience through its leadership role in countless social movements and social policy formulation. Today, social work faces an onslaught of new challenges brought on by societal demographic shifts (see Tables 1 and 2) coupled with rapid technological advancement.

Such growth has contributed to a much broader and more dynamic client base, thereby posing a significant challenge to the traditional value base and practice principles of social work. Current social work clients transcend all socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, religious, and gender boundaries. Consequently, social work service delivery systems must adapt with culturally relevant services reflecting the increasingly diverse client base which expects and demands such services.

Not only has social work's client base transformed, but, correspondingly, social work practice settings have also diversified. Historically, social workers operated within large and small prescribed settings consisting of varying bureaucratic structures such as multi-service social agencies, hospitals, field service offices, and community centers, to name a few. Now, social workers can be found in various private organizations, the corporate sector, higher education institutions, and many other non-traditional social work settings. The expansion of social work practice into this broad array of host settings has necessitated the advancement, development, and extension of the knowledge base in the field of social work.

Social work pioneers in non-traditional settings have successfully penetrated the walls of corporate America via Employee Assistance Programs (EAP). An unexplored practice frontier for social work remains that of higher education where, at this time, very few social workers practice. Those found in academia most often function in the traditional scholarly roles of teaching, research, and service, training new social workers for the field. A small, but growing number of social workers work in public and private institutions of higher education in counseling centers, most often located within the school's student affairs division. In fact, 31% of college counseling centers employ social workers (Gallagher, 1994), who represent 9% of counseling center staff (Whiteley et al., 1987). These pioneering practitioners have entered a fertile domain for the practice of social work in an environment dominated by doctoral-level psychologists. The diversity and uniqueness of the college and

university student body offers social workers a wealth of challenges and opportunities for applying their expertise and for developing new models of practice specific to the higher education setting.

The researcher has 20 years of experience as a social worker in a higher education environment. At one time an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) specialist in the private sector, she now serves as associate director of a college counseling center. The only social worker on the staff of the counseling center, she has observed through her experience on search committees the lack of interest in hiring a professional with a social work credential at either the master's or the doctoral level as a counselor in the counseling center. Her observations confirm the low number of social workers who offer counseling services in higher education settings.

Because so few social workers practice in higher education settings, very little information is available about how social workers function in the postsecondary education environment. Problems are evident for social workers in this environment. First, professional staff employed in higher education institutions, especially four-year colleges and universities, generally hold doctoral degrees; most social workers do not and are therefore not perceived as credible professionals. Second, based on the belief that students attending colleges and universities are intellectually ready, willing, and able to pursue postsecondary education, higher education personnel often either disregard or deny the need of students for academic, emotional, and psychological support. Finally, intellectual elitism, professional prejudice, and ignorance about the

nature of social work practice foster the employ only of doctoral level psychologists as the only ones fit for student interaction. The researcher has observed that ads in the *New York Times* and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* for counselors and directors of counseling centers in higher education institutions attest to this search for counselors in fields other than social work. As a result, clinical and counseling psychologists holding Ph.D.s and Ed.D.s, not social workers, are currently the gatekeepers and territorial possessors of college and university counseling centers.

Two main factors undergird the resistance of psychologists toward the use of social workers as counselors in college and university counseling centers. First, this researcher has seen that psychologists are naive or ignorant about the nature of social work practice and the training of its practitioners. It appears that a popular misperception persists among psychologists that social work training is limited to provision of concrete and other non-clinical auxiliary services. Further embedded in this incorrect assumption is the belief that the mental health needs of college students are of a clinical nature, which, psychologists believe, is not the expertise of social workers. Both psychologists and social workers, however, enjoy the comfort level of working in college and university counseling centers which provide clinically diverse clients for the application of a broad range of clinical approaches which, in other settings, are often limited to the therapeutic dyad of client and therapist.

The second factor demonstrating resistance to social work practitioners by psychologists is really an interplay between the naivete or ignorance of psychologists

about the nature of social work practice and the training of its practitioners and the inherent organizational politics of the college and university administrative structure in which the counseling center functions. For instance, college and university counseling centers may be placed in the student affairs division, as a support unit in academic affairs, as an activity of the Psychology Department, as an auxiliary of residential life services, or within health services. In some cases, the counseling center may be outsourced to an independent provider. The placement of the counseling center within the institution determines its staffing and its budget. In fact, it may be perceived that hiring social workers for counseling positions may save money over the employment of doctoral-level psychologists. If, however, a staff line is designated and funded for a doctoral-level psychologist, filling the position with a lower cost social worker may serve to decrease the overall budget of the counseling center in an irretrievable way.

Salary disparity and role differentiation between masters-level social workers (M.S.W.s) and Ph.D. or Ed.D. psychologists employed in college and university counseling centers tend to be significant, although their roles and functions are identical. Hiring practices, role clarity, salary differentiation, and interdisciplinary integration of psychology and social work practice remain unresolved issues for social workers in higher education settings.

The Higher Education Perspective

Most often, the mission of an institution of higher education includes service to all students, the primary consumers of higher education. In concert with their mission,

colleges and universities design innovative curriculums, try to stay abreast of the needs of the ever-changing local labor market, and claim to respond to the needs of the current college-going public.

Black¹ students entered the higher education mainstream during the late 1960s, at the height of the Civil Rights Movement. At that time, the issue was access. Frequently, scholarships, room and board, and books were provided to Black and other minority students of low socioeconomic status (SES) through a variety of programs designed to attract them to colleges. Programs to retain them or to help them graduate on time were unproven, unavailable, and limited (Fleming, 1981).

One economic way to help students of color remain in college is through support programs. Social workers, present in every area of human service for the betterment of society, are now more than ever in a position to assist in higher education institutions. The college student population, now more heterogeneous than ever, continues to grow more racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse as well as in gender, age, sexual orientation, and spiritual/religious belief. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2001), the proportion of students of color, excluding foreign students, has increased from 16% in 1976, to 28% in 1999, mostly attributable to the presence of Asian and Hispanic students. Specifically, the percentage of Asian and Pacific Islander students rose from 2% to 6%; the proportion

¹ For the purpose of this study, the term "Black" will refer to students primarily of African American descent or who identify themselves as "Black" but have a different heritage.

of Hispanic students increased nationally from 4% to 9% during the same time period. The proportion of Black students has fluctuated and in 1999 was 11%.

Institutions of higher education are no longer racially and socioeconomically homogenous entities. Instead, they are mosaic pathways to economic empowerment for all regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, social class, or religious belief. For this reason, colleges and universities, especially publically funded ones, must accept the responsibility to provide social and learning environments conducive to the needs of all constituents. This is no easy task, for the needs of today's diverse college and university students are as complex as those of the social and cultural group to which each student belongs. Higher education, a self-contained social system with competing forces, can no longer base student retention on Darwin's theory of "survival of the fittest" as it has in the past. To survive such a system, a student must now navigate seemingly impenetrable barriers, assimilate into resistant social groups, and maneuver through the dynamic interplay between the internal and external resources of the student and the direct or indirect support offered by the institution.

The Combined Perspective of Social Work and Higher Education

Because few social workers are associated with the field of higher education as direct service providers, the practice of social work in colleges and universities is both under-explored and under-developed. This uncharted territory offers the social worker the opportunity to apply social work knowledge and skills to a wealth of information that has the potential to expand the knowledge base in the field.

The perspective of the social worker is appropriate for the diversity of the student body now present in higher education. Students enter postsecondary education with certain attributes, experiences, and backgrounds that include their academic skills and abilities, their previous grade point average, their social expertise and attainment, their family history and background, their coping mechanisms, and other characteristics which bear upon their academic performance and level of achievement. On a personal level, this conglomeration of traits influences the development of expectations of the college experience and the level and type of commitment each student is willing to make to achieve his or her goals. This combination can predict the student's "integration into the academic and social system" of the institution (Tinto, 1975) and his or her academic achievement.

Emphasizing the complementarity of the missions of both higher education institutions and the field of social work, social work practice at colleges and universities may be most beneficial at the juncture of this interplay between the resources of the entering student and those of the institution. For instance, many institutions of higher education state their missions to include a commitment to promote intellectual, cultural, and social growth of all students so that they may become productive members of society. This value- and achievement-based mission is broadly analogous to the mission of the field of social work:

The primary purpose of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being. Social workers help meet the basic human needs of all people and empower those who are vulnerable, oppressed, or living in poverty. A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession's *dual focus on the*

individual in a social context and the betterment of society. Social workers help people identify and manage the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living. . . . For over 100 years, social workers have helped millions of people challenge their circumstances and change their lives, and pushed institutions to value and support families in need. [Emphasis added.] (National Association of Social Workers, 2002).

Further, throughout the social work literature, historical and contemporary theorists alike contend that the social purpose of the social work profession is the matching of the adaptive capabilities of the individual and the environmental properties of the situational context to produce transactions that will maximize the growth and development of the individual and will improve the contextual environment (Bartlett, 1970; Germain & Gitterman, 1980; Gordon, 1969).

The under-representation of social workers in institutions of higher education has meant that few models of practice have been generated. Baker and Steiner (1995) proposed a solution-focused model for students served by Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP) in colleges and universities that is consistent with a statement by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) that “Everywhere, social workers provide practical and compassionate guidance to individuals confronting and resolving personal dilemmas. Everyday, over half a million professional social workers bring hope, help, and opportunity for success into people’s lives” (NASW, 2002, p. 4). Their program was designed to provide access and support for economically and educationally disadvantaged students who otherwise would not have been accepted to four-year colleges and universities.

In another instance, Jones and Donovan applied a person-environment model of practice with college students who were economically disadvantaged. Similarly, Jonk, Markward, and Arnold (2000) conducted an exploratory study applying the person-environment model with traditional college students. The focal point of their study was less on the applicability and effectiveness of the model and more on the social worker's role, function, and required competence in terms of knowledge and skills for the practice of social work in institutions of higher education. Among their key observations were:

- Social work academicians should strive to make the university community aware that the education and training that social workers receive qualifies them to competently service college students, particularly non-traditional college students and those who are members of disenfranchised minority groups. The need for social work educators, especially field coordinators and liaisons, to nurture relationships with key personnel, such as counseling center staff members and directors, in institutions of higher education [is important].
- [One way to] heighten the visibility of social work [is] through development of practice in college and university settings. This might create the opportunity to influence hiring.
- Social workers are ideally suited to address many of the barriers that minority college students and other disenfranchised groups (gay, lesbian, and students with significant psychiatric disturbance) encounter because of social work curriculum emphasis on diversity and oppression.
- Social workers in college settings must have solid clinical skills. These include excellent relationship and diagnostic skills, knowledge of adolescent and young adult development theory, clinical practice theory and skills, knowledge and skill with brief treatment models, and specific knowledge and skills to handle a variety of practice issues that

are common among students such as rape, eating disorders, and identity issues.

- Social workers in higher education must have the knowledge and skills to negotiate systems. They must be knowledgeable of systems theory, aware of the structure of the institution in which they are working, and [be] skilled with community interventions such as psycho-education, advocacy, and task-force leadership. Social workers must possess the ability to work ethically within a small, closed system, requiring total confidentiality and professionalism.

These observations conform to the belief by the NASW that within the community, social workers “increase the capacity of individuals to address their own needs, social workers frequently connect people with critical community resources. They are skillful at providing the right tools to help their clients cope with and solve life’s most severe challenges” (NASW, 2002, p. 4). The community in this case is the college or university, the client is a student, and the need is to complete the course of study and graduate in a timely manner.

The Life Model and Social Work in Higher Education:

A Theoretical Framework

Even with the advancements made in both the knowledge base and the practical skills of the profession, some social workers might still be inclined to argue for maintaining lines of demarcation between models, methods, and service delivery settings. Traditionally, methodologies were rigidly defined in their association with specific service or social institutions. Because of the separate development of practice methods, agencies and workers defined themselves as casework agencies and caseworkers or as group work agencies and group workers. More recently, the

definition of the work environment has expanded to include grassroots organizations and community workers (Germain & Gitterman, 1980). The ramification of maintaining this widely held precept has been the significant limitation of fluidity of the practice methods of the social work profession as well as, and perhaps more important, of the altering of the organization processes that affect client access and utilization of services. Thus, successful practice of social work in higher education settings requires a method of practice with a value base that emphasizes the dynamic interplay between the students as the clients and the nature of the environment of higher education.

The life model of practice seems to be the most appropriate theoretical framework for assessing social work in higher education. By its design, within the framework of the life model, social workers at any college or university and in any division or department within the institution of higher education can respond effectively to student needs. In many practice models, problem definition is a key determinant of intervention. While this is, to some extent, also true of the life model of practice, a critical point of departure is that the intervention required in this framework tends to be multi-level and simultaneous. The life model of practice provides a non-restricting framework for conceptualization of a problem and involves analysis of the individual, consideration of the environment in which the individual acts, and the interplay between the individual and the environment. In the life model of practice, the needs, problems, or predicaments of the client fall into three

interrelated areas: (a) life transitions involving developmental changes, role and status changes, and crisis events; (b) the unresponsiveness of social and physical environments; and (c) communication and relationship difficulties in families and other primary groups (Germain & Gitterman, 1980).

Non-teaching social workers in higher education environments are most often working in the counseling center, carrying out a number of different roles and performing a variety of functions. Appreciation for the application of the life model role of practice to colleges and universities requires an understanding of the unique features and nature of both the clientele—the students—and the host setting—the institution of higher education.

Colleges and universities are generally considered closed social systems whose members, consisting of both service providers and consumers, have been “hand picked” for entry into the system. This closed social system has its own set of cultural norms and values which are sometimes both varied and fluid. The traditional age of the consumer, or student, is 18 to 24 years, with an increasing proportion over 30 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). In addition, despite changes in the racial and ethnic demography of the United States as evidenced in the 2000 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 2002), the college-going population, especially the traditional college-age students, tend to be White and male, except in the case of historically Black colleges, women’s colleges, and urban colleges and universities (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). For students who reside on campus, the higher

education environment represents a small, self-contained, closed social system. Those in suburban, rural, or remote areas often feature limited community resources, forcing such institutions to be self-sufficient in terms of social services.

Colleges and universities, especially four-year, residential colleges, are composed of two integrated systems: an academic system and a social system (Tinto, 1975). The student's ability to thrive or succeed in both systems as well as the greater single environmental system requires balancing the two competing forces of academic demand and social integration.

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that academic integration, as measured by such variables as grades or grade point average (GPA), intellectual development, and contact with faculty, had its strongest positive influence on persistence or degree attainment for students at the lowest level of social integration, as measured by such variables as extracurricular involvement and informal interaction with peers. As a student's level of social integration increased, the importance of that student's academic integration for persistence or degree attainment diminished. The reverse was found to be true for the influence of social integration on persistence or degree attainment at different levels of persistence or degree attainment for students at the lowest levels of academic integration, and as levels of academic integration increased, the importance of social integration diminished. For many students, especially first-year students and students of color, navigating through the processes of social and academic integration, clearly dependent on one another, can be an overwhelmingly

challenging task. Their ultimate success depends upon their personal capacity, their ability to seek assistance and support in a timely manner, and the availability of instructional and social resources to respond to their various needs.

It is important to reiterate that the life model of practice purports that problems and predicaments of individuals fall into three interrelated areas: (a) life transitions involving developmental changes, status role changes, and crisis events; (b) the unresponsiveness of social and physical environments; and (c) communication and relationship difficulties in families and other primary groups (Germain & Gitterman, 1980). These three interrelated areas accurately depict the nature, categories, and range of the problems that exist in a college or university environment. For example, college students are generally at the apex of their developmental transition from adolescence to young adulthood. During this period, separation and individuation from parents and home are crucial developmental tasks facing students that affect personal, social, and academic adjustment (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994). The inherent difficulties of this life transition task coupled with the need for adjustment to a new environment oftentimes culminates in a crisis and interferes with both academic and social integration.

The second area of problems and predicaments in the life model of practice is the unresponsiveness of social and physical environments. The nature of the college and university environment as a closed social system can be alienating to students, especially those in the minority in terms of social groups. For example, students of

color, gay and lesbian students, and students with disabilities, none of whom have been historically well-served by higher education, may continue to find a less than welcoming attitude on campus in spite of recent strides to incorporate and celebrate all types of diversity on many college campuses. For students new to campus, such a lack of welcome can be devastating and lead to the student's dropping out of school, which is not good for enrollment and funding circumstances for the institution. Moreover, institutions that lose students through attrition rather than graduation lose favor with the college-going population resulting in depressed enrollments, face decreased funding as a result of fewer students, negatively affect the local labor markets with fewer qualified graduates, and maintain a poor campus climate. In such cases, the social worker may act to mitigate the negative effects of institutional behavior and positively impact change to retain students. The life model of practice enables the social worker to identify any gaps in service and facilitate the change process for greater institutional responsiveness congruent with student needs.

The third interrelated area of problems and predicaments posed by the life model of practice is communication and relationship difficulties in families and other primary groups. Issues related to communication and relationships are prevalent among college and university students and tend to impact upon their performance and persistence in negative ways. For example, traditional college age students often come to postsecondary education environments with a host of family problems and interpersonal issues ranging from the marital difficulties of their parents, to alcohol

and/or substance abuse, to financial constraints, to health concerns, and so on. As a result, while college and university students, especially those away from home for the first time, are busy managing their academic demands, learning to integrate socially, and separating and individuating from their parents or surrogate parents and family, they are simultaneously spending an inordinate amount of time pondering the activities of their families, who may be quite far away. Concerns about family, regardless of distance, and unresolved issues of parental marital conflict and poor attachment relationships with the parents may inhibit the development of coping factors and negatively affect personal and social adjustment in college (Hoffman & Weiss, 1987; Lopez, Campbell, & Walkins, 1988).

Many students of color are first-generation college students or are expected to be the first in their families to complete a four-year degree. While many families provide the emotional and financial support necessary for student success, still too many others offer nothing resulting either from a lack of belief in the value of a college education, a lack of understanding of the college experience, or the lack of emotional and financial resources. In addition, sometimes a hostile socio-cultural climate at an institution of higher education may create further alienation for students of color. Moreover, for many students—both White and of color—the college and university living and learning residential community may be the first and most intimate experience that either group has had with the other. This also holds true for other under-represented diverse groups such as gay, lesbian, and disabled students.

For many of these students, the challenge of this new experience in a living and learning community with a diverse population sometimes results in poor interpersonal relationships with faculty and peers and ultimately hinders their social and academic integration.

Students in colleges and universities must also contend with the complexity of the higher education institution. Germain and Gitterman (1981) stated that the problems that clients have with organizations fall into three areas: (a) the agency's definition of its purpose and services, (b) the structures and procedures used to coordinate and integrate organizational operations, and (c) service provision. Given the bureaucratic nature and complexity of colleges and universities, effective social work practice warrants a model which provides a framework for constant examination of the interplay between students/clients and the organizational dynamics. The life model of practice in higher education institutions offers social work practitioners the opportunity to uphold the profession's social purpose even in a host setting in a manner that is beneficial to both students and institutions. For students in higher education, success is ultimately defined by graduation; for the college or university, by retention and graduation rate. Applied appropriately and strategically, the life model of practice provides a win-win opportunity for both client and organization.

Contextual Background of the Problem of High Achieving

College Students of Color

The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) was begun at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) during the 1988-1989 school year to help students of color who were not admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), a special program for students who evidence both academic and economic need, make a positive transition to campus life and continue at the university through graduation. The creation of SMP was rooted in the theoretical framework and imperatives of the life model of social work practice which expects the social worker to identify problems in the environment and move to correct them. This model therefore calls for the practitioner to conceptualize the professional function broadly in working with clients. According to Germain and Gitterman (1981), the social worker's function must include responsibility for influencing his or her own organization to improve its services, correct maladaptive processes, and increase organizational responsiveness to the needs of the population it seeks or is expected to serve. This function transcends the particular needs of the worker's own clients vis-à-vis the agency. They further stated that within this expanded function, the worker must take account of the employing organization's presence in the lives of all its actual and potential clients, seeking always to improve the goodness-of-fit between needs and services.

The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP), the program under study, was developed and implemented as a means of increasing the college's responsiveness to the needs of a target group--high achieving students of color--because the college was having difficulty retaining this segment of the student population. These students were admitted under the "general" admission program, not under the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) or any other such program that targets and supports underprivileged and under-prepared applicants. As a result, no support services were in place specifically for this target group--high achieving students of color admitted under general admissions guidelines and processes. This need was determined through systematic study of data on retention and degree completion of this group as well as through informal conversations with students, faculty, and professional staff at the college.

Statement of the Problem

Applicants to the State University of New York System complete a single application which is submitted to a central admissions office. On the application, prospective students designate their SUNY campus of choice and may specify their race/ethnicity. They also indicate their interest in applying for financial aid. Students are then admitted to SUNY-NP in one of two ways: regular admissions, meaning academic criteria are met regardless of economic need, and EOP, a specialized program for students with both academic and economic need. The Multicultural Recruitment Program (MRP), a subset of regular admissions, specifically seeks

students of color to increase the diversity of the student body at SUNY-NP, a clear goal of the college.

Students of color recruited through MRP and admitted through general admissions processes were found to be experiencing significant difficulty adjusting to the academic rigors and social environment of the college especially during their first year. They complained of feeling isolated and misunderstood, and they frequently felt frustrated when dealing with faculty, staff, and student services departments.

Previously high achieving students in high school, they now were distressed by the decline in their academic performance as they struggled to maintain the good grades to which they were accustomed. Some faculty members and professional staff expressed their concern about the discrepancies between the academic performance and the obvious capabilities of these students. While such discrepancies may be evident for many first-year students regardless of race or ethnicity, the difficulties experienced by students of color seemed incapable of mitigation with traditional support systems. Consequently, it was believed that race and ethnicity had to compound the problems experienced by these students of academic and social integration into the college.

The administration of the college believed that it was fulfilling its mission in diversifying the population of college students racially, ethnically, and culturally simply by admitting a variety of students of color into the institution. Little attention was paid to retention and graduation rates of these students, however. Over time, it

became increasingly evident that the academic and social needs of these students were not being met by the institution that admitted them.

High achieving students of color, defined as those who are admitted to a college or a university through regular admissions processes, are frequently placed in double jeopardy by institutions of higher education. On the one hand, their strong high school academic record along with other supporting documentation such as standardized test scores is perceived to be a key predictor of their ability to compete and persist to graduation in college. This perception leads institutions to ignore the inherent issues faced by students of color in their adjustment to the academic rigors and social environment of college. This ignorance is supported by their lack of provision of support services in the belief that accommodating this difference in students of color would serve to stereotype and segregate them. As a result, high achieving students of color, recruited by and attracted to a specific institution of higher education to increase diversity on campus, are left alone to self-indoctrinate into a world very different from what they have known.

On the other hand, these students of color who are accustomed to academic success at the high school level are now competing in a whole new arena, armed only with the same self- and family-imposed pressure to succeed that worked for them in the past. For many students of color, they are the first in their family to attend or to have the opportunity to complete college. This status fosters significant stress, especially if the student is far away from home, an absence not fully supported by

family members. In fact, for some, they were the “parent/child” who assumed responsibility for younger siblings and who acted as the anchoring mechanism to maintain a somewhat stable home environment. In such cases, their flight from home to college is fraught with uncertainty and mixed emotions, including shame for having “abandoned” the family and fear of what might become of the family in the absence of the student.

For some high achieving students of color, the fact that their parents never attended college and now work multiple jobs to finance the college education of their children causes added stress to succeed in college and achieve high grades. The stress imposed by the parents or perceived by the students arises from misunderstood and unrealistic expectations about college. Consequently, the determination to succeed in college on the part of these students is sometimes achieved at the cost of social alienation from their peers, and they are often accused by their peers of thinking that they are “better than the rest.” For many high achieving students of color, the struggle to succeed in college is a lonely and emotionally overwhelming experience. The level of need of these students is frequently underestimated; therefore, they are often extremely under-served. As a result, by the end of their first year, high achieving students of color may become “at risk” for academic dismissal, drop out, or transfer to another institution—all a poor reflection on the ability of the institution of higher education to retain its students.

Overview of the Establishment and Operations
of the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP)

Established at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) during the 1988-1989 academic year, the goal of the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) is to enhance the academic careers and college experiences of high achieving students of color, defined as those admitted to SUNY-NP under the university's general admissions criteria—as opposed to the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) or any other special admissions program for under-represented and/or underprivileged individuals. SMP was begun as a collaborative initiative between the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs divisions of the university. Within the Division of Academic Affairs, SMP is housed within the Black Studies Department; in Student Affairs, the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC). It consists of two primary activities: a faculty mentoring program and a peer mentoring program. An interdisciplinary six-member task force spearheads SMP. The chair of the Black Studies Department serves as SMP director. A half-time staff member coordinates it, and the researcher, associate director of the PCC, directs the peer mentoring component of SMP.

Mentoring dyads are assigned when the student enters college freshman year. Students and mentors are matched, to the degree possible, by gender, ethnicity, culture, academic major, and career interests. Student participants are referred to as “protégées” and are assigned both a faculty/staff mentor and a peer mentor. The

mentoring process involves an expectation of at least three meetings per semester between the protégée and the faculty/staff mentor and a minimum of one weekly meeting during the first semester between the protégée and his or her peer mentor. In addition, all incoming freshman protégées are required to enroll in SMP's course entitled, "Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students." Freshman protégées are also encouraged to live in the residence hall on campus designated as a "Living and Learning" environment for SMP participants, located in Shango Hall. This residential accommodation is similar to other First Year Initiative (FYI) requirements of university programs.

SMP differs from both EOP and SUNY-NP's FYI (First Year Initiative) programs. At the admissions level, both SMP and FYI include regularly admitted students regardless of financial need; EOP requires both academic and financial need or disadvantage. EOP has its own admissions and academic dismissal processes; SMP and FYI use regular institutional admissions and academic dismissal processes. SMP offers faculty/staff and peer mentoring, one required and several optional courses, an opportunity for a "Living and Learning" environment, a specialized computer and learning center facility, and cultural enhancement. EOP has mandatory participation in a holistic model that includes workshops, advisor meetings, remedial courses, and specialized counseling. FYI students live and take classes together as a cohort, restricting them to specific courses. Only SMP requires students to be of color,

although the majority of EOP students are students of color. FYI has no limitation or specification for race or ethnicity.

Historical Background of the Development of the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP)

Prior to the establishment of the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) during the 1988-1989 academic year, the Black Studies Department and the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC) had both been involved in the development and implementation of a mentoring program targeting the same pool of high achieving, regularly admitted students of color. Neither was aware of the other's program. The Black Studies Department focused on linking entering students to a faculty mentor with similar academic interests and of the same race or ethnicity. The PCC sought to match these same students at the beginning of their freshman year to a peer mentor of the same gender, race, ethnicity, or culture and with similar academic interests. Both programs existed for two or three years before their merge into the single SMP entity.

The development by the PCC of the Peer Mentoring Program was part of a larger initiative to increase the PCC's visibility to and access for students of color. The PCC had historically been underutilized by approximately 18% of the student body, specifically students of color. Those students of color using PCC services were generally referred by the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and either did not show up or prematurely terminated counseling. The EOP director during that time was especially invested in the academic success of the students in his program and

viewed the counseling services offered by PCC as essential to the successful achievement of EOP students. After identifying the pattern of not showing up for appointments and terminating counseling too soon to be effective, the directors of the EOP and the PCC joined together to solve the problem. Following their initial meeting, they met also with the vice president of the Student Affairs Division. One major outcome of these meetings was the conclusion that the PCC needed to provide more culturally relevant services. It was agreed that the first step in that direction required hiring a culturally/ ethnically diverse professional staff.

The researcher, now associate director of the PCC, joined the PCC professional staff in 1983 as its first clinical social worker and person of color, charged with the responsibility of providing both clinical and outreach services to students of color. In 1983, the PCC consisted of the director, the associate director, and two full-time staff members. All were psychologists with doctoral degrees. Due to illness, the director moved from full- to part-time employment, and the associate director prepared to assume the directorship. This change in management significantly altered the direction and function of the PCC. The center's mission, services, and methods of service delivery changed.

Over time, the PCC's mission has evolved to incorporate and reflect the university's overall mission—commitment to the growth of the students intellectually, culturally, and socially. According to its web site, the mission of the PCC is:

to promote retention through interventions specific to the diverse university community; to facilitate intellectual, social, emotional, and moral learning

processes which constitute academic success and student well-being; and contribute to academic programs in related disciplines, campus life, and the educational/cultural life of the region.

The PCC fulfills its mission through the provision of short-term psychotherapy, group therapy, crisis intervention, programming, consultation, and training. It is a training site for graduate students in psychology and social work. Current staffing consists of three full-time counseling and clinical psychologists with doctoral degrees, one certified social worker, and one part-time consulting psychiatrist. Staff diversity includes differences in race, ethnicity, culture, gender, and sexual orientation—specifically, two White women, one Black woman, and one gay White male. The PCC is accredited by the International Association of Counseling Services, Inc.

Staffing patterns among college and university counseling centers vary according to institutional size and the role and function of the center. Typically, such centers provide time limited psychotherapy, prevention and outreach, vocational counseling, and training for graduate students, most often in the fields of psychology and social work. Some centers offer both personal and vocational counseling services, while others afford only one or the other. Many campuses have a separate career services office which includes vocational counseling.

Along these lines, Whiteley, Mahaffey, and Geer (1987) identified five types of counseling centers according to their functions. The first type, the “macrocenter,” offers a broad range of services that encompass all counseling related functions except for research. The second type, the career planning and placement center, performs

primarily a vocational counseling function. The third type is somewhat similar to the macrocenter except that it emphasizes personal counseling and offers limited or no vocational counseling. The fourth type provides a general level of service including support and advisement for student life activities. The last type affords minimal services. The PCC at SUNY-New Paltz most closely fits the third type—a macrocenter focusing on personal counseling that offers limited or no vocational counseling services.

The issue of use of the PCC by students of color has improved. Currently, 18% of students using PCC services are persons of color, approaching the university's proportion of 24% students of color. The PCC's ongoing involvement in coordination and further development of the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) as a strategic intervention to increase retention and graduation of students of color remains a vital method of ensuring the connection of students of color to the university community.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to monitor and evaluate an ongoing mentoring program for students of color at a public university. To date, no formal evaluation of the program's effectiveness has been carried out.

To monitor and evaluate SMP, the following questions guided the literature review and the selection of the research design:

1. What historical dimensions of higher education help clarify the current status of students of color in higher education?

2. What is the current status of students of color in higher education?
3. What is the current status of students of color at SUNY-NP?
4. What are problems of access for students of color?
5. What are problems in recruitment of students of color?
6. What are problems in retention of students of color?
7. What are problems in timely graduation of students of color?
8. Are mentoring programs generally an effective strategy for resolving recruitment and retention problems of students of color?
9. What is an appropriate theoretical framework for evaluating the effectiveness of a mentoring program for students of color?
10. What is an appropriate research design for evaluating the effectiveness of a mentoring program for students of color?
11. Is SMP an effective program at SUNY-NP for retaining and graduating students of color who are regularly admitted to the university as opposed to entrance through EOP?

Summary

This study monitored and evaluated the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) from a social work perspective. Functioning approximately 12 years, SMP has helped hundreds of students of color make the transition from high school to higher education successfully

and remain at SUNY-NP to graduate. No formal program evaluation has occurred to date.

In the second chapter, the literature relevant to the SMP evaluation is presented according to the questions that guided the research. Through this review, the theoretical framework and research design were determined. The research design is fully described in Chapter III and includes operational definitions of terms used in the study. It is followed by the results in Chapter IV. In Chapter V, a conclusion is formed and suggestions for further research and possible program restructuring are offered.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the literature is presented according to the guiding questions presented in Chapter I. General topics include a historical perspective; the current status of minority students² in higher education; problems of access, recruitment, retention, and timely graduation for minority students; mentoring programs as a solution for these problems; and a theoretical framework for monitoring and evaluating a mentoring program.

Historical Perspective

History

Historically, Black and White students were not educated together in the United States. Court cases affirmed or negated segregation in schools, including colleges and universities. For example, *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 reaffirmed the constitutionality of segregation, thus excluding Blacks from White institutions of education. This type of segregation relied on the doctrine of "separate but equal,"

² Historically, the term "minority" referred to students of color—i.e., Asian American or Pacific Islander, Black - African American, Black - Caribbean/West Indian, Black - Continental African, Native American, Latino or Hispanic, Mexican American. This list of "minorities" is consistent with the questionnaire (Appendix B). The current term, "students of color," will be used in this document in relation to students at SUNY-NP. For the literature review, however, the historical term, "minority," will continue to be employed.

meaning that the presence of schools which enrolled only Black students assured that they would not be able to attend all White schools (Micheletti, 2002).

Segregation by race and the notion of "separate but equal" educational facilities were not successfully challenged in court until 1954 in *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*. Effectively, the Supreme Court reversed *Plessy*, deeming both segregation and "separate but equal" unconstitutional (Micheletti, 2002). Barely 50 years ago, then, higher education became legally obligated to enroll students of all races.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Segregation and the concept of "separate but equal" forced the creation of colleges and universities specifically for Blacks, if they were to become doctors, lawyers, teachers, business owners, and so on. Although often financed inadequately, historically Black colleges and universities have achieved success in graduating thousands of Black professionals. By recognizing the unique needs of Black students, these institutions pride themselves on their ability to provide quality education in an environment highly conducive to the social, psychological, emotional, cultural, and developmental needs of their clientele. As a result, historically Black colleges and universities have been able successfully to retain and graduate their students.

Black students have most often entered historically Black colleges with few personal and academic resources, having been educated, for the most part, in segregated schools or classrooms. According to Fleming (1984), Black students on campuses with a Black student majority demonstrate higher intellectual gains. Gurin

and Eppes (1975) found that Black students attending historically Black colleges and universities possessed positive self-images, strong racial pride, and high aspirations. These colleges provide a supportive social-psychological environment for Black students that enhances persistence and degree completion while maintaining an academic climate equivalent to their White or mixed counterparts in intellectual rigor and impact (Bohr, Pascarella, Nora, & Terenzini, 1995).

The Status of Minority Students in Higher Education

Current National Trends

Today, the majority of Black students entering college are academically and financially disadvantaged. Their parents tend to reside in urban communities, have fewer years of education, work at lower status jobs, and earn less money than their White counterparts. In addition, Black students, more often than White ones, come from single-parent families (Blackwell, 1983; Nettles, 1988). Consequently, Black students, perhaps more than White students, require additional assistance in functioning within the higher education environment.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, data on higher education enrollment were not maintained by racial identity until 1976 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). At that time, of nearly 11 million college students, only 15.7% were minority.³ The period of consideration for the current study is 1990, the

³ The following race/ethnicity categories were used by federal agencies until the 2000 Census: White, non-Hispanic; Black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian/Alaskan Native; and

base year and first full year of SMP, through 1999, for national data, and through 2001, for institutional data. Table 1 compares enrollment by race/ethnicity nationally for 1990 and 1999, and undergraduate enrollment at SUNY-NP for 2001. Nationally, the rate of increase in enrollment of minority students between 1990 and 1999 was 40.5%. The proportion of minority students at SUNY-NP in 2001 was 20.3%, considerably lower than the 1999 national proportion of 28.1%.

Problems of Access to Higher Education for Minority Students

Access to higher education for minority students increased substantially with the legislation and implementation of affirmative action. Americans for a Fair Chance (AFC), based in Washington, D.C., published a history of affirmative action policies (AFC, 2002). According to their report, the legal requirement to admit students to colleges and universities regardless of "race, color, religion, sex, or national origin" began with *Brown* in 1954, but it was not federally mandated until 1961 (p. 1). The phrase "affirmative action" was cited in President John F. Kennedy's *Executive Order (E.O.) 10925* in 1961, which also created the Committee on Educational Employment Opportunity (CEEEO; p. 1). Equality of access to higher education was not challenged until 1978, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (438 U.S. 912) that race could be used as a factor in admissions decisions, but reserving space for minority students could not be practiced (p. 1).

Nonresident alien. The category "Total minority" excludes White, non-Hispanic, and Nonresident alien.

Table 1

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity Nationally, 1990 and 1999, and for SUNY-New Paltz, 2001

Race/Ethnicity	United States				SUNY-New Paltz	
	1990		1999		2001	
	<i>n</i> *	%**	<i>n</i> *	%**	<i>n</i> *	%
White, non-Hispanic	10,722.5	79.9	10,262.5	71.9	4,825	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,247.0	9.3	1,640.7	11.5	469	7.8
Hispanic	782.4	5.8	1,316.6	9.2	522	8.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	572.4	4.3	909.7	6.4	224	3.7
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	102.8	0.7	145.3	1.0	13	0.2
Nonresident alien	391.5	2.8	516.4	3.5	N/A	N/A
Total minority	2,704.7	20.0	4,012.3	28.1	1,228	20.3
Total enrollment	13,818.6	100.0	14,791.2	100.0	6,053	100.0

* In thousands

** As reported by NCES (2002)

Statistical documents appearing since 1976, when higher education enrollment data were first reported by race/ethnicity, indicated an increasingly diverse student body. By the mid-1990s, however, a large-scale backlash became evident when the State of California's voters approved Proposition 209, ending the use of "race, gender, ethnicity or national origin as a factor in admissions decisions" to state higher education institutions and permitting gender discrimination (AFC, 2002, p. 2). In addition, in 1996, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled in *Texas v. Hopwood* (518 U.S. 1033) that the law school of the University of Texas violated the Constitution's equal-protection guarantee in its policy of considering race in admissions decisions (pp. 2-3). Further, in 1998, voters in the State of Washington passed *Initiative 200* which banned affirmative action in higher education (p. 3). Similarly, the Florida legislature eliminated affirmative action in 2000. Finally, on May 14, 2002, in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (288 F.3d 732 6th Cir.), the Sixth Circuit upheld "as constitutional the use of race as one of many factors in making admissions decisions at the University of Michigan's Law School" (p. 4).

The bottom line is that diversity on college campuses is generally seen as a positive factor (Bunzel, 2002). In the wake of court decisions and legislation that reverse affirmative action policies and practices, admissions personnel are becoming hard-pressed in their attempt to diversify the student body on their campuses. Reported by Graham B. Spanier, president of The Pennsylvania State University, the Kellogg Commission has made seven recommendations for increasing access to higher

education to enhance diversity on college campuses. The two recommendations pertinent to the present study include:

1. Transform public universities by creating new kinds of programs and services, and if need be, new kinds of institutions to meet the needs of traditional and non-traditional learners.
2. Focus on what students need to succeed by improving student support services and academic programs to ensure that all students . . . have a better chance of success, and by encouraging faculty engagement in the task of meeting the diverse needs of students from different backgrounds. (Spanier, 1998, p. 3)

New kinds of programs, such as the Scholar's Mentorship Program at SUNY-New Paltz, is one example of a new program that serves to increase diversity on campus by meeting the diverse needs of students from different backgrounds.

Problems in Recruitment of Minority Students

Minorities are under-represented in higher education. Some of the more common barriers to recruitment of minority students are:

1. Poor academic preparation while in high school has limited the pool of admissible minority applicants.
2. Counseling often is too little, too late, or nonexistent. Students learn about prerequisites for college admission too late in their high school careers. Others suffer from the gap between their high school performance and the requirements for college admission.
3. Lack of family experience with higher education means that first-generation college students often lack the family-initiated aspiration for a college degree, knowledge of the process for entering and financing college, and support for getting through the admission process. These students often lack information and ideas about what college will be like and have academic, financial, and social fears about college.

4. Money is almost always an issue cited by potential students who often are convinced that higher education is beyond their means. They have little knowledge of the types and amounts of financial aid available or of the steps required in securing financial assistance. Even students who receive financial aid may find the grants inadequate. For most students from low-income families, the threat of incurring a high level of debt by taking out student loans is not an acceptable option.
5. The *Hopwood* decision not only eliminated affirmative action efforts, but reinforced the perception that institutions of higher education do not seek or welcome minority students. Some minority students viewed this as a return to official legal discrimination.
6. Certain conditions in institutions of higher education send the wrong message to prospective minority students. These conditions include the small number of enrolled minority students, too few minority alumni, faculty, staff, and administrators, and too few academic programs and activities that appeal to these students.
7. Community and technical colleges, despite their open admissions policy, also have barriers that discourage minority students, including the lack of childcare services, locations away from public transportation, and lack of clarity about their role in the higher education system. (Texas Commission on a Representative Student Body, 1998)

Many colleges and universities in the United States have developed programs to address barriers to recruitment of under-represented students. Such programs include skill development, remedial programs, study techniques, summer orientation and study programs, pre-college on-campus programs, grants and loans, childcare services, and active recruitment in predominantly minority high schools. These are offered as content-based courses, workshops, seminars, and individual and group tutoring sessions as well as through mentoring programs. The Scholar's Mentorship Program at SUNY-New Paltz is a recruitment tool for minority students who enroll

through general admissions processes that uses faculty, staff, and peer mentoring as the tool for student retention.

Problems of Retention of Minority Students in Higher Education

For Black students on predominantly White campuses, social and academic adjustments are more intense than they are for their White counterparts (Fleming, 1981). Failure to adjust may lead to dropping out. In addition, for some students, racial integration on campus represents a new experience.

Black students on predominantly White campuses do not perform as well as do their White counterparts in their persistence, academic achievement, entry to post-graduate study, and general psychosocial adjustment (Allen, 1987; Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Astin, 1982; Fleming, 1984; Kemp 1990). They also have great difficulty in establishing a meaningful personal identity. Moreover, the inherent stressors of the predictable and normal life transition at this age from home and high school to college may be exacerbated when coupled with being in a foreign and sometimes hostile college environment. As a result, the stresses of racial tension and inadequate social lives borne by Black students in predominantly White schools generate feelings of alienation that often lead to serious adjustment problems and psychological withdrawal that impair academic functioning (Fleming, 1984).

Campus involvement and identification with an activity or program increase student retention, especially among minority students (Abrahamowicz, 1988; Allen, 1987; Astin, 1984; Mallinckrodt & Sedlacek, 1987; Tinto, 1975). In addition, their

ability to integrate effectively into predominantly White colleges and universities serves not only to validate resolution of the normal identity crisis indicated in Erikson's model of development, but it also contributes to college persistence among Black students (Astin, 1984; Fleming, 1981). Students who persist and complete college are the goal of retention programs.

Problems in Timely Graduation of Minority Students

In recent years, many students of all races have faced the problem of graduating within four years, the traditional amount of time needed to complete a bachelor's degree. Problems may be student- or institution-centered. For example, the student may need additional funds to continue school, may have to work to help support his or her family, may experience academic difficulty, or may find other reasons to stop out or drop out. Institutional difficulties relate to scheduling, overcrowding in classes, changing the major, or needing to meet certain requirements.

The minority focused upon in the present study is Blacks. Between 1976 and 2000, the proportion of Black recipients of bachelor's degrees increased from 6.5% of all bachelor's degrees conferred to 9.0%, a gain of 38.5%. In numbers, the increase was from 58,636 to 107,891, a gain of 84.0% (NCES, 2001). According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 2,389,000 Blacks in the United States hold bachelor's degrees, 7.5% of the total population of bachelor's degree holders (Newburger & Curry, 2000). This represents their highest level of education. In addition, the highest level of education of 828,000 Blacks is the master's degree; of 113,000, professional degrees; and of

72,000, doctoral degrees. In proportion to the total population for whom these degrees are the highest level of education, Blacks represent 7.9% of master's degree holders, 4.3% of professional degrees, and 3.5% of doctorates.

One Solution: Mentoring Programs

The concept of mentoring dates back to ancient Greek mythology. Mentor, an older, wiser man, helped Telemachus, a younger inexperienced one, navigate the road to personal growth and development. For the present study, mentoring involves the linking of minority faculty and professional staff as well as sophomore, junior, and senior students of the college with minority students on a one-to-one basis. The goal is to cultivate a supportive relationship between mentors and *protégées*, also called *mentees*. The mentoring process may include advising, guiding, directing, and role modeling. Used partly as a recruitment tool and primarily for retention, mentoring programs help increase graduation rates among minority students. A summary of research on mentoring programs for undergraduate college students is shown in Table 2.

Fourteen studies of mentoring of undergraduate college students are reported chronologically in Table 2. These studies were published between 1984 and 1998. Studies related to the preferred gender mix of mentor and protégée (Erkut & Mokros, 1984; Farylo & Paludi, 1986; Frierson, Hargrove, & Lewis, 1994), the degree of benefit or effectiveness of the mentoring relationship to the mentor and the protégée (Aloia & Smith, 1991; Jadwick, 1997; Yeomans & Sampson, 1994), the effects of

Table 2

Summary of Research on Mentoring Programs for Undergraduate College Students

Author	Year	Population	Findings
Erkut & Mokros	1984	College students	Gender is not a significant factor in students' selection or preference of a mentor. Mentored students were more confident and better able to formulate their thoughts.
Faryio & Paludi	1986	Male college students	Male students chose male mentors. Students liked having advocates and academic career guides.
Aloia & Smith	1991	College students	Mentors and protégées perceive mutual benefit to the relationship.
James	1991	Community college students	Mentoring increased course completion, GPA, graduation, transfer, and retention rates and decreased attrition rates. The program expanded faculty/staff development programs for mentors. It improved orientation programs for protégées, mentors, and parents. The program was integrated into the college's budget and received positive national publicity.

Table 2 (cont'd.--)

Author	Year	Population	Findings
Chavez & Maestas-Flores	1991	Hispanic community college students	Academic achievement, program completion, and transfer to four-year colleges improved. Students moved from developmental to general education courses in English and math. Students had higher retention levels than non-program Hispanic students.
Howard & Grosset	1992	Community college students	Mentors and students disagreed about belonging, time spent together, meeting goals, and college transfer.
Awbrey	1993	College students	Students have a tendency to select education-related individuals for career mentor functions while relying on friends for psychological mentoring functions.
Frierson, Hargrove, & Lewis	1994	18 college students	Protégées with Black or female mentors had more positive perceptions and attitudes towards research and the research environment than with White males.
Yeomans & Sampson	1994	College students in a teacher training program in England and their mentors	Mentors reported a more optimistic view of the mentoring relationship than students did. Mentors rarely perceive the mentoring relationship as less than okay. Mentors hardly ever perceive a faulty relationship to be their fault. About two-thirds of the mentors recognized failures and faults in the protégées.

Table 2 (cont'd.--)

Author	Year	Population	Findings
Boyd	1996	College students	Majority students and first-generation college students who have mentors experience greater satisfaction with college.
Horton	1996	College students	Students perceived that the primary function of mentors was psychosocial support. Amount of time spent with the mentor provided a "retention enhancing function" for upperclassmen.
Jadwick	1997	College students and mentors	This study measured the perception of effectiveness of mentoring using the Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale (PAMS; Cohen, 1993).
Edmonds	1997	African American community college students	Mentoring programs enhance the academic achievement of this population in terms of GPA and retention. Important to program success were institutional support, orientations for mentors and protégées, matching mentors and protégées, and consistent follow-ups. Mentors were committed, interested in disadvantaged students, and eager to give back. Students looked for focus, nurturing, role models, and a sense of belonging.

Table 2 (cont'd.--)

Author	Year	Population	Findings
Petruolo	1998	Community college students	Quality of mentoring was not related to students' academic persistence, re-enrollment, GPA, or academic/work self-concept. Quantity of mentoring is related to students' academic persistence and academic/work self-concept.

mentoring in terms of student achievement (Boyd, 1996; Chavez & Maestas-Flores, 1991; Edmonds, 1997; Horton, 1996; Howard & Grosset, 1992; James, 1991; Petruolo, 1998), and the selection of a mentor (Awbrey, 1993). The present study focuses on the effectiveness of the mentoring program in the retention of minority students at SUNY-New Paltz., so the studies on mentoring relating to that topic are discussed here.

In their study of college students, Aloia and Smith (1991) and Jadwick (1997) reported that mentors and protégées both perceive a benefit to the mentoring relationship. Yeomans and Sampson (1994) found that mentors are more optimistic than protégées about the mentoring relationship, and the mentors almost always find the relationship to be satisfactory. If the relationship is not satisfactory, mentors rarely believe that the fault lies with the mentor, yet the majority of mentors readily recognized failures and faults in their protégées.

SMP is a retention program; therefore, some academic benefit needs to result from the mentoring program. Boyd (1996) found that non-minority and first-generation college students with mentors experienced greater satisfaction than similar students without mentors, and Horton (1996) reported a “retention enhancing function” for upperclassmen in her study. According to Chavez and Maestas-Flores (1991), Hispanic community college students benefitted academically from having mentors. They demonstrated improved academic achievement, program completion, transfer to four-year colleges, and higher retention levels than those Hispanic students

without mentors. These students were also more likely to move from developmental to general education courses in mathematics and English, a necessity for moving towards a degree.

For African American community college students, Edmonds (1997) found that mentoring programs enhance academic achievement defined as GPA and retention. She further discovered that certain characteristics were critical to program success: (a) institutional support, (b) orientation sessions for mentors and protégées, (c) matching mentors and protégées, and (d) consistent follow-up activities such as phone calls and individual and group contacts. In addition, mentors were committed to the program, interested in disadvantaged students, and eager to give back to the community. Students in the mentoring relationship were looking for focus, nurturing, role models, and a sense of belonging to the campus community. In their study of community college students, however, Howard and Grosset (1992) discovered that mentors and students disagreed about belonging, time spent together, meeting goals, and college transfer.

Certain factors appear to be related to the success of mentoring programs for community college students. James found that mentoring increased course completion, GPA, graduation, transfer, and retention rates along with decreased attrition rates for student participants. The mentoring program also expanded faculty/staff development programs for the mentors and improved orientation programs for

protégées, mentors, and parents. As a result of the program's success, it was integrated into the college's budget and received positive national publicity.

The most recent study cited here (Petruolo, 1998) examined the quality and quantity of mentoring activities in relation to community college students' academic/work self-concept. The *quality* of mentoring was not related to students' academic persistence, re-enrollment, GPA, or academic/work self-concept. The *quantity* of mentoring is related to students' academic persistence and academic/work self-concept. In other words, student appear to benefit from the time spent with a mentor.

Planned mentoring, a phenomenon of the late 1980s, represents a radical departure from the traditional skill-focused remedial programs often provided for minority students as retention tools. The underlying assumption of remedial programs is that minority students are academically inferior; therefore, given academic assistance, they will acquire the necessary skills for integration into the academic atmosphere of the college or university. This approach addresses only the academic side of the minority student retention issue while ignoring the social and cultural side. Mentoring programs, like SMP, in contrast, address academic, social, and cultural difficulties (Brower & Garvin, 1989; NEA, 2002; Stampen & Cabrera, 1988). The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP), with its goal of minority student retention and its grounding in student involvement theory (Astin, 1975, 1984), is the mentoring program under study. SMP, described briefly in Chapter I, is more fully described in Chapter III.

Theoretical Framework

The Life Model approach to social work practice offers an ecological perspective requiring the social worker to focus on both people and environments at the same time. This, according to Germain and Gitterman (1981), yields “a method of practice that integrates practice principles and skills within an organizational, community, and cultural context” (p. 619). Intervention strategies are therefore developed to mitigate the stressful relationship between the individual and his or her environment. Students in postsecondary education and institutions of higher education are the people and the environment, respectively, under consideration in the present study.

The first problem to be addressed is access. The appearance of a number of court cases and new laws and policies negating affirmative action calls into question the issue of access to higher education. For the purpose of this study, diversity of race among the student body in a college or university is deemed a positive goal. Given that assumption, the second problem is retention of students of color in higher education. The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP), encouraging high academic achievement and good social adjustment and creating a support network to promote retention and persistence among students of color, addresses issues of student development, in general, and students of color, in particular.

Student Development

Student development theories tend to integrate traditional pedagogical knowledge. The conceptual framework required for the present study, however, requires a way of viewing students within an ecological system perspective that emphasizes the match and fit between the student, specifically the student of color, and the college environment. In addition, the framework must help foster and explain the components or mechanisms that enable retention of students of color in higher education institutions, the primary goal of the SMP.

Many studies of retention and related program development are based on the concept of student involvement (Astin, 1975). Astin defined student involvement as the quantity and quality of physical and psychological energy that students invest in the college experience. Examples include absorption in academic studies, participation in extracurricular activities, and interaction with faculty and other institutional personnel. In theory, the greater the student's involvement, the greater the amount of learning and personal development (Astin, 1984).

Astin (1975, 1984) developed student involvement theory from longitudinal studies of college dropouts and the environmental impact of college on student persistence. He then investigated the interplay between the student and the environment. Key environmental factors positively affecting student retention include the following:

1. The student lives in campus-based housing, the center of the student's daily life of eating, sleeping, and socializing.

2. The student is involved in campus-based organizations and social-cultural activities.
3. The student is employed part-time by the college at the college.

The common element among these factors is direct campus involvement which enhances a sense of belonging that yields identification with the college.

Academic performance and persistence. Research on academic performance and persistence among college students subsequent to Astin (1975, 1984) have replicated or incorporated dimensions of student involvement theory in their design (i.e., Abrahamowicz, 1988; Pace, 1984). Additionally, the student involvement model may be a useful tool in exploring and understanding the impact of college environmental factors on persistence, academic achievement, and dropping out among students of color.

Integration, alienation and attrition among Black students. Pre-college factors can influence the ability of a student to integrate into the college environment. For Black students, pre-college strain between Black and White races carries over to the college experience, particularly on predominantly White campuses (Shingles, 1979). Moreover, Black students often alienate themselves on these campuses, maintaining a highly cohesive bond among themselves.

For many Black students, alienation becomes a coping mechanism, buffering them from a racially hostile campus atmosphere. When Black peers are available, they offer self-validation through their support system, reinforcing their racial identity and

self-esteem. Increased self-validation results in enhanced academic performance and persistence (Shingles, 1979).

Non-cognitive factors in student retention. In examining the first-year student's perception of social support and dropout intention, Mallinckrodt (1988) found that non-cognitive variables had the highest correlation with persistence for Black students. These factors, the combination of the student's overall life experiences prior to and during college along with his or her self-perception and attitude towards the college environment, are also better predictors of academic success than traditional measures such as grade-point average (Tracy & Sedlacek, 1984). Specifically, non-cognitive variables include: (a) positive self-concept, (b) realistic self-appraisal, (c) understanding of and ability to deal with racism, (d) preference for long-term goals over short-term needs, (e) availability of at least one strong support person, (f) successful leadership experiences, and (g) demonstrated community service (Tracy & Sedlacek, 1984).

The seven non-cognitive predictors of Black student success in college were developed into an assessment instrument, the Non-Cognitive Questionnaire (NCQ). Its predictive validity, especially for Black students, has been useful in early identification of problems and program development for students identified at high risk for dropping out. Consisting of two nominal items on educational expectations, 18 Likert-type items on expectations about college and self-assessment, and three open-ended questions on current goals, past accomplishments, group membership, and

offices held, the NCQ yielded significant findings for Black students. For example, persistence was found to be significantly related to Black students' academic self-confidence, realistic self-appraisal of academic skills, and academic familiarity. Support for college plans and a preference for long-range goals predicted persistence after three semesters, but not beyond that. In addition, demonstrated community service experience and an understanding of racism were significantly related to persistence in the academic careers of Black students (Tracy & Sedlacek, 1985). Clearly, non-cognitive factors must be considered in programming for retention of Black students. The NCQ was not used in the present study as it did not specifically relate to the monitoring and evaluation of SMP, but it lent itself rather to pre- and post-testing students over time.

Summary

The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz is a retention program for minority students who are admitted to the university through general admissions procedures, as opposed to programs for disadvantaged students. Historically, Blacks did not have access to higher education, except for a very limited number of predominantly White schools and a handful of historically Black colleges. Minority students first entered higher education institutions in greater numbers during the late 1960s as a result of the Civil Rights Movement and legislation authorizing affirmative action in college admissions.

Today, a backlash against affirmative action is occurring, and California, for example, has eliminated it through Proposition 209 for public institutions.

For the purpose of this study, diversity in terms of race and ethnicity is deemed to be an asset on college campuses. Consequently, predominantly White colleges must recruit students of color, attracting them with scholarships, academic specialties, and special programs to help them succeed in college. Once on campus, these students must participate in these special programs to benefit from them. Therefore, the theoretical framework used for the present study is student involvement (Astin, 1975), placed in the Life Model of social work practice which focuses on the interaction between the individual and his or her environment (Germain & Gitterman, 1981).

CHAPTER III

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to monitor and evaluate an ongoing mentoring program for students of color at a public university. The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) was designed to help students of color who were not admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) make a positive transition to campus life and continue at the university through graduation. The evaluation of SMP is based on the goals and objectives of the program; therefore, SMP is described first, followed by operational definitions and the research design.

The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP)

The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP), a project of the Multicultural Recruitment Program Task Force at SUNY-NP, was created during the 1988-1989 school year as a means of assisting general admit students of color to achieve a positive transition to campus life. Its mission is to enhance the academic achievement, social/cultural integration, and college persistence of general admissions African-American, Latino, Native American, and Asian-American students. The rationale for SMP was prompted by the observation by faculty of college adjustment difficulties experienced by general admission students of color, manifested in their depressed academic performance and limited persistence, combined with a lack of institutional

support. Initially a collaboration between the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC) and the Black Studies Department, SMP brought together PCC's Peer Mentorship Program, an outreach program for increasing access to PCC by students of color, and the Faculty/Staff/Student Mentorship Program run by the Black Studies Department. The present name, Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP), resulted from the merger of the two programs.

Operated now by the Psychological Counseling Center at SUNY-NP and directed by the chair of the Black Studies Department and the researcher, associate director of PCC, SMP is described on the university's web site as shown in Figure 1. The program is co-directed by the researcher for the present study, the associate director of the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC). She is a master's level social worker completing her doctorate in social work. Program coordinators, responsible to the director and associate director of the PCC as well as to the chair of the Black Studies Department, who holds a Ph.D. in linguistics, are responsible for recruiting students of color, peer mentors, and faculty and staff mentors and planning and coordinating academic and socio-cultural activities for SMP. The only two criteria for eligibility for SMP are (a) the student must be a self-identified ethnic minority and (b) the student must have been accepted through regular admissions processes, as opposed to EOP. As upperclass students, EOP students may participate in SMP as peer mentors.

The goals of the Scholar's Mentorship Program are two-fold.

- First, it encourages high academic achievement and good social adjustment.
- Second, it seeks to create a support network to encourage the retention and persistence of general admit African-American, Asian, Latino, and Native American students.

Nationally, mentoring programs have been extremely successful in producing students who are noted for academic excellence, leadership, and social responsibility.

The Scholar's Mentorship Program consists of three tiers.

- Tier I is comprised of Freshman Protégées who are assigned faculty/staff mentors and peer mentors and participate in program activities for as long as the mentoring relationship continues.
- Tier II is comprised of sophomores, juniors, and seniors who become Peer Mentors by enrolling in course # 17420 – Counseling Under-represented Students.
- Tier III is comprised of Student Leaders who are enrolled in or have completed course # 17393 – Black and Latino Leadership or have completed Counseling Under-represented Students and have joined the Mentorship Leader's Club.

In fulfilling its overall mission, the program provides highly specialized services including academic advising, tutorial support for selected subjects, retention-based workshops, and socio-cultural enhancement programs.
(<http://www.newpaltz.edu/counseling/mentors/htm>)

Figure 1. The Scholar's Mentorship Program: Description from the SUNY-NP Web Site (<http://www.newpaltz.edu/counseling/mentors/htm>).

The tier system used in SMP, as shown in Figure 1, simply delineates the process of movement from protégée to peer mentor to student leader for SMP participants. On average, approximately 10% of protégées become peer mentors by the beginning of their sophomore year. Another 15% of protégées wait until their junior or senior year to adopt the peer mentoring role. Becoming a peer mentor requires the student to take the course, *Counseling Under-represented Students*. To become a student leader, the individual is not required to be either a peer mentor or an SMP participant; however, the student leader is required to take either the *Counseling Under-represented Students* course or the *Black and Latino Leadership* course. About 10 students each year complete Tier III requirements.

Recruitment

Recruitment of students into SMP involves aggressive outreach strategies. Beginning in the fall, the SMP Task Force participates in university-wide Open House activities, Accepted Candidates Day, and other recruitment-related efforts. In the middle of spring semester, the MRP admissions counselor, who is also a member of the SMP Task Force, forwards a current list of general admit students of color to the SMP Task Force. An SMP program description, an application, and a program contract are then mailed to the students on the list who have already paid their acceptance deposit. In addition, during the summer, the university holds five 2½-day residential orientation sessions for all students and their parents. Summer Orientation staff, who are informed of SMP, along with the SMP program coordinator canvass

prospective SMP students at that time. An informational invitation card is given to all regularly admitted students of color at the point of check-in for this orientation program. The students are invited to a briefing about SMP. For that meeting, the Task Force chair or SMP program coordinator meets with the students to brief them about SMP, respond to questions and/or concerns, and sign them up for the program if they are interested. At that time, students read and sign a program contract (Appendix A). At the end of the Summer Orientation before the students return to their homes, they register for classes. Students interested in participating in SMP sign their contracts and register for *Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented Students*.

Students entering SMP start at Tier I and are called *protégées*. Each protégée is assigned a peer mentor and a faculty/staff mentor. In order to promote compatibility, an attempt is made to match mentor and protégée in terms of gender, ethnicity, and academic areas of interest. This holds true for both peer and faculty/staff mentors. Peer mentors are assigned three or four protégées, and faculty/staff mentors work with one or two. Peer mentors are selected for their ability to balance involvement in extra-curricular activities with academic demands, their leadership abilities, and their real desire to assist new students. Peer mentors must also take a course, *Counseling Under-represented Students*. This course is also open to any upperclass student regardless of gender, race, and/or ethnicity who is in good academic standing, as defined by a GPA of at least 2.5.

Orientation and Reception

At the beginning of the fall term, a reception is held to honor the new protégées. The president of the university, selected key administrators, faculty/staff mentors, peer mentors, and upperclass protégées attend this reception. This forum provides an opportunity for peer and faculty/staff mentors and incoming protégées to meet, exchange contact information, and plan informal meetings and/or activities. In addition to the initial reception, faculty/staff mentors and protégées are encouraged to meet as frequently as possible, at least three times per semester--once before the midpoint, again after mid-term examinations, and finally toward the end of the term. In addition, the SMP strategically schedules three meetings during the term and sends the information to all participants.

The three meetings between faculty/staff mentor and protégée may be either small group or one-on-one. At the first of the three meetings, held shortly after the initial reception, the mentors and protégées discuss the semester as it has unfolded so far. The goal is to head off social and academic problems through referral to appropriate campus resources. The second meeting, held either just before or after mid-term examinations, further explores the academic and social progress of the protégées. The final meeting, held near the end of the first semester, focuses on fulfilling academic prerequisites, progress toward course completion, and future academic and career planning. In addition to the fall reception, a cultural trip, most often to New York City, is held to help faculty/staff and peer mentors and their

protégées to bond socially. In the spring semester, a “Spring Reconnect” event occurs to assist in the continuity of the faculty/staff- and peer mentor-protégée relationship. At this event, program participants are awarded certificates of achievement for outstanding academic performance, for those who qualify, and/or peer mentor leadership performance awards. Key administrators are invited to this event.

Role of the Mentor

While some expectation of the mentor is evident, the role is as unique as the individual who performs it. The faculty/staff mentor provides emotional and psychological support, role models, advises academically (in addition to the regular academic advisement offered by the student’s advisor), and focuses and helps direct the protégée's career. Most staff mentors, whose university roles do not permit it, do not provide academic advisement. Cultivation of a reciprocal relationship is supported by the SMP coordinators, and faculty/staff mentors are encouraged to report any problems of concern. Faculty/staff mentors are asked to complete a mentor-protégée contact sheet which is forwarded to the SMP program coordinator after contact occurs.

Roles of peer mentors are more diversified. Their three key functions are: (a) to ensure the relationship between the faculty/staff mentor and the protégée is working effectively, (b) to assist the protégée in developing new peer relationships, and (c) to identify campus resources which will meet the needs of the protégée. While some overlap appears in the responsibilities of the faculty/staff mentors and the peer mentors, the peer mentors facilitate the transition of the protégée into the informal

social structure of the school and teach them "the ropes," the formal institutional structure. Required to spend a minimum of one hour per week with their protégées, peer mentors often meet with their protégée almost daily by eating meals together, attending student organization meetings together, and/or studying together at the library or Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center.

Mentor-protégée activities are monitored through bi-weekly class attendance in the required course, *Counseling Under-represented Students*. The fieldwork format of the course allows peer mentors to present and discuss issues and concerns related to their protégées. Additionally, mentoring theories and strategies are discussed along with role playing and problem solving approaches for facilitating mentor-protégée relationship development. As part of the course requirement, peer mentors maintain a log sheet of their weekly activities and length of time they spend with their protégées. The log sheets must be signed by the protégée as verification of their meeting. The log sheets are turned in weekly to the course teacher, the researcher in this case. Because of the depth of their role, peer mentors are considered the lifeline of the program especially in the fall semester.

SMP Program Limitations

SMP currently serves about 70 new students per year, a total of about 225 students at one time. The amount of tracking of mentoring activities that would ensure a successful experience for all participants is limited. A major constraint is that SMP continues to lack sufficient funding to increase the number of activities offered to

participants and to improve the ability to track students socially and academically. In addition, the program has not been adopted formally and fully by the university through normal funding and resource allocation procedures. At this time, SMP employs one half-time program coordinator and one half-time secretary. Funds to operate SMP are provided by the Provost from his discretionary funds. The Vice President for Student Affairs also contributes. Moreover, in spite of the race-based Multicultural Recruitment Program (MRP), the university appears to be disinterested in supporting any program that may be perceived as race-based.

Another limitation is the fact that structured peer mentoring is offered only during the fall term and only during the protégée's first year. Often, the relationship developed by the peer mentor and the protégée continues informally, but it is no longer a program requirement after the first fall term the protégée attends the university. This is important because it may be reflected in the responses of those students who fail to connect with the university and give the program a negative evaluation as a result of the limited formal mentoring period.

The lack of funds also affects the ability to train peer mentors before the fall term begins. As a result, peer mentor training occurs in the context of course work and the required field work for the course, as does peer mentor supervision. Therefore, peer mentor training happens in concert with peer mentoring.

Operational Definition of Terms

To understand this monitoring and evaluation study, it is important to consider the definitions of certain concepts and the functions of the faculty/staff and peer mentors. These definitions are presented here as an introduction to the research design.

Concepts

Academic performance: Semester grade point average and overall average of all grades received since enrollment in SMP.

College integration: Participant's membership in any student organization, leadership positions held in any number of student organizations, attendance at social/cultural events, and establishment of informal relationships with peers, professors, and other members of the college community.

College persistence: Successful progress toward graduation as determined by consecutive re-enrollment and successful completion of courses with passing grades.

Ongoing relations: Maintenance of a mentor-protégée relationship beyond the minimum expectation of three times for faculty/staff mentors and one hour per week during the fall term for peer mentors.

Peer mentor-protégée contact: Adherence to the one hour per week face-to-face meeting expectation during the fall term of the protégée's first year.

Re-enrollment: Registration in a semester subsequent to the first semester and in every semester thereafter without interruption.

Faculty/Staff Mentor Function

Facilitative: Mentor guides and refers protégée to campus-based resources when necessary; recommends protégée for internship opportunities and jobs; writes reference letter.

Intellectual/academic: Mentor guides protégée through course selection process prior to registration, advises protégée on time management strategies and study skills, and provides career-specific knowledge and information as it pertains to the protégée's areas of interest; monitors academic performance and makes appropriate recommendations and referrals when academic difficulty is identified.

Psychological/emotional: Through verbal appraisal and behavioral action (i.e., persistently reaching out to protégée), mentor conveys genuine interest in, concern for, and understanding of protégée; encourages protégée to pursue challenges and listens in a supportive way to protégée's academic and/or personal trials.

Role modeling: Mentor personally shares with protégée strategies used to achieve success in his or her own career and describes challenges encountered and methods for overcoming them; engages in discussion of challenges and values specific to protégée's career interest.

Peer Mentor Function

Facilitative: Mentor refers protégée to faculty/staff mentor and/or other campus-based resources when warranted; encourages protégée's participation in campus social, educational, and cultural events; accompanies protégée when possible;

introduces protégée to other students, especially those with similar academic interests; praises protégée as appropriate and encourages more campus involvement and challenge.

Intellectual/academic: Mentor engages in ongoing informal discussion with protégée about academic concerns and performance as well as time management strategies and study skills; if possible, prior to registration brainstorms with protégée about course selection before protégée's meeting with faculty/staff mentor.

Psychological/emotional: Mentor supports and encourages protégée's positive attitude and behavior as they relate to the protégée's academic and social/cultural experiences; empathetically listens to protégée's needs/concerns and reframes experiences as able and appropriate.

Role modeling: Through personal practice, mentor instills in protégée a generally positive attitude about college experiences, study habits, and time management techniques; shares personal experiences, as appropriate, to provide alternative options and perspective.

Research Design

The present study uses an evaluation research design to attempt to monitor the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz with the hope of generally assessing SMP's effectiveness as a retention program for high achieving students of color. According to Borg and Gall (1983), evaluation is "the process of making judgments about the merit, value, or worth" of a program (p.

733). Context evaluation analyzes a program in a specific setting. Process or formative evaluation occurs after the program has been designed, developed, and implemented. Its function is to try to determine the program's effectiveness in filling the need the program was designed to meet. It is the systematic application of scientific methods to assess the design, implementation, improvement or outcomes of a program. For SMP, monitoring and evaluation purposes include improvement of the implementation and effectiveness of programs, better management of limited resources, and documentation of program accomplishments (Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Short, Hennessy, & Campbell, 1996). From process or formative evaluation in the early stages, evaluation should eventually proceed to more goal- or outcome-oriented evaluation.

One useful evaluation model is CIPP—context, input, process, and product (Stufflebeam, 2002). It asks four questions about the program to be evaluated:

1. What needs to be done?
2. How should it be done?
3. Is it being done?
4. Did it succeed? (Stufflebeam, 2002, p. 1)

In the case of SMP, the first three questions have been answered. SMP was designed to assist generally admitted students of color to graduate from SUNY-NP in a timely fashion. The program was then developed as a peer and faculty/staff mentoring program. SMP continues at SUNY-NP. The only remaining question concerns its

success in terms of impact and effectiveness, the topic of the present monitoring and evaluation study.

The specific research design is formative evaluation utilizing a retrospective correlational, one group after only design as described by Tripodi (1983). Frequently used in social work program evaluation, this methodology provides preliminary knowledge regarding program variables.

The unobtrusive methodology of this design allows the evaluation to be conducted in the program's current state of existence. According to Tripodi (1983), although the design does not control for internal and external validity factors, its approximation of cause-effect through correlation provides a pre-condition necessary for causality. The limitation of the design is the inability to generalize findings; therefore, the SMP evaluation will not be able to make any statement about the usefulness of other formal mentoring programs to promote academic success among students of color in general. The evaluation will provide, however, empirical data and insight into the functional dynamics of this particular mentorship program and lead to modifications and/or restructuring of the program.

Evaluation of SMP focused on answering the following questions:

1. What impact, if any, does bi-level mentoring comprised of faculty/staff and peer mentors have on first-year students who participate in SMP in terms of academic performance as measured by grade point average (GPA), college integration as measured by involvement in extracurricular activities and interaction with mentors, and college persistence as measured by re-enrollment in consecutive semesters?

2. What is the retention rate of protégées who persist beyond the first year?
3. What is the retention rate of program participants--both protégées and peer mentors--at the end of the second and third years, respectively?
4. What is the graduation rate of program participants?
5. Is there a correlation among academic performance, college persistence, and mentoring for program participants?
6. Is there a correlation among academic performance, college persistence, and type of mentoring--peer or faculty/staff--for program participants?
7. Do demographic characteristics such as gender, age, ethnicity, and hometown relate to academic performance of program participants.
8. Is there any significant difference in academic performance between protégées who maintained active relationships with their mentors and those who did not?
9. What aspect(s) of SMP appear to be most effective in participant retention, and what aspects of SMP do participants rate more positively?

Population

SMP was developed in response to the changing proportion of students of color at SUNY-NP. With a 2001-2002 total minority population of 20.3%, the college appears to be significantly less diverse than the national average of 30.9% and the New York state average of 32.0% (Table 1). Table 3 shows national census data that support the increased diversity of the United States compared with the state of New York, the source of the majority of SUNY-NP students. New York equals or exceeds the nation for every non-White population except "American Indian and Alaska Native" (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

The target population for the present evaluation consists of the SMP participants currently enrolled in SUNY-NP. They were admitted through the general admission process as opposed to the EOP, a program for economically disadvantaged students. Self-identified as students of color, defined as Black-African American, Black-Caribbean/West Indian, Black-Continental African, Native American, Latino/Hispanic, and Mexican American, SMP participants include female (70%) and male (30%) freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors between the ages of 18 and 30. All were recruited into SMP as freshmen and voluntarily agreed to participate in SMP. Over the 15 years of SMP's existence, approximately 750 individuals have been participants. Each year, at least 70 new students enter SMP. As a result, approximately 225 SMP participants are enrolled at SUNY-NP at any one time. Therefore, the available population for this evaluation is 225 SMP participants.

Recruitment of Evaluation Participants

Evaluation participants were recruited in a systematic manner. First, names, addresses, and phone numbers were retrieved by the researcher from the SMP database. Next, an informational letter was mailed to all SMP participants (Appendix A), informing them of the opportunity to participate in the evaluation. After one week, the researcher telephoned all SMP participants to determine their interest in participating in the evaluation, answer any questions they might have about the procedure, and arrange a specific time and place for questionnaire (Appendix B) completion. As per Institutional Review Board (IRB) of both Hunter College and

Table 3

Census 2000 Data by Race/Ethnicity for New York and the United States

Race	New York		United States	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	2,867,583	15.1	35,305,818	12.5
Not Hispanic or Latino	11,760,981	62.0	246,116,088	87.5
White	12,893,689	68.0	194,552,774	69.1
Black or African American	3,014,385	15.9	33,947,837	12.1
American Indian and Alaska Native	82,461	0.4	2,068,883	0.7
Asian	1,044,976	5.5	10,123,169	3.6
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8,818	0.1	353,509	0.1
Some Other Race or More Than One Race	1,341,946	7.1	5,069,916	1.8
Two or More Races	590,182	3.1	6,826,228	2.4
Total Population	18,976,457	100.0	281,421,906	100.0

SUNY-NP, students who chose not to participate after learning about the questionnaire or during the completion session were not penalized in any way and were not included in data collection and analysis. This posed the possibility that the desired sample of 225 might not be reached, and, in fact, a cohort of only 126 (56.0%) ultimately

responded. The confidence interval or error rate for a sample of 126 from a population of 225 is $\pm 6\%$.

Description of the Sample

Table 4 reports frequency and percentage on the gender, ethnic heritage, year in school, age, and length of time in program for the protégées. The next table (Table 5) displays the responses to questions on the questionnaire regarding the academic performance of the protégées and includes GPA, number of times on academic probation, number of incidences of academic dismissal, and numbers of leaves of absence. Table 6 reports the same data as Table 5; however, this information was gathered from 123 transcripts of participants. In addition, Table 6 shows the current status of 123 participants based on their transcripts as either graduated, still in school and on target in terms of the number of semester hours completed, and still in school but not on target. Each student is expected to complete 30 credits per academic year in order to graduate in four years with a standard 120-credit bachelor's degree.

Demographic variables. The majority of respondents (70.6%) are female. In terms of ethnic heritage, 92.9% of participants responded to this question and indicated that they are Black (58.8%), Hispanic or Latino (18.3%), Asian American or Pacific Islander (12.7%), or Other (3.2%). The Black students further identified themselves as Black African American (44.6% of all Black participants), Black Caribbean West Indian (47.3%), and Black Continental African (8.1%). Of 126

Table 4

Description of the Respondents

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	37	29.4
Female	89	70.6
Ethnic Heritage		
Asian American or Pacific Islander	16	12.7
Black African American	33	26.2
Black Caribbean West Indian	35	27.8
Black Continental African	6	4.8
Latino or Hispanic	23	18.3
Other	4	3.2
No response	9	7.1
Year in School		
Freshman	30	23.8
Sophomore	38	30.2
Junior	23	18.3
Senior	35	27.8
Age (<i>M</i> = 19.9)		
18	20	15.9
19	33	26.2
20	32	25.4
21	24	19.0
22	14	11.1
23	2	1.6
24	1	0.8
Length of Time in Program		
One semester	2	1.6
Two semesters	33	26.2
Three semesters	3	2.4
Four semesters	37	29.4
Five semesters	1	0.8
Six semesters	22	17.5
Seven semesters	3	2.4
Eight semesters	20	15.9
More than eight semesters	5	4.0

Table 5

Academic Achievement and Persistence of the Respondents: Self-Report

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
GPA (<i>M</i> = 3.03)		
< 2.0	1	0.8
2.0 - 2.9	48	38.1
3.0 - 3.9	69	54.8
No response	8	6.3
Frequency on Academic Probation		
Never	108	85.7
Once	13	10.3
Twice	3	2.4
Three times	1	0.8
No response	1	0.8
Frequency of Academic Dismissal		
Never	120	95.2
Once	4	3.2
Twice	1	0.8
No response	1	0.8
Frequency of Leaves of Absence		
Never	122	96.8
Once	1	0.8
Three times	1	0.8
More than three times	1	0.8
No response	1	0.8

students completing the survey, 23.8% are freshmen; 30.2%, sophomores; 18.3%, juniors; and 27.8%, seniors. Their age range is 18 to 24, standard college age, with an average of 19.9 years. The average number of semesters that respondents have participated in the SMP is 4.67. Because the peer mentoring aspect of the program is

Table 6

Academic Achievement and Persistence of the Respondents: Transcript Report

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
GPA (<i>M</i> = 2.97)		
< 2.0	2	1.6
2.0 - 2.9	58	47.2
3.0 - 3.9	63	51.2
Frequency on Academic Probation		
Never	106	86.2
Once	14	11.4
Twice	2	1.6
Three times	1	0.8
Frequency of Academic Dismissal		
Never	119	96.7
Once	4	3.3
Twice	0	0.8
Frequency of Leave of Absence		
Never	120	97.6
Once	3	2.4
Three times	0	0.0
More than three times	0	0.0
Current Status as a Student		
Graduated	25	20.4
Still in school and on target	49	39.8
Still in school but not on target	49	39.8

program is offered formally only in the fall and the survey was conducted in the spring, a surge of participants appears in even-numbered semesters in Table 4 under “Length of Time in Program.” The peer mentor and protégée relationship may continue informally as long as the two students wish it to endure.

Academic achievement and persistence. Academic achievement and persistence was measured in four ways: (a) Grade Point Average (GPA), on a four-point system where 4.0 is A and 0.0 is F; (b) number of times on academic probation, where a high number means poor academic achievement; (c) number of incidents of academic dismissal, which may or may not enable a student to return to school; and (d) number of leaves of absence, indicating difficulty in persistence. In addition, transcripts were reviewed to determine if the participant has graduated, is still in school and is on target with credits to graduate in four years, or is still in school and will not graduate in four years unless he or she attends summer school or takes a heavier than normal course load.

For this group of respondents, the self-reported mean GPA was 3.03 or *B*, while the transcript-reported mean GPA was 2.97, slightly below a *B*. Although 8 (6.3%) students did not respond to the question about GPA, 69 (54.8%) reported a GPA greater than or equal to 3.0, and only one student indicated a GPA below 2.0 (*C*). The 123 transcripts of the participants revealed that 63 (51.2%) had a GPA between 3.0 and 3.9; 58 (47.2%) between 2.0 and 2.9; 2 (1.6%) below 2.0.

Very few students in this sample have been on academic probation or academic dismissal. Most (85.7%) reported never having been on academic probation, and a transcript review indicated that 106 (86.2%) have never been on academic probation. Thirteen students (10.3%) reported being on academic probation once; 3 (2.4%), twice; and one (0.8%) three times. Transcripts indicated 14 (11.4%) students on

academic probation once; 2 (1.6%) twice; and one (0.8%) three times. Only five students (4.0%) reported having ever been academically dismissed, and transcripts showed that four (3.3%) students have been academically dismissed. By self-report and transcript report, three students (2.4%) have had one or more leaves of absence.

Data Collection

The questionnaires were administered in a reserved room in the Student Union Building's SMP-Martin Luther King Study Center, SUNY-NP. A combination of direct and indirect methods was employed to compile the necessary data for the study. Admissions, enrollment, grade point average, and race/ethnicity information was obtained from the college's student record system and by self-report on the demographic section of the questionnaire (Appendix B). Additional information related to persistence and retention was garnered from withdrawal lists for judicial and medical reasons as well as academic dismissal. SMP records were also examined and relevant data extracted regarding faculty/staff and peer mentor contacts and activities involving program participants.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was developed specifically for this study (Appendix B). The items on the survey come from previous research regarding non-academic factors that affect student persistence and retention (Astin, 1972, 1975, 1984). The design of the survey was based upon Pascarella and Terenzini's (1980) freshman questionnaire and Tinto's (1975) attrition model. It consists of items that investigate (a) demographic

variables, (b) pre-enrollment and individual variables, and (c) student perception of the program and the institutional environment. Specific areas include organizational involvement, program participant-faculty/staff mentor involvement, and peer mentor-program participant involvement. Items require either fill-in answers, 6-point Likert-type scale responses, or open-ended short essays. Participant responses were recorded directly on the questionnaire.

Data collection occurred during March and April 2003. Not a faculty member and therefore not their teacher, the researcher administered surveys individually and in small groups, first providing each participant an informed consent form (Appendix C) and reading it aloud to engage interest and focus. Participants were reminded that they had the option of dropping out of the study at any time without negative consequence.

Completed questionnaires were stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's office in the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC). Questionnaires were coded to informed consent forms so that no identifying information appeared on the survey itself. The questionnaires and the informed consent forms were stored separately, and only the researcher had access to the master code list, the surveys, and the forms. Names were necessary in order to access GPA and enrollment data.

Variables

The two key factors under examination for this study are the components of the mentorship program, the independent variable, and the program participants' response to the program, the dependent variable. The components of the participants' response

are: (a) academic success as measured by grade point average (GPA), both self- and transcript-report; (b) academic persistence as measured by continuous registration for six academic terms, as indicated by self- and institutional-report; and (c) academic dropout as measured by the failure to enroll after participation in SMP, as reported via institutional data. The definition of academic persistence is based on Astin (1972, 1975) who found that dropout behavior tended to occur during the first year.

SMP has four critical functions: (a) to provide academic and career advisement to program participants by faculty/staff and peer mentors; (b) to familiarize participants with and facilitate their use of campus resources; (c) to facilitate program participants' involvement in campus social, educational, and cultural activities; and (d) to provide emotional and psychological support to participants. Based on these critical functions, three independent variables were investigated: (a) participant-faculty/staff mentor interactions, (b) peer mentor-participant linkages, and (c) social, educational, and cultural activities. These are evaluated formatively in that the goal is to determine whether or not they occurred and with what frequency.

Data Analysis

Data gathered from the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively using the chi-square statistic, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and *t* test. Responses to short-answer questions are reported. Results from the analysis are then interpreted in Chapter IV in light of the evaluative goal of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to monitor and evaluate an ongoing mentoring program for students of color at a public university. The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) was designed to help students of color who were not admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) make a positive transition to campus life and continue at the university through graduation. The evaluation of SMP was based on the goals and objectives of the program. A total of 126 student protégées, described demographically and academically in Chapter III, responded to the questionnaire. Their responses are analyzed and interpreted in this chapter.

The tables in this chapter report the responses of these 126 protégées to questions concerning themselves, their faculty/staff mentors, and peer mentors. In some cases, the respondent did not answer the question; therefore, the total number of respondents per question may be less than 126.

The Mentoring Experience

In Table 7, the characteristics of the respondents' faculty/staff mentors are displayed along with the answers to questions about their relationship and frequency and modes of communication. Table 8 reports similar characteristics of the peer mentors. To monitor and evaluate the Scholar's Mentorship Program, it is important

Table 7

Description of the Respondents' Faculty/Staff Mentors and Their Relationship

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	37	29.4
Female	75	59.5
No response	14	11.1
Ethnic Heritage		
Asian American or Pacific Islander	8	6.3
Black African American	41	32.5
Black Caribbean West Indian	13	10.3
Black Continental African	6	4.8
Latino or Hispanic	14	11.1
Other	26	20.6
No response	18	14.3
Frequency of Faculty/Staff Mentor Contact		
Never interacted	31	24.6
Once	23	18.3
Once per semester	27	21.4
Two or three times per semester	27	21.4
More frequently than two or three times per semester	15	11.9
No response	3	2.4
Length of Faculty/Staff Mentor Contact		
less than 15 minutes	23	18.3
15 to 30 minutes	39	31.0
30 to 45 minutes	16	12.7
45 to 60 minutes	6	4.8
more than 60 minutes	6	4.8
have not met faculty staff mentor	31	24.6
No response	5	4.0
How Faculty/Staff Mentor Keeps in Touch (multiple responses possible)		
Telephone	42	47.7
Campus Mail	18	20.5
Email	7	8.0
Face to face	50	56.8

Table 7 (cont'd.-)

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Mentoring Contacts with Faculty/Staff Mentor include (multiple responses possible)		
Dining on campus	13	10.7
Dining off campus	17	13.9
Campus functions	17	13.9
Off campus functions	7	5.7
Shopping	3	2.5
Scholar's Mentorship Program activities	28	23.0
Office meetings	65	53.3
Other	10	8.2
Have had no contact with faculty/staff mentor	38	31.1
Quality of Faculty/Staff Mentor Relationship		
Very dissatisfactory	28	22.2
Dissatisfactory	11	8.7
Satisfactory	24	19.0
Somewhat satisfactory	13	10.3
Very satisfactory	21	16.7
Not applicable	24	19.0
No response	5	4.0
Reason for No Contact with Faculty/Staff Mentor		
Never informed of assigned mentor	7	5.6
Assigned mentor never contacted me	12	9.5
Mentor never responded to my contact	1	0.8
I never responded to mentor contact	1	0.8
Our schedules conflicted	2	1.6
I was too busy	7	5.6
I did not know what to talk about	7	5.6
I was not interested in a mentor	4	3.2
Other	11	8.7
No response	13	10.3
Have had contact with mentor	61	48.4

to understand the relationship between the student and his or her faculty/staff and peer mentors. Questions relating to this interaction had to do with the gender and ethnic heritage of the mentor, the frequency and nature of the contact, the student's

assessment of the quality of the relationship, and the reasons for not having a mentoring relationship with either the assigned faculty/staff or the assigned student mentor. The number of students who did not respond is included because the lack of response to these questions seems to be important in reflecting the attitude of the students towards SMP and towards the task of responding to the questionnaire. Chi-square analysis indicated that interaction with mentors ($\chi^2 = 19.80, p < .001$) and degree of satisfaction with the mentoring experience ($\chi^2 = 6.57, p = .011$) were significant.

The Faculty/Staff Mentor

Table 7 shows the description of the faculty/staff mentor and the relationship between the student/protégée and the mentor. Although 11.1% of respondents did not answer the question about the gender of their mentor and 14.3% did not say the ethnic heritage of the mentor, in most cases (59.5%), the mentor is a woman and of Black heritage (47.6%). In terms of ethnic heritage, 11.1% of respondents have a Hispanic/Latino faculty/staff mentor; 6.3%, Asian American or Pacific Islander; and 20.6%, Other. Students may have indicated “Other” when they did not know the race or ethnicity of their mentor.

About one-fourth (24.6%) of protégées have had no contact with their faculty/staff mentor while, except for the 3 (2.4%) students who did not respond to this question, the rest have met with the faculty/staff mentor at least once. Twenty-three (18.3%) of the students have met with the faculty/staff mentor one time; 27 (21.4%),

once per semester; 27 (21.4%), two or three times per semester; and 15 (11.9%), more than two or three times per semester. For the 90 (71.4%) students reporting having met with their faculty/staff mentor, most (61.1%) have spent, on average, 15 to 45 minutes per session with the mentor. More than one-fourth (25.6%) normally spend less than 15 minutes, and 12 (13.4%) students reporting contact typically spend more than 45 minutes with the faculty/staff mentor. The method of interaction is most commonly either face-to-face (56.8%), telephone (47.7%), or campus mail (20.5%). Very few (8.0%) reported primary contact via email.

The types of meetings held between protégées and faculty/staff mentors were also of interest. Of the 160 contacts selected from eight types reported, the most frequent was office meetings (40.6%), followed by SMP activities (17.5%), dining off campus (10.6%), and campus functions (10.6%). Dining on campus (8.1%), other forms of contact (6.3%), off-campus functions (4.4%), and shopping (1.9%) were also indicated by respondents.

The quality of the faculty/staff mentoring relationship was not assessed as particularly positive among these respondents. Nearly one-third (30.9%) reported that the relationship is either very dissatisfactory (22.2%) or dissatisfactory (8.7%). Slightly more than one-fourth (27.0%) feel the relationship is positive with 16.7% assessing the relationship as very satisfactory and 10.3% as satisfactory. Twenty-four students (19.0%) were neutral in their response; another 24 (19.0%) said that the question is not applicable since they do not have a faculty/staff mentor; and five

students (4.0%) did not respond to this question. A cross-tabulation of frequency of contact between faculty/staff mentor and protégée and degree of satisfaction with the faculty/staff mentoring experience was highly significant ($\chi^2 = 25.968, p < .01$).

The final question reported in Table 7 asked the students/protégées to state why they have not had contact with their mentors. For 61 (48.4%) respondents, the question was not applicable since they have had contact with their faculty/staff mentors. Of the remaining 65 students, 13 (20.0%) did not respond and 11 (16.9%) had a reason other than the ones listed for not making contact. The most common response (18.5%) of those listed was that the faculty/staff mentor did not contact the student, followed by the fact that the student was too busy (10.8%) or the student didn't know what to talk about with the mentor (10.8%) or the student was not informed of who the mentor was (10.8%). Less important responses included disinterest (6.2%), schedule conflicts (3.1%), lack of response from the mentor (1.5%), and lack of response to the mentor by the student (1.5%).

The Peer Mentor

Table 8 reports information about the peer mentor and his or her relationship with the student/protégée. Students were mentored primarily by female (70.6%) peer mentors. The ethnic heritage of the peer mentor was primarily Black (58.7%), consisting of Black African American (38.1%), Black Caribbean West Indian (18.3%), or Black Continental African (2.4%); followed by Hispanic/Latino (19.0%); Other (13.5%); Asian American or Pacific Islander (1.6%); and Native American (0.8%).

Table 8

Description of the Respondents' Peer Mentors

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	29	23.0
Female	89	70.6
No response	8	6.3
Ethnic Heritage		
Asian American or Pacific Islander	2	1.6
Black African American	48	38.1
Black Caribbean West Indian	23	18.3
Black Continental African	3	2.4
Native American	1	0.8
Latino or Hispanic	23	18.3
Mexican American	1	0.8
Other	17	13.5
No response	8	6.3
Frequency of First Semester Contact with Peer Mentor		
Never interacted	6	4.8
Once	12	9.5
Two or three times	28	22.2
More frequently than two or three times	34	27.0
Weekly	38	30.2
Practically every day	4	3.2
No response	4	3.2
Current Frequency of Peer Mentor Contact		
Not at all	87	69.0
Once a semester	11	8.7
Two or three times during the semester	14	11.1
More frequently than two or three times	4	3.2
Weekly	6	4.8
No response	4	3.2
How Peer Mentor Keeps in Touch (<i>multiple responses possible</i>)		
Telephone	52	49.1
Campus Mail	1	0.9
Email	12	11.3
Face to face	56	52.8
Other	23	21.7

Table 8 (cont'd.-)

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Mentoring Contacts with Peer Mentor include <i>(multiple responses possible)</i>		
Dining on campus	65	53.7
Dining off campus	25	20.7
Campus functions	41	33.9
Off campus functions	19	15.7
Shopping	13	10.7
Scholar's Mentorship Program activities	39	32.2
Office meetings	60	49.6
Other	20	16.5
Have had no contact	11	9.1
Quality of Peer Mentor Relationship		
During Active Period of Relationship		
Very dissatisfactory	12	9.8
Dissatisfactory	14	11.1
Satisfactory	30	23.8
Somewhat satisfactory	11	8.7
Very satisfactory	43	34.1
Not applicable	12	9.5
No response	4	3.2
Current Quality of Peer Mentor Relationship		
Very dissatisfactory	27	21.4
Dissatisfactory	5	4.0
Satisfactory	15	11.9
Somewhat satisfactory	8	6.3
Very satisfactory	9	7.1
Not applicable	57	45.2
No response	5	4.0
Reason for No Contact with Peer Mentor		
Never informed of assigned mentor	2	1.6
Assigned mentor never contacted me	4	3.2
Mentor never responded to my contact	3	2.4
I never responded to mentor contact	1	0.8
Our schedules conflicted	3	2.4
I was too busy	2	1.6
I was not interested in a mentor	5	4.0
Other	18	14.3
No response	9	7.1
Have had contact with mentor	79	62.7

In terms of frequency of contact, participants were asked to report for their first semester of SMP participation and now. In the first semester of participation, respondents said they met with their peer mentors often—at least two or three times during the first semester (22.2%), more than two or three times (27.0%), or weekly (30.2%). Fewer students met with their peer mentors just once during the first semester (9.5%), not at all (4.8%), or daily (3.2%). Most students (69.0%) do not continue to meet with their peer mentors. Those who do, meet two or three times a semester (11.1%), once a semester (8.7%), weekly (4.8%), or more than two or three times a semester (3.2%).

The primary method of contact between students/protégées and peer mentors is face-to-face (52.8%), followed by telephone (49.1%), other (21.7%), email (11.3%), and campus mail (0.9%). Students/protégées and their peer mentors dine on campus together (53.7%), have office meetings (49.6%), attend campus functions together (33.9%), see each other at SMP activities (32.2%), dine together off-campus (20.7%), interact in other ways (16.5%), go to off-campus functions together (15.7%), and go shopping (10.7%).

Students/protégées assessed the quality of their relationship with their peer mentors both during the active phase of the relationship and at the present time. More than one-third (34.1%) of respondents were very satisfied and 8.7% were satisfied with the peer mentoring relationship during its active phase for a satisfaction rating of 42.8%. During the active phase of the peer mentoring relationship, 20.9% of

respondents were dissatisfied and 23.8% were neutral in their assessment. Since many students no longer have relationships with their peer mentors, 57 (45.2%) responded that the question about the current quality of the relationship with the peer mentor does not apply; five (4.0%) students did not reply at all. Of the 64 students who assessed the quality of their current peer mentor relationship, half (50.0%) reported that it is dissatisfactory, 17 (26.6%) said that it is satisfactory, and 15 (23.4%) were neutral. A cross-tabulation of frequency of contact between peer mentor and protégée and degree of satisfaction with the peer mentoring experience was highly significant ($\chi^2 = 5.982$, $p = .015$).

The final question asked respondents to report their reasons for not having contact with a peer mentor. Most (62.7%) of the students did have contact with a peer mentor and nine (7.1%) students did not respond to this question. The highest responses were lack of interest (13.2%), no contact from the peer mentor (10.5%), no response from the peer mentor following contact by the student (7.9%), schedule conflicts (7.9%), no information about the peer mentor (5.3%), the student was too busy (5.3%), and the student did not respond to the mentor's contact (2.6%).

Research Questions

Evaluation of SMP focused on answering nine questions. The results are reported here in the sequence of the research questions.

Research Question #1

The first question asked, “What impact, if any, does bi-level mentoring comprised of faculty/staff and peer mentors have on first-year students who participate in SMP in terms of academic performance as measured by grade point average (GPA), college integration as measured by involvement in extracurricular activities and interaction with mentors, and college persistence as measured by re-enrollment in consecutive semesters?” Response to this research question requires division into sections on GPA, college integration, and college persistence in terms of repeat enrollment.

Grade Point Average (GPA)

As already reported, the average GPA of SMP participants responding to the survey is 3.03, and their transcript-reported average GPA is 2.97. Data provided by the Department of Institutional Research at SUNY-NP of campus-wide GPAs appears in Table 9 for students who were admitted beginning in fall 1998 through fall 2002. The institution reported such data by cohort, defined by the year of entry into the university. The data in Table 9 are aggregated from the institutional data for clarity.

Students in this report are identified as (a) Research participants, (b) Multicultural Recruitment Program (MRP), (c) Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), and (d) Regular (i.e., regularly admitted students). Research participants, if not separated out, would fall under MRP, as they were recruited to SUNY-NP through the Multicultural Recruitment Program. Although they were regularly admitted, as

opposed to EOP which admits academically and economically disadvantaged students, students categorized as “Regular” are not students of color.

GPA's are reported for both graduates and “persisters.” Students who entered in 1998 or 1999 would have graduated by 2003, the semester the data were gathered for the present study. Persisters are those students who are still enrolled. Enrollment headcount and status are also indicated as (a) Still Persisting, (b) Academic Dismissal, or (c) Dropped Out. For the research participants, the most obvious finding is that they have graduated or are still persisting, and they have not been academically dismissed nor have they dropped out.

College Integration

College integration concerns the ability of the student to become a part of the life of the campus both academically and socially. Questions 5, 6, and 7 on Part I of the Faculty/Staff Mentor-Protégée Questionnaire and on the Peer Mentor-Protégée Questionnaire asked about how the students became involved in campus activities, if they did. The sequence of questions, which attempted to determine if the mentor was the impetus for involvement, was:

5. At the suggestion of and with encouragement from my faculty/staff (or peer) mentor, I attend student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me.
6. When I have attended student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me, I became actively involved in these organizations and/or activities.
7. Once I became actively involved, I was able to make new friends who also participate in such activities.

Table 9

Graduation Rate, Enrollment Status, and Average GPA Summary as of Fall 2003 for Students Who Enrolled Between Fall 1998 and Fall 2002

Group	Headcount by Enrollment Status										Average GPA			
	Total Cohort	Number Graduated Within Six Years	Still Persisting	Academic Dismissal	Dropped Out	Graduates	Persisters							
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Research participants	118	2.6	25	21.2	90	76.3	0	0.0	3	2.5	3.02	2.91		
MRP	491	10.8	101	20.6	212	43.2	55	11.1	123	25.1	3.12	2.88		
EOP	620	13.6	127	20.5	324	52.3	63	10.1	106	17.1	2.88	2.76		
Regular	3,324	73.0	645	19.4	1,689	50.8	236	7.1	754	22.7	3.07	3.06		
Total	4,553	100.0	898	19.7	2,315	50.8	354	7.8	986	21.7	3.03	2.99		

Most students agreed that the faculty/staff (44.1%) or peer (62.7%) mentor suggested and encouraged the student to attend organization meetings and/or activities (Table 10). More support was given to the peer mentor, as 47.6% disagreed with the statement in terms of the faculty/staff mentor and only 27.1% disagreed in terms of the peer mentor. For the most part, the students agreed that they became actively involved following the recommendation of the faculty/staff (43.4%) or the peer (46.1%) mentor. Others disagreed that they became actively involved following the recommendation of the faculty/staff (40.8%) or the peer (38.2%) mentor. The students agreed that they were able to make new friends as a result of the involvement that followed the recommendation of the faculty/staff (47.4%) or the peer (48.1%) mentor. About one-third of participants disagreed with the statement regardless of faculty/staff (33.8%) or peer (37.5%) mentor.

College Persistence

College persistence, frequently evidenced by academic success, is the successful progress toward graduation as determined by consecutive re-enrollment and successful completion of courses with passing grades. Tables 5 and 6 provided the self- and transcript-reported average GPA of participants and the infrequency of their academic probation, academic dismissal, and leaves of absence. In addition, Table 6 indicated that 25 (20.4%) of participants have graduated, 49 (39.8%) are still in school and are on target in terms of the number of credits earned towards graduation, and 49 (39.8%) are still in school but lack the credits necessary to graduate in four years

Table 10

The Effect of Mentoring on College Integration

Question	Disagree		Undecided		Agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
At the suggestion of and with encouragement from my faculty/staff (or peer) mentor, I attend student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me.						
Faculty/Staff mentor	40	47.6	7	8.3	37	44.1
Peer mentor	32	27.1	12	10.2	74	62.7
When I have attended student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me, I became actively involved in these organizations and/or activities.						
Faculty/Staff mentor	31	40.8	12	15.8	33	43.4
Peer mentor	39	38.2	16	15.7	47	46.1
Once I became actively involved, I was able to make new friends who also participate in such activities.						
Faculty/Staff mentor	27	33.8	15	18.8	38	47.4
Peer mentor	39	37.5	15	14.4	50	48.1

unless they attend summer school or take increased course loads. Table 9 shows persistence by cohort from the class that began as freshmen in 1998 through 2002.

Study participants are less likely to be academically dismissed or to drop out than other members of their cohorts, in spite of the lack of difference in GPA.

Research Question #2

The second research question asked, “What is the retention rate of protégées who persist beyond the first year?” As indicated in Table 9, among study participants, only one member of the 1999 cohort and two members of the 2001 cohort dropped out, and none was academically dismissed. As reported by the institution, then, of 118 study participants, only three did not persist for a retention rate of 97.5%.

Research Question #3

The third research question inquired, “What is the retention rate of program participants--both protégées and peer mentors--at the end of the second and third years, respectively?” Using the same institutional data from Table 9, no differentiation was made between protégées and peer mentors, who had been protégées as freshmen. Therefore, the retention rate of 97.5% for study participants answers this question as well as the previous one.

Research Question #4

The fourth research question asked, “What is the graduation rate of program participants?” According to transcripts of 123 participants, 25 (20.4%) have graduated (Table 6). Based on institutional data reported in Table 9, 25 study participants graduated of 53 eligible to do so from the 1998, 1999, and 2000 cohorts, yielding a graduation rate of 47.2%.

Research Question #5

The next research question asked, “Is there a correlation among academic performance, college persistence, and mentoring for program participants?” A correlation appears between these three factors: (a) academic performance, (b) college persistence, and (c) mentoring for program participants; however, the degree of correlation was not determined. The reason is that academic performance for all participants as measured by GPA averaged about 3.0, all but two of the participants persisted in that those two were academically dismissed, and not all participants received mentoring in spite of their eligibility for it. Further explanation follows.

As evidenced by the data on GPA and persistence in Tables 5, 6, and 9, a relationship clearly exists between academic performance and college persistence. Those participants who remain in school have average GPAs of approximately 3.0. The GPAs of those who dropped out are not reported, and academic dismissal requires a GPA below 2.0. Only two study participants (1.6%) had a GPA below 2.0, making them candidates for academic dismissal.

In order to look at the possibility of correlation, as opposed to causality, between academic performance, college persistence, and mentoring for program participants, it is necessary to look at non-participants, as shown in Table 9. Study participants were eligible to receive mentoring; others were not, at least through SMP. Four groups are categorized in Table 9: (a) Research participants, (b) Multicultural Recruitment Program (MRP), (c) Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), and (d)

Regular. Research participants and MRPs are students of color; Regular are White; and EOP may be either White or of color. Research participants are a subset of MRP. EOP and Research participants are mutually exclusive categories, as are Regular and Research participants. SMP is for minority (MRP) students who are regularly admitted; however, the institutional data has classified regularly admitted students of color as MRP. As a result, participants appear in two categories (Research participants and MRP) and cannot be readily isolated from these data. In spite of the limitation in separating out the SMP participants from the MRPs, the data infer that SMP participants, who have been mentored, show high academic performance as measured by GPAs greater than 2.5 and persistence as measured by re-enrollment and graduation.

Research Question #6

The sixth research question asked, “Is there a correlation among academic performance, college persistence, and type of mentoring—peer or faculty/staff—for program participants?” This research question was broken down into parts because the variables are of different types—continuous, dichotomous, and categorical. This led to the consideration of questions in four groups as shown in Table 11.

Correlation Between Type of Mentoring and Impact on Academic Growth, Career Planning, and Plans for Graduate School

The two correlation questions were analyzed and reported together (Table 12). They are: “Is there a correlation between academic performance and impact of

Table 11

Breakdown of Research Question #6 into Answerable Questions

Topic or Category	Question to Be Answered
Faculty/Staff Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a correlation between academic performance and impact of faculty/staff mentoring on academic growth, career planning, and plans for graduate school? • Is there a difference in perception of the impact of faculty/staff mentoring on academic growth, career planning, and plans for graduate school based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience? • Is there a difference in perception of the impact of faculty/staff mentoring on academic growth, career planning, and plans for graduate school based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall college experience? • Is there a difference in perception of the impact of faculty/staff mentoring on academic growth, career planning, and plans for graduate school based on who protégées believe changed or improved them?
Peer Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a correlation between academic performance and impact of peer mentoring on academic growth and career planning? • Is there a difference in perception of the impact of peer mentoring on academic growth and career planning based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience? • Is there a difference in perception of the impact of peer mentoring on academic growth and career planning based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall college experience? • Is there a difference in perception of the impact of peer mentoring on academic growth and career planning based on who protégées believe changed or improved them?
College Persistence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a difference in college persistence based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience? • Is there a difference in college persistence based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall college experience? • Is there a difference in college persistence based on who protégées believe changed or improved them?

Topic or Category	Question to Be Answered
Academic Performance and Type of Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a difference in academic performance based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience? • Is there a difference in academic performance based on who protégées believe had the greatest impact on their overall college experience? • Is there a difference in academic performance based on who protégées believe changed or improved them?

faculty/staff mentoring on academic growth, career planning, and plans for graduate school?” and “Is there a correlation between academic performance and impact of peer mentoring on academic growth and career planning?” The faculty/staff mentor questions all stated, “My faculty/staff mentor has continued to . . . influence . . .” followed by “academic and intellectual growth,” “further study,” and “preparation for a career.” Except for the question about influence on academic and intellectual growth which was the same, the questions about the influence of the peer mentor were more specific. For career preparation, the peer mentor statement was, “My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me . . .” either to “use the career Advising and Fieldwork Center” or “seek out my faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance.” No peer mentor question asked about further study.

As shown in Table 12, no significant correlation was found between academic performance as measured by either transcript of self-report GPA and perceptions of either faculty/staff or peer mentoring. The range of r was from $-.17$ to $.05$.

Table 12

Correlation of Academic Performance and Perception of Impact of Faculty/Staff and Peer Mentoring

	Transcript GPA		Self-report GPA	
	<i>n</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>r</i>
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.	73	-.17	81	-.07
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my interest in further study (graduate school).	57	-.08	63	-.05
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career.	64	.04	68	.05
My peer mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.	103	-.08	116	-.02
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to use the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center.	103	-.06	116	.00
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to seek out my faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance.	103	-.05	116	-.01

Relationship Between Faculty/Staff Mentoring, Influence, and Positive Impact of Faculty/Staff Mentoring

Protégées were asked to evaluate the faculty/staff mentoring experience in terms of its impact on their academic experience and their college experience as well

as on changing them in any way. For this analysis, protégées who said that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have influence were compared with those who indicated that the peer mentor had greater influence. The number of respondents is low because not all participants had both a faculty/staff and a peer mentor, a requirement for this analysis of the differentiation between the effects of the type of mentor. The chi-square (χ^2) statistic was used in this analysis, as shown in Table 13.

Impact on academic experience. Protégées who say that faculty/staff mentors have had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience are much more likely to agree (70.7% to 21.9%; $\chi^2 = 20.27, p < .01$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have influence on their academic and intellectual growth. Protégées who say that peer mentors have had the greatest impact are more likely to disagree (62.5% to 14.6%; $\chi^2 = 20.27, p < .01$) that faculty/staff continued to influence their academic growth. Similarly, protégées who say that faculty/staff mentors have had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience are more likely to agree (50.0% to 0.0%; $\chi^2 = 19.39, p < .01$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have influence on their interest in graduate school. Those who say that peer mentors have had the greatest impact are more likely to disagree (79.2% to 26.7%; $\chi^2 = 19.39, p < .01$) that their faculty/staff mentors have continued to influence their interest in graduate school. Finally, protégées who say that faculty/staff mentors have had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience are more likely to agree (41.9% to 17.2%; $\chi^2 = 9.68, p = .01$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have influence on their

Table 13

Relationship Between Who Protégées Believe Has Influenced Them and the Impact of Faculty/Staff Mentoring

	Greatest Impact				χ^2	p
	Faculty/Staff Mentor		Peer Mentor			
	n	%	n	%		
Greatest impact on academic experience:						
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.						
Disagree	6	14.6	20	62.5	20.27	< .01
Undecided	6	14.6	5	15.6		
Agree	29	70.7	7	21.9		
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my interest in further study (graduate school).						
Disagree	8	26.7	19	79.2	19.39	< .01
Undecided	7	23.3	5	20.8		
Agree	15	50.0	0	0.0		
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career.						
Disagree	10	32.3	21	72.4	9.68	.01
Undecided	8	25.8	3	10.3		
Agree	13	41.9	5	17.2		

	Greatest Impact				χ^2	<i>p</i>
	Faculty/Staff Mentor		Peer Mentor			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Greatest impact on college experience:						
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.						
Disagree	3	15.0	21	43.8	8.07	.02
Undecided	2	10.0	9	18.8		
Agree	15	75.0	18	37.5		
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my interest in further study (graduate school).						
Disagree	6	46.2	20	52.6	3.86	.15
Undecided	1	7.7	10	26.3		
Agree	6	46.2	8	21.1		
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career.						
Disagree	5	41.7	25	54.3	1.50	.47
Undecided	4	33.3	8	17.4		
Agree	3	25.0	13	28.3		

	Greatest Impact				χ^2	<i>p</i>
	Faculty/Staff Mentor		Peer Mentor			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Greatest impact on personal change:						
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.						
Disagree	6	26.1	14	51.9	7.84	.02
Undecided	2	8.7	6	22.2		
Agree	15	65.2	7	25.9		
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my interest in further study (graduate school).						
Disagree	8	47.1	13	65.0	3.47	.18
Undecided	3	17.6	5	25.0		
Agree	6	35.3	2	10.0		
My faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career.						
Disagree	9	47.4	17	68.0	2.35	.31
Undecided	4	21.1	2	8.0		
Agree	6	31.6	6	24.0		

preparations for a career. In contrast, protégées who say that peer mentors have had the greatest impact are more likely to disagree (72.4% to 32.3%; $\chi^2 = 9.68, p = .01$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have influence on their preparations for a career.

Impact on college experience. Protégées who say that faculty/staff mentors have had the greatest impact on their overall college experience are more likely to agree (75.0% to 37.5%; $\chi^2 = 8.07, p = .02$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have influence on their academic and intellectual growth. Those who say that peer mentors have had the greatest impact are more likely to disagree (43.8% to 15.0%; $\chi^2 = 8.07, p = .02$) with this statement. No significant difference is evident between the groups on the questions of influencing interest in further study ($\chi^2 = 3.86, p = .15$) or influencing preparation for a career ($\chi^2 = 1.50, p = .47$).

Impact on individual change. Protégées who say that faculty/staff mentors have had the greatest impact on changing or improving them are more likely to agree (65.2% to 25.9%; $\chi^2 = 7.84, p = .02$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to influence their academic and intellectual growth. On the other hand, protégées who say that peer mentors have had the greatest impact are more likely to disagree (51.9% to 26.1%; $\chi^2 = 7.84, p = .02$) that their faculty/staff mentor has continued to have some influence on their academic and intellectual growth. No significant difference is evident between the groups on the questions of influencing interest in further study ($\chi^2 = 3.47, p = .18$) or influencing preparation for a career ($\chi^2 = 2.35, p = .31$).

Relationship Between Peer Mentoring, Influence, and Positive Impact of Peer Mentoring

Similarly, protégées were asked to evaluate the peer mentoring experience in terms of its impact on their academic experience and their college experience as well

as on changing them in any way. The chi-square (χ^2) statistic was used in this analysis, as shown in Table 14.

Impact on academic experience. Protégées who say that faculty/staff mentors have had the greatest impact on their overall academic experience are more likely to agree (41.9% to 15.2%; $\chi^2 = 8.59, p = .01$) that their peer mentor has continued to have influence on their preparations for a career by sending them to their faculty/staff mentor. In contrast, protégées who say that peer mentors have had the greatest impact are more likely to disagree (73.9% to 41.9%; $\chi^2 = 8.59, p = .01$) that their peer mentor has continued to have influence on their preparations for a career by sending them to their faculty/staff mentor. No significant difference is evident between the groups on the questions of influencing academic and intellectual growth ($\chi^2 = 3.63, p = .16$) or influencing preparation for a career by encouraging the protégée to use the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center ($\chi^2 = 1.13, p = .57$).

Impact on college experience. No significant difference is evident between the groups on any of the questions regarding influence: (a) influencing academic and intellectual growth ($\chi^2 = 0.74, p = .69$), (b) using the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center ($\chi^2 = 1.82, p = .40$), and (c) seeking out the faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance ($\chi^2 = 2.52, p = .28$).

Impact on individual change. No significant difference is evident between the groups on any of the questions regarding influence: (a) influencing academic and intellectual growth ($\chi^2 = 0.69, p = .71$), (b) using the Career Advising and Fieldwork

Table 14

Relationship Between Who Protégées Believe Has Influenced Them and the Impact of Peer Mentoring

	Greatest Impact				χ^2	p
	Faculty/Staff Mentor		Peer Mentor			
	n	%	n	%		
Greatest impact on academic experience:						
My peer mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.						
Disagree	6	43.3	30	63.8	3.63	.16
Undecided	6	20.0	8	17.0		
Agree	29	36.7	9	19.1		
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to use the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center.						
Disagree	17	54.8	30	66.7	1.13	.57
Undecided	6	19.4	7	15.6		
Agree	8	25.8	8	17.8		
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to seek out my faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance.						
Disagree	13	41.9	34	73.9	8.59	.01
Undecided	5	16.1	5	10.9		
Agree	13	41.9	7	15.2		

	Greatest Impact				χ^2	<i>p</i>
	Faculty/Staff Mentor		Peer Mentor			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Greatest impact on college experience:						
My peer mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.						
Disagree	7	58.3	35	55.6	0.74	.69
Undecided	3	25.0	11	17.5		
Agree	2	16.7	17	27.0		
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to use the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center.						
Disagree	7	63.6	36	58.1	1.82	.40
Undecided	3	27.3	10	16.1		
Agree	1	9.1	16	25.8		
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to seek out my faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance.						
Disagree	7	58.3	38	61.3	2.52	.28
Undecided	3	25.0	6	9.7		
Agree	2	16.7	18	29.0		

	Greatest Impact				χ^2	<i>p</i>
	Faculty/Staff Mentor		Peer Mentor			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Greatest impact on personal change:						
My peer mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.						
Disagree	9	64.3	19	51.4	0.69	.71
Undecided	2	14.3	7	18.9		
Agree	3	21.4	11	29.7		
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to use the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center.						
Disagree	9	64.3	21	60.0	0.92	.63
Undecided	3	21.4	5	14.3		
Agree	2	14.3	9	25.7		
My peer mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to seek out my faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance.						
Disagree	8	57.1	23	63.9	0.65	.72
Undecided	1	7.1	4	11.1		
Agree	5	35.7	9	25.0		

Center ($\chi^2 = 0.92, p = .63$), and (c) seeking out the faculty/staff mentor for support and guidance ($\chi^2 = 0.65, p = .72$).

Research Question #7

The seventh research question examined the possible differences in demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and ethnicity and their relationship to academic performance or success. Academic performance or success is measured by GPA.

The correlation of self-reported GPA and age was not significant ($r = -.12, p = .21$), nor was the correlation of transcript-reported GPA and age ($r = -.06, p = .54$). Table 15 reports the relationship of gender and ethnic heritage to academic performance as indicated by transcript- and self-reported GPA.

Post hoc tests conducted for gender found that females (3.04, $p = .05$) have higher transcript-reported GPAs than males (2.84). Similar tests for ethnic heritage found that Asian American or Pacific Islander respondents have significantly higher transcript-reported GPAs (3.29, $p = .03$) than Black or Hispanic (3.10) participants. Moreover, Asian American or Pacific Islander respondents have significantly higher self-reported GPAs (3.34, $p = .02$) than Black African American (2.90), Black Caribbean West Indian (3.00), Black Continental African (3.24), and Latino or Hispanic participants (3.05).

Research Question #8

This research question asked, "Is there any significant difference in academic performance between protégées who maintained active relationships with their mentors and those who did not?" Analysis required that this question be broken out

Table 15

Relationship of Gender and Ethnic Heritage to Academic Performance

	Transcript-reported GPA				Self-Reported GPA			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender:								
Female	3.04	.44			3.06	.40		
Male	2.84	.59	3.83	.05	2.96	.52	1.29	.26
Ethnic Heritage:								
Asian American or Pacific Islander	3.29	.43			3.34	.34		
Black African American	2.79	.53			2.90	.44		
Black Caribbean West Indian	2.96	.44			3.00	.36		
Black Continental African	3.15	.52			3.24	.60		
Latino or Hispanic	3.10	.47			3.05	.46		
Other	3.01	.39	2.54	.03	3.33	.45	2.93	.02

by type of mentor—either faculty/staff or peer mentor. No significant difference was found between academic performance as measured by transcript- ($p = .19$) and self-reported GPA ($p = .79$) and current frequency of contact with peer mentor, as shown in Table 16. Respondents who had no more than three contacts with their peer mentor in the first semester have a higher transcript-reported GPA ($p = .03$) than those who had more than three contacts with their peer mentor.

Table 16

Relationship Between Contact with Mentor and Academic Performance

	Transcript-reported GPA				Self-Reported GPA			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Frequency of contact with faculty/staff mentor:								
Never	3.05	.59			3.11	.48		
Once	3.14	.41			3.12	.33		
Once per semester	3.00	.44			3.02	.43		
More than once a semester	2.91	.46	1.03	.38	2.96	.45	0.90	.44
Frequency of contact with peer mentor during first semester:								
No more than 3 times in semester	3.13	.47			3.12	.43		
More than 3 times in semester	2.90	.50	5.16	.03	2.98	.44	2.44	.12
Frequency of contact with peer mentor currently:								
No contact	3.03	.46			3.04	.43		
Some contact	2.89	.58	1.71	.19	3.02	.47	0.07	.79

Research Question #9

The last research question asked, “What aspect(s) of SMP appear to be most effective in participant retention, and what aspects of SMP do participants rate more positively?” The responses to Section III–Part I answered this research question in a way that could be analyzed quantitatively; Section III--Part II, qualitatively. Table 17

outlines the responses to Section III–Part I, questions 1 through 12, which asked for levels of agreement with statements regarding the helpfulness of a variety of activities offered through SMP. Responses are reported in terms of means determined in two different ways. First, the means of the full 5-point Likert-type scale are indicated. Then, the means were recalculated without the response of “Undecided” (3), yielding a slightly higher mean which reflected greater agreement with the statement. In addition, the numbers and percentages of responses were combined into three categories: (a) Strongly Disagree (1) + Disagree (2), (b) Agree (4) + Strongly Agree (5), and (c) No Response (0) + Undecided (3) + Not Applicable (6). The high number of respondents in the third category necessitated the elimination of their respondents from the means, frequencies, and percentages. As a result, the level of agreement with the statements of how participants rate certain aspects of SMP is reflected for those who voiced an opinion about the topics presented.

Academic Advising by the Faculty/Staff Mentor

The role of the faculty/staff mentor includes an academic advising function. Students were therefore asked their agreement on the helpfulness of the academic advising offered by the faculty/staff mentor. More than half (56.3%) of the participants responded to this question. Of those who responded, nearly three-fourths (74.6%) agreed that the faculty/staff mentor advisement has been very helpful; 25.4% disagreed. The mean response was 4.07, suggesting solid agreement.

Table 17

Helpfulness of SMP Activities

Question	Disagree (1 + 2) + Agree (4 + 5) + Undecided (3)		Disagree (1 + 2) and Agree (4 + 5) Only		Strongly Disagree (1) + Disagree (2)		Agree (4) + Strongly Agree (5)		No Response (0) + Undecided (3) + Not Applicable (6)			
	M	n	%	M	n	%	n	%	n	%		
1. My Faculty/Staff Mentor's academic advising has been very helpful.	3.63	82	65.1	4.07	71	56.3	18	25.4	53	74.6	55	43.7
2. My use of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center and the technical support available there have been very helpful.	3.92	82	65.1	4.05	72	57.1	7	9.7	65	90.3	54	42.9
3. The Writing for Scholars course was very helpful to me.	3.50	20	15.9	3.62	16	12.7	4	25.0	12	75.0	110	87.3

Table 17 (cont'd.-)

Question	Disagree (1 + 2) + Agree (4 + 5) + Undecided (3)		Disagree (1 + 2) and Agree (4 + 5) Only		Strongly Disagree (1) + Disagree (2)		Agree (4) + Strongly Agree (5)		No Response (0) + Undecided (3) + Not Applicable (6)	
	M	n %	M	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
4. The Mathematics for Scholars course was very helpful to me.	3.21	19 15.1	3.28	14 11.1	5 35.7	9 64.3	112 88.9			
5. The Research for Scholars course was very helpful to me.	3.07	14 11.1	3.77	9 7.1	2 22.2	7 77.8	117 92.9			
6. The Black and Latino Leadership course was very helpful to me.	2.92	14 11.1	3.71	7 5.6	2 28.6	5 71.4	119 94.4			
7. The Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students course which I took freshman year was very helpful to me.	3.82	78 61.9	3.92	69 54.8	11 15.9	58 84.1	57 45.2			

Table 17 (cont'd.--)

Question	M	n	%	Disagree (1 + 2) + Agree (4 + 5) + Undecided (3)	M	n	%	Disagree (1 + 2) and Agree (4 + 5) Only	M	n	%	Strongly Disagree (1) + Disagree (2)	Agree (4) + Strongly Agree (5)	M	n	%	No Response (0) + Undecided (3) + Not Applicable (6)
8. The Counseling Under-represented Students course which I took after freshman year was very helpful to me.	3.70	23	18.3	3.84	19	15.1	4	21.1	15	78.9	107	84.9					
9. The Scholar's Mentorship Program Annual Fall Orientation Reception was very helpful to me.	3.80	83	65.9	3.98	67	53.2	6	9.0	61	91.0	59	46.8					
10. The Scholar's Mentorship Program Annual Spring Reconnection Reception was very helpful to me.	3.81	64	50.8	4.01	51	40.5	4	7.8	47	92.2	75	59.5					
11. The Scholar's Mentorship Program Annual Fall Cultural Trip to New York City was very helpful to me.	4.22	74	58.7	4.30	69	54.8	6	8.7	63	91.3	57	45.2					

Table 17 (cont'd.)

Question	Disagree (1 + 2) + Agree (4 + 5) + Undecided (3)	Disagree (1 + 2) and Agree (4 + 5) Only	Strongly Disagree (1) + Disagree (2)	Agree (4) + Strongly Agree (5)	No Response (0) + Undecided (3) + Not Applicable (6)							
	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
12. The Scholar's Mentorship Program living and learning experience provided freshman year in Shango Hall was very helpful to me.	3.76	49	38.9	3.90	41	32.5	9	22.0	32	78.0	85	67.5

Use of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center

The Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center provides technical and academic support to SMP students, although they are not the exclusive beneficiaries. It has computers and tutors and is located in close proximity to Shango Hall, the residence hall designated for SMP students if they wish to live together as a group. Students were therefore asked their agreement on the helpfulness of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center and the technical support offered there. More than half (57.1%) of the participants responded to this question. Of those who responded, nearly all (90.3%) agreed that it has been very helpful; 9.7% disagreed. The mean response was 4.05, suggesting solid agreement.

Required and Voluntary Coursework

SMP students are offered a variety of courses designed to help them adjust to academics and college life. One is required of SMP freshmen—Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students. More than half (54.8%) responded to the statement about this required course.

Five courses are offered through SMP, but they are not required of SMP students. More than 80% of participants indicated “Not Applicable” in responding to questions about these five voluntary courses: (a) Writing for Scholars (87.3%), (b) Mathematics for Scholars (88.9%), (c) Research for Scholars (92.9%), (d) Black and Latino Leadership (94.4%), and (e) Counseling Under-represented Students (84.9%).

Consequently, these students probably did not take these courses and could neither agree nor disagree that they were helpful.

Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented Students. Of the 69 students who responded to the statement that the Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented Students course that they took as freshmen was helpful, 58 (84.1%) felt it was helpful, while 11 (15.9%) thought it was not, the greatest proportion of agreement among the courses. The mean was 3.92, close to agreement that the course was helpful.

Writing for Scholars. Of the 16 (12.7%) students who responded to the statement that the Writing for Scholars course was helpful, 12 (75.0%) felt it was helpful, while 4 (25.0%) thought it was not. The mean was 3.62, closer to agreement that the course was helpful, but not strong in that belief.

Mathematics for Scholars. Of the 14 (11.1%) students who responded to the statement that the Mathematics for Scholars course was helpful, 9 (64.3%) felt it was helpful, while 5 (35.7%) thought it was not. The mean was 3.28, closer to agreement that the course was helpful, but not strong in that belief.

Research for Scholars. Of the 9 (7.1%) students who responded to the statement that the Research for Scholars course was helpful, 7 (77.8%) felt it was helpful, while 2 (22.2%) thought it was not. The mean was 3.77, closer to agreement that the course was helpful, but not strong in that belief.

Black and Latino Leadership. Of the 7 (5.6%) students who responded to the statement that the Black and Latino Leadership course was helpful, 5 (71.4%) felt it was helpful, while 2 (28.6%) thought it was not. The mean was 3.71, closer to agreement that the course was helpful, but not strong in that belief.

Counseling Under-represented Students. Of the 19 (15.1%) students who responded to the statement that the Counseling Under-represented Students course was helpful, 15 (78.9%) felt it was helpful, while 4 (21.1%) thought it was not. The mean was 3.84, closer to agreement that the course was helpful, but not strong in that belief.

SMP Activities

SMP has four key annual activities: (a) SMP Annual Fall Orientation Reception, (b) SMP Annual Spring Reconnection Reception, (c) SMP Annual Fall Cultural Trip to New York City, and (d) SMP living and learning experience provided freshman year in Shango Hall, a residence partly dedicated to the SMP first-year students. The statements most agreed to by participants were: (a) “The Scholar’s Mentorship Program Annual Fall Cultural Trip to New York City was very helpful to me” ($M = 4.30$) and (b) “The Scholar’s Mentorship Program Annual Spring Reconnection Reception was very helpful to me” ($M = 4.01$). The other two statements regarding the Annual Fall Orientation Reception ($M = 3.98$) and the living and learning experience in Shango Hall ($M = 3.90$) rated agreement, but not as strong as the other two statements. The highest proportion of disagreement, 22.0%, referred to the living and learning experience in Shango Hall.

The Effectiveness of SMP in Retaining Students at SUNY-NP

To understand the effectiveness of SMP in retaining students at SUNY-NP, the survey included five open-ended questions: (a) The three greatest benefits of the Scholar's Mentorship Program for me have been . . . , (b) Which form of Mentoring (faculty/staff or peer mentor) do you feel had the greater impact on your overall academic experience and why . . . ; (c) Which form of Mentoring (faculty/staff or peer mentor) do you feel had the greater impact on your overall college experience and why . . . ; (d) Which mentoring relationship (faculty/staff or peer mentor), if any, caused you to change or improve in any way and why and/or how . . . ; and (e) Please write down any ideas you have for improving the Scholar's Mentorship Program. The analysis of these responses required searching for patterns and themes to emerge from the students' comments. Students had a great deal to say about these topics.

SMP Benefits. Most important to the students is that SMP has provided a sense of connectedness to others who are of similar ethnic and cultural backgrounds. One student referred to the SMP group as "a family of friends" and the beginning of the program as a way of "jump starting friendships." Another student feels that a benefit of SMP is "meeting new people who in many ways share the same ideas and goals as I do." One student benefits from "sharing a lot of things in common with the people I hung out with in the program," while another liked "the unified activities with minorities of various cultures" and "forming a common bond." One student of color said, "It helped me be aware of how important minorities are," while another was

pleased to see “that there is an effort to build the Black/Latino community in New Paltz.”

Similarly, SMP develops, according to students, a sense of belonging and being part of a program in which “I have a support system and people that care about me.” Being a part of campus, knowing people, and feeling comfortable are recurrent themes. For example, one student said, “I have gotten a chance to feel more comfortable by knowing an upperclassman (peer mentor).” One student enjoys “the commitment of faculty/staff mentors, the loyalty of peers and colleagues, and the unity of everyone involved in the program.” It enables students to “relate to other people of my race or other minorities,” “makes me feel as like part of a family or a group,” “develops long-term relationships,” and “lets me integrate into the college environment with other people of my culture.” It is “a support network of peers and faculty—they are a surrogate family in a sense.” SMP “provides me with many resources and opportunities for academic and social success.” Finally, faculty/staff and peer mentors enabled the student to “come to New Paltz with at least two people to support me.”

Students found the SMP trip to New York City to be fun and educational, and it also enabled them to bond with one another while enjoying a common cultural experience in a situation they were unlikely to undertake on their own. One student commented, I enjoyed “the cultural trips and socializing with other people of color.”

Another said, “The cultural trip to the city allows all the participants of the program to bond.”

Participants liked knowing that academic and social help are there for them if and when they need it. According to one student, SMP gives “the chance to receive a hand in a college struggle.” Another student commented, “I was able to talk to someone about the stresses of not only life but school.” Another student recognized the practical help that she received: “Now I know how to set up my courses in a way that will benefit me. Also, I learned how to manage my course load and schedule.” Another stated, “I liked being praised for doing well and it kept me motivated.”

Access to the resources of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center—“to a special group of people”—is also important. One student referred to the MLK Center as a place that “provides the resources I need to be balanced with my school work”; from another, “It is a resource center where I felt comfortable in regards to my race.” It is also “a place to study in a relaxed and helpful atmosphere.” The computer center availability helped one student when “I didn’t have a computer in my room.” Another appreciates “access to the computer lab.”

Mentoring provided for one student “friendship with faculty and a student when I came to college not having many friends.” Peer mentoring specifically was seen as positive and helpful when the peer mentor offered advice, information, guidance, and tips about college life. One student commented, “My peer mentor helped me in guiding me on facilities around school and answered any questions I

had.” The students recognize that peer mentors have gone through the same experiences and can offer advice. As a result, they are able to “lessen any anxiety I had as a freshman.” Finally, for one student, having a peer mentor was particularly important because “I am the only child and never had a big sister.”

Faculty/staff mentoring provided by the Black and Latino faculty and staff was positive because students felt that those mentors, in particular, are especially interested in the well-being of the students. It is important to “have a connection with a professor of African origin.” One student liked “making connections with faculty so I can get answers when I have questions on campus.” Similarly, another respondent said, “I am able to call on my faculty/staff mentor anytime I have a problem or a concern whether it is academic or not.”

Faculty/staff mentors offer benefits to their protégées. One student said, “My faculty mentor was a great influence on my motivation skills and social skills,” while another commented that his faculty mentor “nurtured me through the arduous rigors of college.” Similarly, another commented, “My faculty mentor motivated me to be an intelligent and professional Black woman in society.” Although in some instances faculty/staff mentors are not technically the protégée’s academic advisor, one student said, “My faculty mentor informed me of my academic options better and more objectively than my major advisor.” Another stated, “I liked connecting with my faculty mentor because she is like a second mother to me.” Yet another said, “[We] connected quickly and she provided light for me during my darkest hours.”

Some students did not feel that SMP is beneficial at all. One commented, “It [SMP] enforces racial stereotypes of helplessness for non-Whites. I do not have any reason to support this program. All members have a seeming ‘forced’ or ‘doing this to look good on my resume’ outward appearance.” Another said, “I really had no contact with my faculty mentor. My peer mentor just wanted me to sign the sheet each week to show we had met.” The purpose of the signature was for the peer mentor, who was taking a required class, to get credit for the interaction. Another student “didn’t need to utilize [SMP’s] advantages.”

Impact of Mentoring

Participants were asked which form of mentoring—faculty/staff or peer—had the greatest influence on them in terms of their academic and their college experience. In addition, they were asked which form of mentoring—faculty/staff or peer—caused them to change in any way. Respondents identified either faculty/staff mentor, peer mentor, both, or neither/none as the primary influencer (Table 18) and then told why in an open-ended format.

On overall academic experience. Fifty-seven participants (46.7%) felt that peer mentors had the greatest influence on their academic experience; 44 (36.1%), faculty/staff mentors; 6 (4.9%) both faculty/staff and peer mentors; and 15 (12.3%), neither faculty/staff nor peer mentor. Themes that emerged included: (a) navigating academic college life, (b) navigating social college life, (c) selecting career and future options, (d) identifying with the peer and/or faculty/staff mentor, (e) role modeling,

Table 18

Impact of Mentoring

Impact	Influencer						Total			
	Faculty/Staff Mentor	Peer Mentor	Faculty/Staff Mentor and Peer Mentor	None/ Neither						
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
On overall academic experience	44	36.1	57	46.7	6	4.9	15	12.3	122	100.0
On overall college experience	22	18.3	75	62.5	6	5.0	17	14.2	120	100.0
Caused change or improvement in me	24	21.2	45	39.8	13	11.5	31	27.5	113	100.0

and (f) gaining psychological and/or emotional support. Protégées commented on peer mentors and faculty/staff mentors:

Peer Mentor

- Peer mentors are always around to just call on for help. They know what classes to avoid—also what profs are good.
- [Having a peer mentor enables you to] relate to someone your age and race who lives within the same area as you helps your transition into New Paltz much smoother.
- My peer mentor was a senior who was graduating the semester I came in so he knew almost everything about the classes and professors.
- My peer mentor had the greatest impact on me. She helped me to get around campus and classes—homework, course planning, ideas on time management.
- My peer mentor gave me advice on classes and professors through a student's point of view and was helpful in helping me choose classes and different professors to suit my learning style.
- I was able to relate to [my peer mentor]. She told me about her experience going through college. We also talked about time management.
- My peer mentor because he gave me some advice on what classes I should take and being a role model when I needed someone to look up to.
- My peer mentor advised me on what general education classes to take in order to graduate within four years.
- My peer mentor made an effort to set up time schedules every week so that we can talk just about any and everything.
- I met with [my peer mentor] often. She would listen to what I was experiencing so far. She counseled me when I was homesick.
- My peer mentor encouraged me to be as productive as I can through campus and off-campus events. She also informed me about things I never knew

about and options I never knew of to help me academically. Her attitude on college life inspired me to live college life to the fullest.

- Peer mentoring has had the greater overall academic impact because we both were business majors. She took all the classes I had to take and helped me map out my schedule.
- My peer mentor warned me of pitfalls (i.e., procrastination) and how to set up a study schedule.
- I saw [my peer mentor] weekly in which we talked about academics and social comfort with the college. She helped me get through my freshman year successfully. She offered her knowledge in subjects I needed help with.
- It's much easier connecting with a peer.

Faculty/Staff Mentor

- My faculty mentor cared about the problems I had in my family life and told me what to do to improve progress in class.
- My faculty mentor will keep me on the right track. My faculty mentor will contribute to my decision on future goals.
- I have met with my faculty mentor more often than my peer mentor. She makes course selection and scheduling much more bearable.
- My faculty mentor was able to give me accurate information about where to go when I was having trouble in certain courses and how many classes I would need to take to graduate on time, etc.
- My faculty mentor has been present here on campus since I was a freshman; therefore, it was easier for me to have a more open relationship with her [than with my peer mentor]. This made advice more frequent and more resourceful.
- [My faculty mentor] has helped me make smart decisions about my academic and career goals and I feel like I have gained a Godmom in a sense. I know I can go to her for anything.

- Professor _____ had a great impact on me in the sense that she could connect to me as a student. She brought a smile to class every day which really started me off to a good day.
- Professor _____ is a very hard man to find, but when I get a chance to talk to him, he tells me exactly what I need to do to get to medical school and become a doctor.
- My faculty mentor had the same career interest I have and she was helpful in advising me for future plans.
- My faculty mentor helped me get back in school and is now trying to guide me to the right path.
- My faculty mentor encouraged me because she is pursuing her Ph.D. with a family and a full-time job.

Both Faculty/Staff Mentor and Peer Mentor

- Both faculty/staff mentor and peer mentor because I got different advice from the two which helped me through my academics.
- Both--The faculty/staff mentor provided a helpful professional atmosphere. My peer mentor was like a friend that advised and assisted me with daily activities.

One student who eventually became a peer mentor felt this experience had the greatest impact on him. He said, "I feel me [*sic*] mentoring other students had the greatest impact on me because I had to be the role model for someone else, so that motivated me to do my best and be the example for them." Another found the peer mentor to be a negative influence: "I was out chatting and bowling with her when I should've been home studying. She gave me something to get me away from my work and I took advantage of that and ended up on A. P. (Academic Probation)."

Generally, participants reported successful mentoring experiences with both faculty/staff and peer mentors.

On overall college experience. Seventy-five participants (62.5%) felt that peer mentors had the greatest influence on their college experience; 22 (18.3%), faculty/staff mentors; 6 (5.0%) both faculty/staff and peer mentors; and 17 (14.2%), neither faculty/staff nor peer mentor. Themes that emerged included: (a) common bonds such as age, (b) social adjustment/integration, (c) psychological and/or emotional support, (d) academic adjustment, and (e) career influence. Protégées commented on peer mentors and faculty/staff mentors:

Peer Mentor

- My peer mentor took me out, and I was able to make new friends. Also, I learned more of the New Paltz and Poughkeepsie area, so I knew where to go when I needed something or needed a breather from school.
- My peer mentor is only a year older than me and many activities that I go to, she is there or she was the one who suggested it to me.
- During my first semester it was nice to have someone older to talk to.
- The peer mentor helps one get situated into college life academically and socially. They are a liaison between the book and other aspects.
- My peer mentor gave me a lot of moral support and was a very good friend to me. She also helped me to meet a lot of new people and helped me to become more outgoing.
- My peer mentor influenced me to join the Caribbean Club in which I met most of my closest friends in all my four years at college. Without her influence, I would have not joined a sorority. Also she gave me a reason to stay on campus instead of going home every weekend.

- My peer mentor encouraged me to participate in extracurricular activities which gave me balance in my college career.
- It's easier to relate to someone who is around your age.
- My peer mentor hung out with me even when he didn't need to.
- My peer mentor knew the ropes of college.
- My peer mentor and I can share and talk freely about things because we are both students.
- My peer mentor enabled me to see that college experiences didn't all have to take place in the classroom.
- My peer mentor was there when I needed help in a subject and we would also hang out, go to parties, and play video games.
- My peer mentor was able to get me out of my room and dorm and meet new people—that definitely helped to boost my social skills and build my confidence.
- My peer mentor told me a lot about the atmosphere at SUNY-NP and what and who to watch out for.
- My peer mentor greatly helped my adjustment into and experience in college.

Faculty/Staff Mentor

- My faculty mentor was there for me with whatever problems I had. Fortunately, they were all academic.
- I am not an open person about “sharing my life” with others. But I find that with speaking to my faculty mentor about “every day life” helps my college experience drastically by being able to articulate everything equally but separately.
- My faculty mentor had the greatest impact because she taught me how to balance my academic work with my personal self-growth.

- My faculty mentor had the same career interest I have and she was helpful in advising me for future plans.

Both Faculty/Staff Mentor and Peer Mentor

- The faculty mentor [enabled me] to know someone who's been through it all (life, school, relationships, etc.) to give me advice. My peer mentor exposed me to a few campus activities; however, my outgoing personality allowed me to get involved with everything freshman year.

Not all students reported a positive impact. One said, "I feel that since I didn't have a good relationship with either of my mentors that I had to find out the college experience for myself and I am glad I had the opportunity to do that." Another reported, "Neither has had a great impact on my college experience. Both were there to talk to, but what came out of my college experience was based on my decision." Finally, one protégée said, "I think both of those (faculty/staff and peer mentor) are great because individuals need all different kinds of support, but the program needs to stress and make these contact meetings an appealing requirement."

Caused change or improvement in the participant. Forty-five participants (39.8%) felt that peer mentors caused the greatest change or improvement in them; 24 (21.2%), faculty/staff mentors; 13 (11.5%) both faculty/staff and peer mentors; and 31 (27.5%), neither faculty/staff nor peer mentor. Themes that emerged included: (a) lack of change or improvement; (b) social transition, networking, or connection; (c) academic support, guidance, and focus; (d) career influence; (e) personal attitude and values; (f) perception of college life; (g) persistence; (h) information; and (i) emotional

and/or psychological support. Protégées' comments on this question were more limited in number; however, some poignantly addressed their change or improvement:

Peer Mentor

- My peer mentor showed me that life begins for me now, and I am on the big stage, and I need to get serious because I am in the big world now.
- My peer mentor encouraged me to take care of priorities first.
- I am more active in extracurricular activities at the suggestion of my peer mentor.
- My peer mentor inspired me to become a mentor and make an impact on other people's lives.
- My peer mentor was (and still is) very blunt, assertive, and outgoing. Honestly, I was never any of the above until her qualities started to rub off on me.
- My peer mentor helped me to become more outgoing and helped me to utilize my resources in terms of academic and social success.
- My peer mentor encouraged me to stay on the right track with my studies and be more open and aggressive in my interactions with other people.
- My peer mentor quizzed me, so I felt I should always be ready and know the information just in case she would quiz me. Therefore, I studied a lot harder.
- My peer mentor caused me to hit the books more often!
- My overall outlook into my life/career decisions based on the advice given [by my peer mentor] on my choice of major changed me. I am now in a major that I like rather than what others would want for me to fulfill.
- My peer mentor helped me to become more outgoing and willing to take some risks.
- My peer mentor supported me when I was in a new situation and needed a friend. She encouraged me to not be so kind to people who don't deserve it.

- I think that my relationship with my peer mentor allowed me to be a more social individual. Just by spending time with her, I was able to open up to her friends whom I had never met before. This allowed me to interact better with other people which before having a peer mentor I would probably never do.
- My peer mentor helped me adjust to college, and I learned how to balance the college workload and my social experiences.

Faculty/Staff Mentor

- When I wanted to transfer, my faculty mentor helped me to give New Paltz a chance.
- My faculty mentor broadened my mind with new ideas.
- The faculty/staff mentoring was real. They told me about things as a person of color that I don't feel would have been revealed to me by other people or advisors.
- The constant encouragement from my faculty mentor to try new things helped me improve as an individual and gave me confidence.
- The support of my faculty mentor helped me to stay focused.
- My faculty mentor taught me how to be more open in expressing my views towards negative people. Also to never feel guilty for choosing the career path I've chosen. Do what you have to do. Always be driven.
- My faculty mentor caused me to change by helping me realize that seeking help actually works sometimes. I'm more well-rounded academically— chose good courses and socially stuck up for myself against negative professors. He believed and supported me. Had he not, I probably would have dropped the problem and never solved it.
- My faculty mentor made me concentrate more on my academics and helped me seriously consider grad school.
- My faculty mentor helped me figure out what I would like to do with my time here.

Both Faculty/Staff Mentor and Peer Mentor

- My faculty mentor encouraged me to do better academically. She has a lot of confidence in me. My peer mentor encouraged me socially, getting to know her friends and other people on campus, to be more open.
- My faculty and peer mentor helped me change my outlook on college and life.
- Both mentoring relationships caused me to value others' opinions.
- The culmination of both mentors made me stay and graduate . . . rather than transfer.
- Both [mentors] have affected my intention to improve my communication skills.
- Both mentors taught me to take the experience seriously.

One student said that neither helped him, but “a stronger relationship could have changed me for the better.”

Ideas for Improving the Scholar's Mentorship Program

Almost all participants (83.3%) responded to this question with a variety of ideas for improvement. The ideas fell into the following categories and are reported in this way: (a) praise, (b) criticism, (c) activities and procedures already in place, (d) activities and procedures that can not be done for some reason, (e) increase of activities that are already in place, (f) reasonable or noteworthy suggestions for additions to SMP, (g) decrease or removal of activities that are already in place, (h) change in something that is currently in place, (i) general suggestions, and (j) other comments.

Praise. Participants described SMP as “good,” “fine,” “great,” “excellent,” “wonderful,” “very helpful,” “welcoming,” and “supportive.” They are “proud” to be a part of it and are “grateful” that it is available. In addition, some “love” the program and have “enjoyed” their experience, and others are “glad” to have been accepted into it and have received “great benefit” from SMP. Still others would “recommend it to all students of color not accepted into the EOP program.” A few offered the following more extensive comments:

- First of all, I feel SMP does teach students a lot about the school, time management, study skills, and research skills. Moreover, the peer mentors are a good way to get the underlying culture of the school and how things really get done.
- I think that the program is fine the way that it is. I think that the program does a great job of getting first year students adjusted and comfortable in their new surroundings.
- The peer mentorship is the greatest part.
- I very much enjoyed participating in this program and feel that it contributed to me becoming the person I am today. I think the program is very helpful in introducing freshmen to SUNY New Paltz college life as a whole. In having a faculty and peer advisor/mentor, freshmen are able to have support in social and academic areas. The cultural tours is a lovely opportunity to learn.
- This program is excellent for young adults such as myself!
- I feel as though SMP is a wonderful way to reach out and help first year students.
- I am proud to be a part of the program. It was a great benefit to me, specifically with adjusting to the college atmosphere. I’ve had a good time at the functions provided by the program.

- This is a great program and I am glad to have been a part of it, and I would like to be a peer mentor
- I feel the SMP has a good system in place. I did not utilize many of its resources, but it was beneficial to know I could if I wanted to.

Criticism. In reviewing the criticisms leveled by the participants, it is important to understand that students of color are not required to participate in SMP and, for those who choose to participate in SMP, only one course is required—*Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students*. Moreover, all non-SMP students are strongly encouraged to take a comparable class not geared towards students of color called *Social Issues*. That said, the key complaints concerned required courses, or courses perceived to be required or recommended for SMP students.

Specific comments concerned lack of availability of SMP staff for students not enrolled in the classes, while another student expressed disappointment at the lack of challenge offered by the required course:

In reference to the class[es] of the SMP, they need to be more challenging. My class, Education for Under-represented Students, helped me in getting to know the campus and in academic skills, but I don't feel that it challenged me enough. Challenges are what make people feel more accomplished and further their wanting to do more. Challenges are what make people grow. In my class we had oral presentations and some writing, but my case I was able to do it easily. Other people in my class probably did the work the night before and even handed it in late. They even got time to redo the assignment if done wrong. I feel this is unfair and needs to be stopped. Challenges need to be installed in the course work so students will know that they worked hard for an A in there. They didn't just get it for minimal work.

A more important criticism suggests that SMP segregates students of color and demeans them intellectually. This student was insulted by the program and thought students should integrate into the university community in some other way. He said:

I feel that the courses which are pre-selected for you upon enrollment in this program should be optional. I came from one of the top schools in Westchester County. I graduated in the top 25% of my grade and was a member of the National Honor Society for two years. I felt that those chosen courses underestimate the intelligence of minorities. I feel that this program stereotypes minorities and that those courses are geared towards minorities because they feel that their education prior to the university level was not sufficient as if all minorities are incapable of being successful without these courses. . . . Also when participants of this program are placed in one residence to live together it creates further segregation. If this program and this university pride themselves in diversifying this college community, they shouldn't put all the minorities in one residence. Residence should be random as it is with all other students.

Another student added:

Mandating classes that do not cover GE (General Education) credits is not helpful and if anything troublesome. Also, I hate to say it but the mentors should not have freshman protégées because since it is part of their class, they care about the grade more than the student. In turn, it is artificial caring. Modify that and maybe the program will run smoother and students such as myself won't request "excusal" from the program.

Activities and procedures already in place. Respondents' comments about aspects of SMP demonstrated that they are unaware of what is already done to make the program work to benefit the students. They are concerned that: (a) they are not getting information about the program or other incentives in a timely fashion, (b) they are not being matched to mentors in terms of interests, (c) peer mentors are not being trained well enough in procedures, (d) they should not have to take courses to become a peer mentor, (e) contact between protégées and mentors should be mandated, (f) they

should be encouraged to live and socialize with others throughout the campus rather than limiting to SMP, and (g) SMP should reach out to EOP and other programs for people of color.

Students do not believe that they are getting notices of SMP events in a timely fashion. To announce an event, every SMP protégée, faculty/staff mentor, and peer mentor is notified in three ways: mail, telephone, and email. As many as three phone calls to each student might be made in anticipation of an event. In addition, “literature about scholarships, grants, etc.” is continually sent to students who might be interested.

Matching protégées and mentors is a complex task that begins only a few days before the start of the fall semester each year. Students often indicate their interest either late in the spring or late in the summer so that a final list of incoming first-year SMP participants is not available until the start of the term. SMP staff meet to review the information about protégées and mentors to see if they can be matched by gender, race, and interests. Most mentors and protégées are female and Black African American, and interests vary greatly. A profile of the faculty/staff mentors in terms of gender, race, and faculty or staff status is shown in Table 19. Peer mentors, generally female and Black African American, are identified through registration in their required course, *Counseling Under-represented Students*.

Regarding selection of peer mentors, one student commented,

I would say to interview the students who would like to become mentors to see if they truly want to become one. If a student becomes a mentor and does not

try to have a relationship with their protégée, they should be dropped from the class or receive a failing grade. I don't think it is fair a protégée has a mentor that says nothing to them when you see them on campus. The way my experience went with my mentor was the worst and because of my experience I am going to become a mentor!

Students who wish to become peer mentors used to be interviewed extensively and informed of their responsibilities as a peer mentor. At this time, the pool of peer mentors is not large enough for particular selectivity. They are required to be upperclassmen who are in good academic standing as evidenced by a GPA of at least 2.5 and to take the *Counseling Under-represented Students* both as training and as monitoring of their adhering to their duties. Negative or missing interactions are monitored by SMP staff. Protégées are oriented rather than trained in their roles at meetings that occur before the fall reception. Faculty/staff mentors new to SMP are similarly introduced to the program and their responsibilities to their protégées.

Contact between peer mentors is monitored through signature sheets kept by the peer mentor for this purpose. Each protégée is asked to sign during the meeting with the peer mentor. A couple of students commented that they felt the peer mentor was in it “for the grade,” a practice certainly not intended. Similarly, faculty/staff mentors maintain sign-in cards for their protégées. These are not regularly monitored. Faculty/staff mentors are expected to meet with their protégées at least three times during the semester—beginning, middle, and end—in order to thwart academic and social difficulty at the most stressful times during the term. The question of who contacts whom first is a dilemma: “I think that the faculty/staff member should

Table 19

Profile of 62 Current Faculty/Staff Mentors

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	34	54.8
Male	28	45.2
Race/Ethnicity		
Black (undifferentiated)	24	38.7
White	18	29.0
Latino/Hispanic	15	24.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	6.5
Undeclared	1	1.6
Native American	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0
Work Status		
Faculty	39	62.9
Staff	23	37.1

contact their protégée at least once and set up an appointment with the student. If my faculty/staff member may have did that I would of reached out to her when I needed to.” In theory, the faculty/staff mentor contacts the student by phone, mail, or email, or they meet one another at the fall reception and make plans to meet more formally at that time.

Students expressed interest in expanding their social interactions with mentors and with others in the University community. One student commented, “I think that it

would be nice to have a social between faculty/peer mentors and students.” Both faculty/staff and peer mentors and students currently meet socially at least three times per year—fall reception, cultural trip, and spring re-connection. Another student said, “Instead of having the participants live together, they should live throughout campus. This way will make friends with students of different races.” Some SMP students live together in Shango Hall, facilitating their use of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center. They are not required to live there, and many are found residing throughout campus in a variety of residential settings. Another student believes, “The cultural trip to New York City should include other groups other than Blacks and Latinos. By this I mean the visits to cultural centers.” These trips are open primarily to SMP participants, faculty/staff and peer mentors. Activities of the trip usually include a visit to a museum, an ethnic or cultural exhibit, an ethnic/cultural Broadway performance, and dinner at an ethnic restaurant. Similarly, another student suggested that SMP “work in relation with the EOP program to help students of color out more.” At this time, SMP and EOP periodically work on some aspects of programming together and often share human and other resources.

Activities and procedures that can not be done for some reason. Sometimes financial, time, scheduling, human resource, and other constraints restrict activities and procedures; as a result, suggestions that may be quite worthwhile can not be instituted. For example, five students suggested that some “financial gain,” “scholarships” or “government funding” “like EOP students” be available to SMP

students. One student suggested providing “some sort of book check, stipend, or part-time employment. We are struggling students just like EOP students.” Another said, “I think the SMP should establish a financial budget because doing outside activities with my protégées turned out to be pretty costly sometimes. And I'm a college student so you know how that goes.”

Some students wanted mentors to demonstrate increased commitment:

I would assign a faculty/staff mentor as well as a peer mentor who would live close to the student. I would also make it mandatory for the both mentors to meet with the mentee at least five times a semester and have both the mentor and mentee write about their meetings and submit it to the person in charge so that way the mentee would have met with both mentors and possibly gain something out of it.

This level of commitment would require increased time on the part of SMP staff and more staff members. Mentors would have to be paid for this level of commitment; currently, all mentors are volunteers. On the other hand, students who wish to become peer mentors do not want to fulfill the requirements. One said, “There should be another way to become a mentor because students like myself can't take the required course because I cannot fit it in my schedule, but I would have loved to be a mentor.”

Similarly, another student commented, “Don't make the mentors take a whole class—that's very time consuming.”

Finally, students want more challenging courses and peer mentors who are either sophomores or seniors, and “SUNY-NP should try to hire more staff of color preferably students who have graduated from New Paltz and are looking for work.”

On the other hand, "I think you should ask all members if they still want to be part of the program once they're here."

Increase of activities that are already in place. For the most part, participants want more trips, more activities, greater involvement of and contact with mentors, and increased interaction among SMP protégées and mentors. In terms of trips, one student suggested adding "another educational trip to Washington, DC, or Philadelphia, Pennsylvania." Another said, "I think the program needs more trips to expand our knowledge of African American history." In terms of activities in general, one student commented, "I feel there should be more events for the program so that students in the program can interact more with each other especially during freshman year." Similarly, another student said, ". . . have more social activities and field trips to better connect with the students as well as the faculty and peer mentors."

Students very much want to interact with one another. One student commented, "There should be more events for SMP students to interact with one another especially for those who don't reside in Shango Hall. People who live in other places miss out on the social side of the mentorship experience." They also want to connect with their faculty/staff mentors:

A suggestion would be to make sure that people you choose have a genuine interest in what they are doing so it doesn't become more or less a job rather than a friendship between peer and student. Also when choosing faculty mentors, please consider language barriers. It is hard to connect with someone who you don't understand or they can't understand you.

Participants also “think that faculty/staff mentors should make greater efforts to connect with their mentees,” there should be “more contact between the staff mentor and the SMP student,” and “students and mentors [should be] more involved in each other's lifestyle and experiences.” In addition, “I feel that the faculty mentors should try to be a little more involved, if they notice that their students are not contacting them often.”

Practical suggestions included:

- Maybe the Key Issues class should have more sections and more times.
- Make the MLK Center hours longer.
- Run more different programs.
- Advertise for events ahead of time.

Reasonable or noteworthy suggestions for additions to SMP. Suggestions for additions to SMP ranged from types of activities and trips to financial support and alumni networks and reward systems. Some ideas included : “programs and shows for people on campus like other organizations,” a “bonding night” for protégées and peer mentors, conferences with speakers “to inspire students,” “incentives for making Dean’s List,” “essay contests,” “mixers,” a “Christmas event,” a “career fair,” “resume workshops,” SMP “t-shirts,” a “book exchange,” and “internships and employment opportunities.” Other responses were more specific:

- The program should require that students meet with their mentor at least two times a week and have both student and mentor attend events together. These events would be set up by the SMP, about three programs every week. These programs or workshops should be about activities going on on

campus that maybe both students and mentors could join and both benefit from. On Fridays once there could be a game night or hangout night where students and mentors could meet and socialize with other students in comfortable settings. Having these requirements for both scholars and mentors would allow them to really talk, understand, connect, and benefit from each other's involvement. **(All programs should be academic, social, and interactive.)** This would really help and I hope my idea gets put into action. [Emphasis and parentheses in original.]

- Check up with SMP students to give them the option of switching peer or faculty mentors.
- I feel that the program should have more activities and trips to many other places. We should also go to other colleges and meet other students and see if their schools have mentorship programs. We can also combine with NAACP and other organizations and try to analyze issues that affect minorities. But we need more outside involvement so that networking can occur.
- Some aspects of college life which the class could refocus on are coping and dealing with life and social changes around us.
- I would also suggest that an alumni network be set up. It encourages students to seek info beyond the classroom and school environment. It could also be used as a way to create future job opportunities.

Students are interested in feeling more connected with one another within the program. One student asked for “More get togethers. I wish MRP {SMP} felt more like EOP, a family. [We] should have events and special workshops to help us prepare more for college work as well as graduate school. [We should] have a graduate school workshop.” This student wants to plan and prepare for life at college and beyond.

Decrease or removal of activities that are already in place. Only a couple of comments related to decreasing or removing activities that are already in place. Two students felt that the course, *Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College*

Students, should either be eliminated or not required because they “didn’t learn anything.” Another student said that SMP should not pressure students to take the classes so much--it almost made me feel restricted and almost made me not want to be in program anymore.” This same student further commented, “Don't make the mentors take a whole class--that's very time consuming.”

Change in something that is currently in place. One student was very annoyed with the lack of challenge in the *Key Issues* class and felt it needed to be changed:

However, I feel that in reference to the class of the SMP, they need to be more challenging. My class, Education for Under-represented Students, helped me in getting to know the campus and in academic skills, but I don't feel that it challenged me enough. Challenges are what make people feel more accomplished and further their wanting to do more. Challenges are what make people grow. In my class we had oral presentations and some writing, but my case I was able to do it easily. Other people in my class probably did the work the night before and even handed it in late. They even got time to redo the assignment if done wrong. I feel this is unfair and needs to be stopped. Challenges need to be installed in the course work so students will know that they worked hard for an A in there. They didn't just get it for minimal work.

General suggestions. The general suggestions for improving SMP all concerned changes to faculty/staff and peer mentors as well as SMP staff. Students commented:

- My main advice that I would have for improving the SMP would be to have all participants active and willing to participate. I feel that the program would be a success if the faculty/staff, peer mentors and mentees all took their roles seriously and got and stayed in contact with their respective constituents.
- I didn't have a relationship with my staff mentor. She'd call and leave a message and I'd do the same. Maybe on the cultural trips the mentors could also attend and develop some sort of relationship. These trips always get a good turnout and I think that it would be a great opportunity to meet your

mentors. My peer mentor really didn't reach out to me. She took me out for pizza occasionally, but she didn't ask personal or academic questions. Maybe you could encourage your peer mentors to take the first step in getting to know each other. Also, she didn't tell me any of her personal stories that might have helped.

- It would probably be a good idea to have more serious peer mentors, but I am not sure how to achieve that goal.
- I suggest that the faculty advisors get more involved with the students because our professors are the ones who give us the grades. They can give us inside information by telling us what we should do as freshmen from the very beginning. It's understood now as a second semester freshman, but as a first semester freshman I was clueless.
- Let the faculty/staff mentor be more involved in their protégée's life. It will make academic decisions better.
- Make sure peer mentors are doing it because they want to not because they have to do it for a class.
- Advocate/establish dedicated personnel for SMP.
- I think that after your freshman year, you get exposed to what college is, so this program should take more into consideration freshmen. It should offer 100% of attention to first year students.
- Peer mentors should be the same major as the students. Also, have meetings every now and then so the students can talk with their peer mentors. It is hard to find a common meeting time otherwise.
- One change that I would suggest is having an interview with the peer mentors before "hiring" them. By doing this, you would be able to truly see which volunteers truly has their heart in being a mentor for an incoming student.
- I feel that the faculty/staff mentor should be more persistent with their freshman mentees.
- You should ask first what kind of mentor a student would prefer. I would have liked a male peer mentor better and they don't necessarily have to be Spanish. The person could be black. It would be nice if my faculty mentor

asked how I was doing once in a blue even though I don't see her. I would like a new faculty mentor in my major right now.

- They can try and contact the students more often and show more concern for their college experience. Some students really need guidance in college and life, but I really didn't need the program.
- One way to improve the SMP is to have faculty/peer mentors be evaluated by their mentees in order to be sure an appropriate match was made . . . as well as to ensure everyone is fulfilling their commitment to the program.

The last comment suggests that the students recognize that sometimes a match doesn't work, and the relationships need to be evaluated on an ongoing basis to make sure they succeed.

Other comments. These final comments are personal evaluations by the students of their relationships with their mentors. They exhibit some reflection.

- Due to my situation, many of my answers were negative. However, I feel that if I had not changed my major during the middle of my first semester, I would've (hopefully) had a great relationship with my faculty mentor. As for my peer mentor, I know it isn't fully her fault we did not "click." I realize that way of dress may have not been what my peer mentor expected. Thus, I'm guessing, is the reason why she never contacted me. I never contacted her because of the stress of my classes. I would have really liked to have a good relationship though.
- I think the faculty/staff mentors should be more influenced to take out their proteges out to eat or to do something fun and interesting. In addition, I'd like to mention that my faculty mentor was also my advisor. Therefore, whenever I saw him, we really just had an advisor-advisee type relationship. And this relationship did not go well because I took a class which he recommended to me, and which he also taught. I failed this class mainly because I did not know the knowledge from another class I needed to have taken beforehand.
- I believe the SMP could be a helpful tool for a student's success academically and otherwise. I myself am still learning to take advantage of the resources offered by SMP. The SMP should make clear to the students

all of the ways that they are able to help. I feel I did not connect with my peer mentor and my faculty/staff mentor did not contact me. I also do not believe that being situated in Shango Hall as a part of SMP provided me with any benefits.

- Honestly, calling attention to the fact that we are minorities is pointless. I feel it is completely irrelevant to how we did during our first year.
- The timeliness of mail needs a definite improvement. Twice have I received an invitation to the fall reception two days after the event had passed. Faculty members should make more of an effort to meet with students at least every two weeks. Students should be more involved in peer mentorship experiences. I would have enjoyed being a peer mentor. Also, it would be great to have everyone (SMP staff/students) bring a cultural dish/food as part of a learning experience about culture, and it would be fun (spring reception).
- Although I haven't had much contact with my faculty/staff advisor or my peer mentor, I would like to recommend some changes. My relationship with my peer mentor wasn't the best because I felt as though she was trying to fulfill requirements for the program. Instead, it would have been better if she put her best foot forward to establish a better relationship with me. I didn't take any courses because they didn't fit into my schedule at times. I suggest a weekend course or workshop for students seeking credit who want to be trained as a peer mentor. I really haven't received much information about the academic incentives of the program so I also suggest more literature about scholarships, grants, etc. to be sent to students in the program. Thank you.
- My peer mentor could have been a little more helpful and nice. He once didn't meet with me and had me sign some things that said we did meet. We only met twice. He was not helpful either—didn't try to connect with me—was boring and should be a pleasant and fun experience.
- If I knew my freshman year what I know now, I would have definitely participated in more in the MRP program. I would have especially applied for the scholarship.

Summary of the Open-Ended Responses

Participants emphasized the connectedness, sense of belonging, the notion of “a family of friends,” the concept of “a jumpstart to friendships,” networking, and sense of family that SMP provides through faculty/staff and peer mentoring. They also experienced the opportunity to relate to other persons of color, both other students and adults. This provided identification, role models, and relationships with others like them. For African American and Latino students, in particular, this sense of an SMP family fits into their culture and offers them a “home away from home.” All these factors contribute to retention of students of color at SUNY-NP.

Themes on overall academic and college experience include the ability to navigate both academic and social college lives, to select both career and future options, and to have role models. Participants felt protected by the peer mentors from potential pitfalls of college. This critical protective role was instrumental in the retention of students of color at SUNY-NP and appears in the literature on retention (Astin, 1975; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1975).

Students suggested quite a few improvements for SMP. They were categorized as (a) praise, (b) criticism, (c) activities and procedures already in place, (d) activities and procedures that can not be done for some reason, (e) increase of activities that are already in place, (f) reasonable or noteworthy suggestions for additions to SMP, (g) decrease or removal of activities that are already in place, (h) change in something that is currently in place, (i) general suggestions, and (j) other

comments. Some students wanted either to drop the *Key Issues* class, make it more challenging, or substitute another requirement. They desire more social interaction with their mentors and one another as well as with other organizations that serve people of color. Many participants indicated high interest in more cultural trips, longer hours for the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center, and more variety in programming. One student emphasized that all programs should be academic, social, and interactive. Not all suggestions or comments were positive.

The participants' overall feelings about their mentoring experiences and the spirit of SMP were captured in the following two statements:

My peer mentor encouraged me to be as productive as I can through campus and off-campus events. She also informed me about things I never knew about and options I never knew of to help me academically. Her attitude on college life inspired me to live college life to the fullest.

[My faculty mentor] has helped me make smart decisions about my academic and career goals and I feel like I have gained a Godmom in a sense. I know I can go to her for anything.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, findings from the questionnaire were reported in terms of the research questions along with descriptions of faculty/staff and peer mentors from the perspective of the respondents. Institutional data were also reviewed to support the findings. Qualitative analysis of open-ended survey responses was included to determine the participants' impression of the program and to elicit suggestions for change or improvement. The results are discussed fully in the next chapter along with an evaluation of SMP and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE FUTURE

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to monitor and evaluate an ongoing mentoring program for students of color at a public university. The Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz (SUNY-NP) was designed to help high achieving students of color who were not admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) make a positive transition to campus life and continue at the university through graduation. The evaluation of SMP was based on the goals and objectives of the program.

The program evaluated for this project, SMP, is a retention program. Its goals are to “encourage high academic achievement and good social adjustment” among student participants of color and to “encourage the retention and persistence of general admit” students of color. The CIPP—context, input, process, and product—model of evaluation (Stufflebeam, 2002, p. 1) proposes asking four questions about the program to be evaluated: (a) What needs to be done, (b) How should it be done, (c) Is it being done, and (d) Did it succeed? The need to be met was retaining generally admitted students of color through graduation. It was determined that it should be done through a bi-level mentoring program including both a faculty/staff mentor and a peer mentor

for each protégée with one required course, *Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students*, and several additional elective courses. The SMP program has been in place since 1988-1989, and it has had minor revision since then and no formal monitoring or evaluation. As a result, the remaining question is, “Did it succeed?”

To respond to this question, 126 out of approximately 225 enrolled SMP student participants, called protégées, answered a lengthy researcher-designed questionnaire that offered both Likert-type levels of agreement with statements about the program and open-ended questions about the effectiveness of SMP. While nine research questions guided the analysis of the data, the discussion focuses on the effectiveness of SMP as a retention program for students of color.

One benefit of the research design of using a questionnaire with forced-choice responses as well as open-ended ones along with institutional data enabled triangulation, the use of multiple sources of data. This strategy also provided negative cases to contrast the positive experiences as well as rival explanations for the faculty/staff mentor- and peer mentor-protégée relationships (Patton, 1980). Overall, the qualitative reports from the open-ended questions suggested more positive relationships in both cases, while the quantitative data implied that the faculty-staff mentor relationship was more dissatisfactory than the peer mentor relationship.

Typically, the literature reported more anecdotal and qualitative data to substantiate a positive mentoring relationship. Quantitative approaches have been

somewhat limited. For the present study, an evaluation, the combination of quantitative and qualitative data seems to offer a richness and truth that would be hidden by limiting to either type of data alone. This technique therefore improves the validity of the analysis (Kerr & Chung, 2001).

Retaining Students of Color in Higher Education

SUNY-NP students are predominantly White (80.7%). Studies of Black students on predominantly White campuses indicate repeatedly that the Black students do not perform as well in persistence, academic achievement, entry to post-graduate study, and general psychosocial adjustment (Allen, 1987; Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Astin, 1982; Fleming, 1984; Kemp, 1990). These students often then drop out. Campus involvement, identification with an activity or program, and academic achievement can mitigate this problem, leading to increased retention through completion (Abrahamowicz, 1988; Allen, 1987; Astin, 1984; Mallinckrodt & Sedlacek, 1987; Tinto, 1987). A mentoring program such as SMP provides an opportunity for campus involvement that crosses the barrier between faculty/staff and students; identification with a specific group of students of color, the peer mentors; and academic achievement through a planned program of academic and social support.

College integration has been strongly linked to college satisfaction and successful academic performance (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980). Astin (1984) further suggested that involvement in on-campus activities promotes retention. SMP is a retention program. Participants reported that they became involved in activities as a

result of their faculty/staff mentor's (44.1%) and peer mentor's (62.7%) suggestions. Students then became actively involved in those activities and were able to make new friends through those venues. This is one college integration factor reflected in the increased rate of retention of research participants (76.3%) over MRP (43.2%), EOP (52.3%), and Regular (50.8%) students (see Table 9).

Once the protégées and the faculty/staff mentors connect, significant impacts are evident. For example, participants indicated that their faculty/staff mentors have continued to have some influence on their academic and intellectual growth, their interest in graduate school, and their preparation for a career. In addition, faculty/staff mentors show some continued impact on the overall college experience of their protégées and in producing any personal change in the protégée. In terms of long-term impact, the peer mentor influences the academic experience of the protégées by encouraging the student to seek faculty guidance for career information. This demonstrates what should be happening with the bi-level mentoring. That is, the faculty/staff mentor should have a continued influence on the academic aspects of the life of the student. The peer mentor, on the other hand, should be directing the student to the faculty for career and other academic advice.

The problem of retaining students of color in colleges and universities can be framed in the non-restricting framework of the life model of social work practice which considers the individual, his or her environment, and the interplay between the two. A college student faces problems in three interrelated areas: (a) life transitions

involving developmental changes, role and status changes, and crisis events; (b) the unresponsiveness of social and physical environments; and (c) communication and relationship difficulties in families and other primary groups (Germain & Gitterman, 1980). The life transition from high school to college student changes the individual's role and status and often precipitates crisis, especially if the person is leaving home for the first time. In addition, the complex hierarchical and bureaucratic system of a public university and the residence hall environment may seem unresponsive. Finally, communication and relationship difficulties ensue as the student begins to meet new people who hold new roles and statuses. Developmentally, the student is challenged in this transition to adulthood and independence.

The students who participated in this study average 19.9 years-old. Most (70.6%) are female, and all are students of color (see Table 4). They represent all class years and have been in SMP at least one semester. The average GPA of this group is about 3.0, depending on self- (3.03) or transcript- (2.97) report, suggesting academic success. This group, at a critical developmental stage, needs a balance between social and academic integration into the higher education institution in order to achieve academically and persist through graduation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

This problem of social and academic integration is particularly difficult for the students who participate in SMP. They do not fall under EOP guidelines which require academic and financial disadvantage; instead, they all lack academic

disadvantage, although they may have financial need. “General” or “regular” admission assumes the student has no need for academic support services and that the student, if he or she encounters academic problems, will have the wherewithal to acknowledge them and seek help. In addition, students are made aware of the existence of the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC) and its staff of three psychologists and one social worker should they experience social adjustment or other personal problems.

Unfortunately, students, and especially students of color, are reticent about acknowledging their shortcomings and seeking assistance. Supporting this contention, prior to 1988-1989, the first year of SMP, institutional data suggested a retention and completion problem among regularly admitted students of color. In other words, the Multicultural Recruitment Program (MRP) brought the students in, but then they were left to sink or swim unless they could navigate the university waters to seek the support they needed. The problem was most prevalent freshman year, and traditional support systems did not appear to be effective for students of color.

*The Scholar’s Mentorship Program: A Successful Program
for Retaining Students of Color at SUNY-NP*

Other researchers found that mentoring programs increased course completion (James, 1991), confidence and the ability to formulate thoughts (Erkut & Mokros, 1984), and satisfaction with college (Boyd, 1996); improved GPA, retention, and graduation rates (Chavez & Maestas-Flores, 1991; Edmonds, 1997; James, 1991); and

decreased attrition rates (James, 1991). In addition, students perceived a benefit to the mentoring relationship (Aloia & Smith, 1991), and they relied on friends (i.e., peer mentors) for psychological mentoring functions (Awbrey, 1993; Horton, 1996). Further, the quantity of mentoring appeared to be more important than its quality for academic persistence and academic achievement (Petruolo, 1998).

One factor in retention is GPA. According to Edmonds (1997), mentoring programs enhance academic achievement, defined as adequate GPA and retention—successive re-enrollment in school. James (1991) similarly found that mentoring increased course completion, GPA, graduation, transfer, and retention rates along with decreased attrition rates for student participants. In the present study, no relationship was found between academic performance as measured by GPA and perceptions of either faculty/staff or peer mentoring. Edmond and James, who both studied community college students, may have noticed a greater impact of their mentoring programs because students entered these colleges very disadvantaged academically, economically, and socially. SUNY-NP SMP participants are not academically disadvantaged and are therefore expected to have high GPAs regardless of mentoring; however, in order to retain them at SUNY-NP, the mentoring aspects are deemed helpful. As shown in Table 9, research participants maintain GPAs at least in keeping with institutional averages.

The transcripts of participants reflected the total number of credits completed along with GPA. A normal course load is 15 credits per semester. Consequently, a

freshman should have completed 30 credits at the end of the first year; a sophomore, 60 credits; a junior, 90 credits; and a senior at least 120 credits in order to graduate in four years. The actual number of credits required for graduation varies by academic program. Transcript analysis revealed that 20.4% of students had graduated (i.e., completed at least 120 semester hours of credits), 39.8% were on target for graduation based on the number of completed semester hours of credit and years in school, and 39.8% of students were not on target for graduation because they had completed too few credits during their period of enrollment.

The reasons for lack of credit completion are many and varied. For example, if a student who is taking a 15-hour credit load fails a course, the student will be deficient by 3 credits for that semester. A student may decide to take a reduced course load, perhaps because one or two of the courses are assumed to be unusually difficult for that student. It could be that the student was poorly advised to take a reduced course load or was not advised at all and independently made such a decision. Conversely, the student may register for a very large number of credits and be unable to complete them. Many possibilities, including scheduling difficulties, physical or mental illness, family problems, financial issues, employment, and so on, may interfere with the student's ability to complete the appropriate number of credits during the prescribed amount of time. It is for these reasons that institutional data are reported as "Number Graduated Within Six Years" as opposed to the more traditional four-year baccalaureate degree. This finding suggests that SMP staff need to be more

vigilant about monitoring the number of credits completed by each protégée to ensure that students remain on target for graduation.

Participants in the present study are being retained in undergraduate programs at SUNY-NP to a greater extent than their counterparts who are categorized as (a) Multicultural Retention Program (MRP), (b) Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), or (c) Regular (Table 9). While study participants would otherwise be included in the MRP category, the differences in the categories of (a) Number Graduated Within Six Years, (b) Still Persisting, (c) Academic Dismissal, and (d) Dropped Out strongly suggest that SMP participants are more likely to graduate and persist and less likely to drop out or be academically dismissed. The GPAs of study participants were, on average, not higher than those of other groups, nor were they above the institutional average. Important, however, is the fact that SMP students appear to persist through graduation and continue through their four years at higher rates than other students. Therefore, the retention goal of SMP has been met effectively.

The Quality of the Mentoring Experience

Faculty/staff mentor. SMP assigned each protégée a faculty/staff mentor and a peer mentor. While SMP staff arranged multiple opportunities for interaction, such interaction did not always occur. In fact, 24.6% of protégées in this study reported that they never met their faculty/staff mentor. Of the forced choices, the most frequent response was “Assigned mentor never contacted me,” placing the responsibility for contact on the mentor rather than on the student. Students wanted someone “to reach

out to me.” Through their responses to open-ended questions, they clearly indicated that they believed that the faculty/staff and peer mentors should assume the burden of contact; one student, however, admitted to not returning the faculty/staff mentor’s phone call. Others claimed not to know what to discuss with the faculty/staff mentor, so they did not pursue the relationship. Moreover, although this was not part of the present research, the greatest complaint to SMP staff from faculty/staff mentors is that students do not return their phone calls. This dichotomy of beliefs is problematic for making the faculty/staff mentor-protégée relationship work successfully. This finding is consistent with Yeomans and Sampson (1994) who discovered that the mentor rarely believes that the failure of the mentoring relationship is the fault of the mentor.

Nearly one-third of participants (30.9%) feel their faculty/staff mentor relationship is unsatisfactory, while slightly more than one-fourth (27.0%) believe the mentoring experience to be satisfactory. Dissatisfaction seemed to be based on lack of contact, based on responses to the open-ended questions, and the fact that about one-fourth of the participants had no contact with their faculty/staff mentor. Those who enjoyed the faculty/staff mentoring liked connecting to “a professor of African origin,” getting the “straight” answers about academic campus life, and gaining some career benefit. Faculty mentors were able to offer teaching about negotiating college life and balancing student responsibilities.

Peer mentor. The peer mentor relationship was perceived to be more satisfactory than the faculty/staff mentor one. Two-thirds (66.7%) of participants rated

the quality of the peer mentor relationship as satisfactory during its active period and half (50.0%) of those who currently have peer mentor contact rated the relationship as satisfactory. Perhaps one reason that the peer mentor relationship is more satisfactory is its frequency of contact. Peer mentors, who are taking the *Counseling Underrepresented Students* course, are required to meet with their protégées weekly and to report that meeting to their instructor. In addition, participants claimed that they preferred a mentor who is “closer to their own age.”

The types of activities engaged in by peer mentors and protégées further suggest a developing friendly relationship. For example, participants dined on campus together (53.7%), met together on campus (49.6%), attended campus functions together (33.9%), went to SMP functions together (32.2%), and even frequented restaurants off campus together (20.7%). This demonstrates ways the peer mentors supported the protégées in becoming more active on campus through joint participation in events and activities. Such involvement leads to increased retention (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1987).

In spite of their successes, peer mentors did not always perform satisfactorily. Participants did not like the fact that, on occasion, the peer mentor seemed to be providing the service “simply for a grade.” This made the protégée feel used and uncomfortable. In one case, the student reported so much contact with the peer mentor that she almost flunked out. Another was concerned that the peer mentor relationship dissolved because the peer mentor graduated, leaving the protégée without a peer

mentor. This participant felt this situation could be resolved through the assignment of another peer mentor; however, this did not occur. Sometimes the relationship just did not “click.” Finally, one student was so dissatisfied with her peer mentoring experience that she decided to become a peer mentor just to do it better, while other students decided that peer mentoring provided a means for “giving back” to other students of color regardless of the quality of their own peer mentoring experience.

Conclusion

The reasons that SMP is effective as a retention program for students of color at SUNY-NP are best pointed out in their responses to the last part of the questionnaire—both the Likert-type responses and the open-ended questions. For example, most students agreed that the academic advisement provided by the faculty/staff mentor and the availability of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center and its technical support have been helpful. Although they complained about it in the section of open-ended questions, most who answered about the value of the course, *Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students*, agreed that it was very helpful. In addition, while they enjoy SMP activities overall, the activity that rated the highest among them was the cultural trip to New York City, probably because the only commitment it requires is showing up and it provides an opportunity for fun and learning off campus.

In rating their experience of being mentored, the students by far believe that the value of the peer mentor exceeds that of the faculty/staff mentor in terms of the

overall academic and the overall college experience as well as in causing change in them. What is important to them, it seems, is the ability to connect in a formal way with another student of color who has been through the experience of college. This is consistent with such long-standing programs as the Sophomore Sister program at Douglass College, the women's college of Rutgers University. This is, of course, for female students specifically as opposed to students of color specifically. Practically since the founding of Douglass College in 1918 as New Jersey College for Women, first-year students are assigned to a sophomore student who helps them "negotiate the ropes" of college (Marsha K. Anderson, personal communication, March 18, 2004). This is the same positive experience and perspective noted by the SMP participants.

It is important for the students to feel that they belong in and are connected with the University. They perceive that they are cared about and nurtured through the experience of mentoring and become part of a "family." This is best reflected by the student who said, I enjoy "the commitment of faculty/staff mentors, the loyalty of peers and colleagues, and the unity of everyone involved in the program."

Although more prefer or feel they are helped by the peer mentor, many expressed appreciation for the support provided by the faculty/staff mentor as well. The faculty/staff mentors who do a good job for the student in terms of availability are particularly appreciated by their protégées. In addition, faculty/staff mentors are less likely to disappear through, for example, graduation, and this is important to their protégées who seem to need a consistent presence as a support. One student identified

the difference between the mentors: “The faculty/staff mentor provided a helpful professional atmosphere. My peer mentor was like a friend that advised and assisted me with daily activities.”

Mentoring changed the lives of quite a few of the protégées. They reported changes in their study habits, time management, choice of major, and even personality that resulted from their interactions with their faculty/staff and peer mentors. One faculty mentor reportedly helped a student to stay at New Paltz when that student was thinking about transferring, thereby fulfilling the retention goal of SMP. In terms of academic and social integration, necessities for retention of college students of color, faculty mentoring seemed to fill the bill: “The faculty/staff mentoring was real. They told me about things as a person of color that I don’t feel would have been revealed to me by other people or advisors.” What is important here is the point of view of “a person of color”—that differentiates SMP from all other campus programs.

Recommendations for the Future

Recommendations for the future fall into two categories: (a) for SMP and (b) for research on mentoring. Participants had many ideas for improving the program, and the present study and its design beg for further research.

Improving the Scholar’s Mentorship Program

Students feel strongly that matching them with their faculty/staff and peer mentors must be done very carefully and should be open for change in cases where the match is unsuccessful. While SMP staff work hard to match the mentors and the

protégées at the beginning of the program, perhaps increased effort could be made to ensure that the matches work well. Improving methods of contact with mentors often appeared as a suggestion, too. Currently, SMP staff are diligent in their efforts to contact protégées with mentor assignments and notices of activities by using telephone, snail mail, and email; however, now that an electronic message board has been installed on the campus-wide computer network, perhaps protégées and mentors will be able to make contact more efficiently.

Students want more contact with their mentors and each other. Faculty/staff and peer mentors serve voluntarily, and peer mentors are required to take a course called *Counseling Under-represented Students*. As a result, other than interest in helping others, no incentive is now in place for mentors. Moreover, time is at a premium for both mentors and protégées, making it difficult for faculty/staff mentors to meet with their protégées three times during the semester as encouraged or for peer mentors to meet with their protégées on a weekly basis. Consequently, a recommendation would be to offer an incentive program that may include monetary reward for peer mentors and release time for faculty/staff mentors who take on and document time spent with more than one or two protégées.

Protégées expressed interest in more activities, especially trips like the annual cultural trip to New York City, perhaps expanding to other locations. Such events require funding, as students are not expected to pay for SMP activities, and SMP staff may explore opportunities for additional funding either internally or externally. The

production of more on-campus activities also requires additional resources in terms of both time and money, as planning is essential and providing food, guest speakers, and other incentives costs money. One recommendation would be to invite a committee composed of a limited number of faculty/staff mentors, peer mentors, protégées, and SMP staff to plan SMP activities beyond those already in place.

Students of color expressed feeling isolated even within SMP. They therefore suggested interacting with other organizations on and off campus that attract minority people. For example, although it is not totally comprised of students of color, EOP has a high percentage of students of color; therefore, SMP students could hold more combined activities with EOP. Tapping the resources of NAACP, visiting additional cultural exhibits, or developing a graduates of color alumni network are additional recommendations offered by the participants. Participants want to feel like a “family.”

Research on Mentoring

Research on mentoring of four-year college students of color continues to be lacking in the literature in higher education. For the most part, the focus has been on community college students and the business sector. An available tool not used in the present study, the Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale (PAMS), developed by Cohen (1993) and employed by Jadwick (1997), might be revisited in re-examining SMP. This would serve to eliminate the limitation of the present study in that it queried only protégées and not mentors or SMP staff.

Further investigation might also look at the long-term effects of mentoring programs, especially SMP. For example, what are SUNY-NP's SMP graduates doing now? How would they rate the effectiveness of SMP as a tool for their current careers or lives? Do they look back on the mentoring experience as a positive one? What elements of SMP were most beneficial to them in the short- and the long run? In addition, institutional data could be examined for all SMP participants in relation to all other students to try to determine if SMP is the single or primary intervention that makes a difference in retaining students of color through graduation.

SMP was developed in 1988-1989 in response to a perceived gap in services—that SUNY-NP was not able to retain through graduation regularly admitted students of color who had been recruited through the Multicultural Recruitment Program (MRP). The life practice model of social work suggests that social workers act as change agents by identifying and assessing such problems in a system, organization, or bureaucratic structure and “help people identify and manage the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living” (National Association of Social Workers, 2002). The researcher, the social worker affiliated with the Psychological Counseling Center (PCC), assessed the service gap and responded to the need through the MRP Task Force, consisting of representatives of the Admissions Office, the Black Studies Department, the PCC, and the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). This group, applying mentoring as the primary tool to alleviate the identified gap in service, developed SMP.

The time has come to develop a formal monitoring and evaluation process to ensure that SMP remains effective in retaining students of color at SUNY-NP. To this end, the institution must formally adopt the program, provide full funding, and enable SMP to position itself strongly in the annual competition with other first-year student programs for the 10%-15% of first-year students who are self-identified as persons of color. With 70 to 100 SMP student participants plus faculty/staff mentors and peer mentors, it has become increasingly challenging to manage the program. SMP is coordinated and managed by the MRP/SMP Task Force. It should be noted that each Task Force member has other primary job functions with the exception of the SMP coordinator who works half-time with this program and half-time with another campus-based program. Institutionalizing and legitimizing SMP will enable staff to work together to monitor and evaluate SMP on a regular basis to ensure responsiveness to service gaps that will serve to benefit students of color and SUNY-NP at-large.

A Final Word

By aggregating or grouping students of color into one program, SMP fails to differentiate the cultural differences among students of color. African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian students, for example, lack many common bonds that relate simply to their being “of color.” The current research on mentoring in higher education alludes to this problem, as populations of Hispanic community college students (Chavez & Maestas-Flores, 1991) and African American community college

students (Edmonds, 1997) have already been isolated for study in mentoring programs; however, the focus to date has been on community college students who typically are under-prepared for college-level work.

As a case in point, Asian students who are recruited to SUNY-NP through MRP most often do not sign up for SMP. Only 12.7% of study participants are Asian American or Pacific Islander. They do not perceive themselves as “students of color” and are more reluctant than the other groups to sign up for SMP. They may feel that they can rely on their previous academic records to make it through to graduation, and they try to distance themselves from the stigma they perceive of association with the African American and Hispanic/Latino students who tend to dominate specialized programs such as SMP.

For students such as these who do not wish to be a part of SMP even after they have contracted to do so, SMP staff need to develop a systematic process for exiting the program. Further, all SMP participants should be able to decide before and during the program period simply to opt out. Not all students benefit from mentoring, as evidenced by their comments. In addition, perhaps the program could consider alternative mentoring models, while still retaining the bi-level mentoring. For example, peer mentoring might begin during the first semester, and faculty/staff mentoring could start in the second semester. This would allow the student to offer input into the selection of a faculty/staff mentor.

The Scholar's Mentorship Program has demonstrated its effectiveness as a retention program for students of color who were admitted to SUNY-NP through regular admissions. This evaluation has been the first formal effort to try to identify the aspects of the program that have led to SMP's success. For those students who have participated in the program and in the research, peer mentoring, in particular, has helped them through the higher education labyrinth.

The role of the social worker in SMP, as in all contexts, continues to be to guide the students through their life transitions through culturally appropriate interventions. In the context of higher education, social workers have the opportunity to practice a social mission of ensuring social justice in the form of equality, equity, and accessibility for all. Programs such as SMP, developed from a recognized gap in service, enable the social worker to level the playing field for all participants and empower them to stay in college and graduate. Institutional cooperation is also required. The combination of social work and higher education can become a credible force in promoting the success of the current generation of students of color.

APPENDIX A
FRESHMAN PROTÉGÉE AGREEMENT
AND
INFORMATIONAL LETTER

SCHOLAR'S MENTORSHIP PROGRAM

Freshman Protégée Agreement

As a participant in the Scholar's Mentorship Program, you have the unique opportunity to develop a supportive relationship with faculty, professional staff and upper-class students who are committed to your success. You have been assigned a faculty/staff mentor and a peer mentor. Developing positive relationships requires commitment on the part of each. Your responsibilities are listed below. Failure to fulfill these responsibilities will result in an unsuccessful mentor protégée relationship.

As a freshman protégée, I agree to:

1. Attend all classes regularly;
2. Meet with my faculty/staff mentor at scheduled times (at least three times each semester) and my peer mentor at least once a week for an hour. Critical times are during the third week in the semester, before mid-terms and before final examinations;
3. Notify my faculty/staff mentor, peer mentor, or Program Director (Dr. Margaret Wade-Lewis at X2760) of any difficulties I encounter;
4. Notify my faculty/staff mentor, peer mentor or Director of Peer Mentor Education (Prof. Gweneth Lloyd at X2920) of any social and personal difficulties I encounter;
5. Attend and participate in academic courses, self-enhancement programs and workshops, and social/cultural events sponsored by the Scholar's Mentorship Program;
6. Follow through on referral made by my faculty/staff mentor, peer mentor or Program Director, which may include participating in tutoring, academic advising and/or personal counseling;
7. Strive to maintain at least a 2.5 Grade Point Average;
8. Maintain a positive attitude about myself and my ability to succeed at SUNY New Paltz.

Deliver this signed agreement to your faculty/staff mentor during your first visit in September.

Freshman Protégée Signature

Date Print Name

Faculty/Staff Mentor Signature

Date Print Name

March 20, 2003

Dear Scholar's Mentorship Program Participant:

I am conducting evaluation research on the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) in which you participate. The purpose of the study is twofold. First, the study, when completed, will partially fulfill the requirements for my doctoral degree at the Graduate University Center, Hunter College School of Social Work. Second, SMP has the opportunity to benefit from an empirically-based evaluation. The goals of the study are therefore: (a) to explore the experience of the protégées in their relationship with their faculty/staff and peer mentors and its impact on their academic performance, college persistence, and social integration and (b) to try to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. The quality of the relationship you had with your mentor is not the issue--good, bad, or indifferent, all of your input is valuable.

Because you are an SMP participant, I invite you to join in this study so that SMP may better serve your needs. Information you provide will be kept confidential, and only summarized data will be reported. In Fall 2003, you will have the opportunity to review a summary of the report either in my office in the Psychological Counseling Center or in the Martin Luther King - SMP Study Center.

Your participation in the study is completely voluntary. Your answers will not be connected in any way to your name. Some questions on the survey pertain to your background; most, however, center around your experience with your faculty/staff and peer mentors. A few questions about the program are open-ended requests for your opinion.

Please remember that your participation is voluntary and your responses will be kept strictly confidential. I will be in the room to answer any questions you may have about the questionnaire as they occur. You are not required to complete the questionnaire if it makes you uncomfortable or if you decide you really don't want to participate. You will not be penalized in any way for deciding not to participate.

The questionnaire will be given in small groups at pre-arranged times, such as during a Black Studies class, in designated places such as the SUB, MLK Center, and the Psychological Counseling Center. It will require approximately one hour of your time to complete the questionnaire. I will try hard to accommodate your schedule.

I will contact you within one week to learn of your interest in participating in this important evaluation of the Scholar's Mentorship Program. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gweneth M. Lloyd, Coordinator
Scholar's Mentorship Program

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE

*Scholar's Mentorship Program
Assessment Questionnaire*

Developed by Gweneth M. Lloyd

Approved by the SUNY-New Paltz Institutional Review Board

Spring 2003

Code: _____

FACULTY/STAFF MENTOR - PROTÉGÉE RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION I

Section I of this questionnaire is about your relationship with your **Faculty/Staff Mentor**. Base your responses on either your **current** or your **past** relationship with your **Faculty/Staff Mentor**.

Use the scale below to answer the questions. Answer **6 - Not applicable** *only if you did not have contact with your Faculty/Staff Mentor*.

- | |
|-----------------------|
| 1 = Strongly disagree |
| 2 = Disagree |
| 3 = Undecided/Neutral |
| 4 = Agree |
| 5 = Strongly agree |
| 6 = Not applicable |

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. My Faculty/Staff Mentor's genuine interest and concern for me enable me to trust and follow through with his or her suggestions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. My Faculty/Staff Mentor's openness about his or her life and professional challenges allows me to project myself into the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Discussions with my Faculty/Staff Mentor about my career interests and major reinforce my decision regarding selection of my major.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. My Faculty/Staff Mentor helps me to think through and select courses that balance my course load prior to registration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. At the suggestion of and with encouragement from my Faculty/ Staff Mentor , I attend student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When I have attended student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me following the suggestion of and encouragement from my Faculty/Staff Mentor , I became actively involved in these organizations and/or activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Once I became actively involved in student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me which were suggested and encouraged by my Faculty/Staff Mentor , I was able to make new friends who also participated in such activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. My Faculty/Staff Mentor provides me with useful feedback when I share personal and academic challenges.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. At the suggestion of and with encouragement from my Faculty/ Staff Mentor , I intend to pursue graduate school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Though contact with my Faculty/Staff Mentor is infrequent, I am glad to know that he or she is there for me if I need him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Discussions with my Faculty/Staff Mentor about my college experiences help put things into perspective and make it easier to understand and deal with college life.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Gender similarity between my Faculty/Staff Mentor and me makes it easier to express my thoughts and feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Gender differences between my Faculty/Staff Mentor and me causes me to feel more reserved about openly sharing my concerns about college life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Ethnic/racial similarities between my Faculty/Staff Mentor and me make it easier to express my feelings and concerns openly especially about racial/cultural issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Ethnic/racial differences between my Faculty/Staff Mentor and me cause me to feel more reserved about expressing my feelings and concerns openly especially about racial/cultural issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. My Faculty/Staff Mentor helps me to adjust to college life and its demands and was especially helpful during my freshman year by helping me manage my time and by suggesting ways to study effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. My Faculty/Staff Mentor's close monitoring of my course selection and academic performance assures me that I will graduate from SUNY-NP as planned.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Faculty/ Staff Mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Faculty/ Staff Mentor has continued to have some influence on my personal growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Faculty/ Staff Mentor has continued to influence my interest in further study by assisting me in the application process for graduate school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Faculty/ Staff Mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by suggesting places to apply for internships and jobs and by writing letters of reference.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Similarities between my Faculty/Staff Mentor's academic discipline and my major or area(s) of interest make it easier for me to develop a relationship with him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Differences between my Faculty/Staff Mentor's academic discipline and my major or area(s) of interest make it harder for me to relate to him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part II

Please circle the number of your response and fill in any requested information.

1. The race/ethnic origin of my **Faculty/Staff Mentor** is
 1. Asian American or Pacific Islander – Country of origin _____
 2. Black - African American
 3. Black - Caribbean/West Indian – Island of origin _____
 4. Black - Continental African
 5. Native American
 6. Latino or Hispanic – Country of origin _____
 7. Mexican American – Country of origin _____
 8. Other – _____

2. The gender of my **Faculty/Staff Mentor** is
 1. Female
 2. Male

3. Since my enrollment in the Scholar's Mentorship Program, I have had contact with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor** this often:
 1. I have never interacted with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor**.
 2. Once
 3. Once per semester
 4. Two or three times per semester
 5. More frequently than two or three times per semester

4. The average or typical length of time of each mentoring contact with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor** is
 1. Less than 15 minutes
 2. 15 - 30 minutes
 3. 30 - 45 minutes
 4. 45 - 60 minutes
 5. More than 60 minutes
 6. I have not met with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor**.

5. My **Faculty/Staff Mentor** usually keeps in touch with me by (Circle all that apply):
1. Telephone
 2. Campus mail
 3. E-mail
 4. Face-to-face meetings
 5. Other _____
6. Mentoring contacts with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor** have included (Circle all that apply):
1. Dining on campus
 2. Dining off campus
 3. Attending on-campus function(s)
 4. Attending off-campus function(s)
 5. Shopping at the mall or elsewhere
 6. Attending Scholar's Mentorship Program activities
 7. Meetings in his or her office
 8. Other _____
 9. I have not had contact with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor**.
7. My overall relationship with my **Faculty/Staff Mentor** has been
1. Very dissatisfactory – We have had no or very limited contact and I would have liked some.
 2. Dissatisfactory – He or she is okay but could show more interest in me.
 3. Satisfactory – I like him or her because he or she tries to connect with me.
 4. Somewhat satisfactory – He or she is helpful and really reaches out to me.
 5. Very satisfactory – He or she is terrific and seems to go out of his or her way to help me.
 6. Not applicable – I don't have a **Faculty/Staff Mentor**.
8. Since my enrollment in the Scholar's Mentorship Program, I never had contact with my **Faculty/ Staff Mentor** because (if applicable)
1. I was never informed of who my assigned **Faculty/Staff Mentor** was.
 2. My assigned **Faculty/Staff Mentor** never contacted me.
 3. My **Faculty/Staff Mentor** never responded to my attempt(s) to connect with him or her.
 4. I never responded to my **Faculty/Staff Mentor's** attempt(s) to connect with me.
 5. Our schedules conflicted.
 6. I was too busy.
 7. I did not know what I was supposed to do or talk about with him or her.
 8. I was not interested in having a **Faculty/Staff Mentor**.
 9. Other _____

PEER MENTOR - PROTÉGÉE RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION II

Section II of this questionnaire is about your relationship with your **Peer Mentor**. Base your responses on either your **current** or your **past** relationship with your **Peer Mentor**.

Use the scale below to answer the questions. Answer **6 - Not applicable** *only if you did not have contact with your Peer Mentor.*

- | |
|-----------------------|
| 1 = Strongly disagree |
| 2 = Disagree |
| 3 = Undecided/Neutral |
| 4 = Agree |
| 5 = Strongly agree |
| 6 = Not applicable |

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. My Peer Mentor's genuine interest and concern for me enable me to trust and follow through with his or her suggestions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. My Peer Mentor's openness about his or her life and college experiences allows me to project myself into the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Discussions with my Peer Mentor about my career interests and major reinforce my decision regarding selection of my major.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. My Peer Mentor helps me to think through and select courses that balance my course load prior to registration.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. At the suggestion of and with encouragement from my Peer Mentor , I attend student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When I have attended student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me following the suggestion of and encouragement from my Peer Mentor , I became actively involved in these organizations and/or activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Once I became actively involved in student organization meetings and/or activities of interest to me which were suggested and encouraged by my Peer Mentor , I was able to make new friends who also participated in such activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. My Peer Mentor provides me with useful feedback when I share personal and academic challenges.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. At the suggestion of and with encouragement from my Peer Mentor , I intend to pursue graduate school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Though contact with my Peer Mentor is infrequent, I am glad to know that he or she is there for me if I need him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Discussions with my Peer Mentor about my college experiences make it easier to understand and deal with college life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Gender similarity between my Peer Mentor and me makes it easier to express my thoughts and feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Ethnic/racial similarities between my Peer Mentor and me make it easier to express my feelings and concerns openly especially about racial/cultural issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Ethnic/racial differences between my Peer Mentor and me cause me to feel more reserved about expressing my feelings and concerns openly especially about racial/cultural issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. My Peer Mentor helps me to adjust to college life and its demands and was especially helpful during my freshman year by helping me manage my time and by suggesting ways to study effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. My Peer Mentor's feedback about my course selection and academic performance assures me that I will graduate from SUNY-NP as planned.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Peer Mentor has continued to have some influence on my academic and intellectual growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Peer Mentor has continued to have some influence on my personal growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Peer Mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to use the Career Advising and Fieldwork Center as a place to get help about career opportunities and internships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Over the course of the last one or two semesters, my Peer Mentor has continued to influence my preparation for a career by encouraging me to seek out my Faculty/Staff Mentor for support and guidance.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Similarities between my Peer Mentor's area(s) of major and/or career interest and my major or area(s) of interest make it easier for me to develop a relationship with him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Differences between my Peer Mentor's area(s) of major and/or career interest and my major or area(s) of interest make it harder for me to relate to him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part II

Please circle the number of your response and fill in any requested information.

1. The race/ethnic origin of my **Peer Mentor** is
 1. Asian American or Pacific Islander – Country of origin _____
 2. Black - African American
 3. Black - Caribbean/West Indian – Island of origin _____
 4. Black - Continental African
 5. Native American
 6. Latino or Hispanic – Country of origin _____
 7. Mexican American – Country of origin _____
 8. Other – _____

2. The gender of my **Peer Mentor** is
 1. Female
 2. Male

3. During my first semester in the Scholar's Mentorship Program, I had contact with my **Peer Mentor** this often:
 1. Never
 2. Once
 3. Two or three times during the semester
 4. More frequently than two or three times during the semester
 5. Weekly
 6. Practically every day

4. Currently I have contact with my **Peer Mentor** this often:
 1. Not at all
 2. Once a semester
 3. Two or three times during the semester
 4. More frequently than two or three times during the semester
 5. Weekly
 6. Practically every day

5. My **Peer Mentor** usually keeps in touch with me by (Circle all that apply):
1. Telephone
 2. Campus mail
 3. E-mail
 4. Face-to-face meetings
 5. Other _____
6. Mentoring contacts with my **Peer Mentor** have included (Circle all that apply):
1. Dining on campus
 2. Dining off campus
 3. Attending on-campus function(s)
 4. Attending off-campus function(s)
 5. Shopping at the mall or elsewhere
 6. Attending Scholar's Mentorship Program activities
 7. Meetings in a residence hall
 8. Other _____
 9. I have not had contact with my **Peer Mentor**.
7. My relationship with my **Peer Mentor** during the active period of our mentoring relationship was
1. Very dissatisfactory – We have had no or very limited contact and I would have liked some.
 2. Dissatisfactory – He or she is okay but could have shown more interest in me.
 3. Satisfactory – I like him or her because he or she tried to connect with me.
 4. Somewhat satisfactory – He or she was helpful and really reached out to me.
 5. Very satisfactory – He or she is terrific and seems to go out of his or her way to help me.
 6. Not applicable – I don't have a **Peer Mentor** and/or we have not kept in contact since freshman year.
8. My current relationship with my **Peer Mentor** is
1. Very dissatisfactory – We have had no or very limited contact and I would have liked some.
 2. Dissatisfactory – He or she is okay but could show more interest in me.
 3. Satisfactory – I like him or her because he or she tries to connect with me.
 4. Somewhat satisfactory – He or she is helpful and really reaches out to me.
 5. Very satisfactory – He or she is terrific and seems to go out of his or her way to help me.
 6. Not applicable – I don't have a **Peer Mentor** and/or we have not kept in contact since freshman year.

9. Since my enrollment in the Scholar's Mentorship Program, I never had contact with my **Peer Mentor** because (if applicable)

1. I was never informed of who my assigned **Peer Mentor** was.
2. My assigned **Peer Mentor** never contacted me.
3. My **Peer Mentor** never responded to my attempt(s) to connect with him or her.
4. I never responded to my **Peer Mentor's** attempt(s) to connect with me.
5. Our schedules conflicted.
6. I was too busy.
7. I did not know what I was supposed to do or talk about with him or her.
8. I was not interested in having a **Peer Mentor**.
9. Other _____

10. Including this semester, I have been in the Scholar's Mentorship Program for

1. One semester
2. Two semesters
3. Three semesters
4. Four semesters
5. Five semesters
6. Six semesters
7. Seven semesters
8. Eight semesters
9. More than eight semesters

11. My racial/ethnic heritage is

1. Asian American or Pacific Islander – Country of origin _____
2. Black - African American
3. Black - Caribbean/West Indian – Island of origin _____
4. Black - Continental African
5. Native American
6. Latino or Hispanic – Country of origin _____
7. Mexican American – Country of origin _____
8. Other – _____

12. I am a

1. Female
2. Male

13. I am a

1. Freshman
2. Sophomore
3. Junior
4. Senior

14. I am _____ years old.

1. 18
2. 19
3. 20
4. 21
5. 22
6. 23
7. 24
8. Over 24

15. My current grade point average (GPA) is _____

16. Since my enrollment here at SUNY-New Paltz I have been on the Dean's List

1. Never
2. Once
3. Twice
4. Three times
5. More than three times

17. Since my enrollment here at SUNY-New Paltz I have been on academic probation

1. Never
2. Once
3. Twice
4. Three times
5. More than three times

18. Since my enrollment here at SUNY-New Paltz I have been academically dismissed

1. Never
2. Once
3. Twice
4. Three times
5. More than three times

19. Since my enrollment here at SUNY-New Paltz I have been suspended for non-academic reasons

1. Never
2. Once
3. Twice
4. Three times
5. More than three times

20. Since my enrollment here at SUNY-New Paltz I have voluntarily withdrawn for a semester or taken a leave of absence

1. Never
2. Once
3. Twice
4. Three times
5. More than three times

**OVERALL IMPRESSION
OF THE SCHOLAR'S MENTORSHIP PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE**

SECTION III

Section III of this questionnaire is about any impact the activities and services offered through the **Scholar's Mentorship Program** have had on your college experience, your life, and your future.

Use the scale below to answer the questions. Answer **6 - Not applicable** *only if you did not have experience with that particular item.*

1 = Strongly disagree
 2 = Disagree
 3 = Undecided/Neutral
 4 = Agree
 5 = Strongly agree
 6 = Not applicable

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. My Faculty/Staff Mentor's academic advising has been very helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. My use of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Educational Center and the technical support available there have been very helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The <i>Writing for Scholars</i> course was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The <i>Mathematics for Scholars</i> course was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The <i>Research for Scholars</i> course was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part I

Please circle the number of your response.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The <i>Black and Latino Leadership</i> course was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The <i>Key Issues in the Education of Under-represented College Students</i> course which I took freshman year was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The <i>Counseling Under-represented Students</i> course which I took after freshman year was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The <i>Scholar's Mentorship Program Annual Fall Orientation Reception</i> was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The <i>Scholar's Mentorship Program Annual Spring Reconnection Reception</i> was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The <i>Scholar's Mentorship Program Annual Fall Cultural Trip to New York City</i> was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The <i>Scholar's Mentorship Program</i> living and learning experience provided freshman year in Shango Hall was very helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part II

Please fill in any requested information.

1. The three greatest benefits of the *Scholar's Mentorship Program* for me have been

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

2. Which form of mentoring do you feel had the greater impact on your overall **academic** experience?

1. **Faculty/Staff Mentor**

2. **Peer Mentor**

3. Why? _____

3. Which form of mentoring do you feel had the greater impact on your overall **college** experience?

1. **Faculty/Staff Mentor**

2. **Peer Mentor**

3. Why? _____

4. Which mentoring relationship, if any, caused you to change or improve in any way?

1. **Faculty/Staff Mentor**

2. **Peer Mentor**

3. Why and/or how? _____

5. Please write down any ideas you have for improving the **Scholar's Mentorship Program**.

**THANK YOU
FOR YOUR HELP!**

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

I, _____, agree to participate in the research/evaluation study of the Scholar's Mentorship Program (SMP) at the State University of New York at New Paltz, conducted by Gweneth M. Lloyd. She is conducting the study in partial fulfillment of the requirements for her doctoral degree from the Graduate University Center, Hunter College School of Social Work. Because I am a participant in SMP, I have been invited to participate in the study. All program participants have been invited to participate.

I understand that the purpose of this study is to assess the impact and determine the effectiveness of the Scholar's Mentorship Program. I also understand that the results of this study will be used by the program's task force to consider addressing any service gaps that become evident through the research and to begin restructuring SMP, if necessary, in an effort to serve participants better.

I understand that I must be at least 18 years-old to participate in this study. Further, I understand that participation requires me to complete one questionnaire which may take as long as one hour. Additionally, I understand that data relating to my academic progress and enrollment will be obtained from the SMP data base as well as from the Office of the Registrar. Such data will be kept confidential.

I understand that my written responses and information regarding my academic performance and enrollment will be kept strictly confidential. No individual besides the researcher will have access to this information, and only summarized data will be reported in any published document. Furthermore, I understand that my responses identified with my name will not be shared with my mentors, the program's task force, the SUNY-NP faculty or staff, or any college administrators. In addition, I understand that the research data will be securely stored in a locked file cabinet for a period of five years. At the end of this period, completed questionnaires and any accompanying identifiable data will be destroyed by use of a paper shredder.

In conclusion, I understand that participation in this study is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty and will not negatively affect my access to the program's services and resources. I may choose not to take part, may leave the study site at any time, or may refuse to answer any research questions. Leaving the study without completion will not result in any penalty, and I will be able to continue in SMP. If any questions disturb or upset me, I may express my feelings to the researcher. If warranted, I may be referred to the appropriate campus resource office for further assistance and/or I may choose to withdraw my consent to participate.

I have read and/or have had read to me the preceding information describing the study and my rights regarding participation. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I am signing this form voluntarily indicating my desire to participate in this study. I am not waiving my legal rights by signing this form.

Printed Name of Participant

Signature

Date

Code _____

REFERENCES

- Abrahamowicz, D. (1988). College involvement, perceptions, and satisfaction: A study of membership in student organizations. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*, 233-238.
- Americans for a Fair Chance. (July 2002). The history of affirmative action policies. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on December 9, 2002, from <http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/aahist.html>
- Allen, W. R. (1987, May/June). Black colleges vs. white colleges. *Change, 29*-34.
- Allen, W., Epps, E., & Haniff, N. (Eds.). (1991). *College in black and white: African american students in predominantly white and in historically black public universities*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Aloia, G. F., & Smith, J. C. (1991). Mentor-protégée relationships with undergraduates underrepresented at a large doctorate granting institution. *Diversity in Mentoring Full-Text Proceedings and Executive Summaries* (pp. 12-19). Normal-Bloomington, IL: Illinois State University, University Research Center.
- Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1982). *Minorities in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 29*7-307.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1987). *Maintaining outsiders: The production of Black professionals*. New York: General Hall.
- Bohr, L., Pascarella, E. T., Nora, A., & Terenzini, P. T. (1995). Do black students learn more at historically black or predominately white colleges? *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(1), 75-85.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

- Boyd, P. J. (1996). *Mentoring by college faculty: Perception by students in evaluation of their satisfaction with college*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS).
- Brower, A. M., & Garvin, C. D. (1989). Design issues in social group work research. *Social Work With Groups*, 12(3), 91-102.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Bunzel, J. H. (2002). *Affirmative action in higher education: A dilemma of conflicting principles*. Retrieved December 9, 2002, from <http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/publications/epp/89/89a.html>
- Chavez, M., & Maestas-Flores, M. (1991). Minority student retention: ENLACE. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 74, 63-66.
- Chickering, A. W. et al. (1981). *The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cohen, N. H. (1993). Development and validation of the Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale for faculty mentors in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International-A* 54/02. Section A.
- Edmonds, G. N. (1997). *The effects of community college mentoring programs on the academic achievement of first-time, full-time African American students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin).
- Erkut, S., & Mokros, J. R. (1984). Professors as models and mentors for college students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(2), 399-417.
- Farylo, B., & Paludi, M. A. (1985). Developmental discontinuities in mentor choice by male students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 521-522.
- Fleming, J. (1981). Special needs of Blacks and other minorities. In A. W. Chickering et al., *The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society* (pp. 279-295). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Fleming, J. (1984). *Blacks in college: A comparative study of students' success in Black and White institutions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Freeman, K. (1999). No services needed? The case for mentoring high-achieving African American students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(2), 15-26.
- Frierson, H. T., Jr., Hargrove, B. K., & Lewis, N. R. (1994). Black summer research students' perception related to research mentors' race and gender. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 475-480.
- Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (1999). *Applying educational research: A practical guide* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Gerdes, H., & Mallinkrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72.
- Germain, C. B., & Gitterman, A. (1980). *The life model of social work practice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gurin, P., & Epps, G. (1975). *Black consciousness, identity and achievement*. New York: Wiley.
- Haring, M. J. (1999). The case for a conceptual base for minority mentoring programs. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(2), 5-14.
- Horton, S. S. (1996). *Mentor functions on a college campus: Perceptions of students of color*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College).
- Howard, J., & Grosset, J. (1992). Student responses to a community college faculty mentoring program. *Community College Review*, 20(1), 48-53.
- Jadwick, D. K. (1997). *The perceptions of effectiveness of mentoring relationships in higher education*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL).
- James, D. P. (1991). A summary of the Prince George's Community College Black and minority student mentoring/retention programs. *Diversity in Mentoring Full-Text Proceedings and Executive Summaries* (pp. 189-196). Largo, MD: Prince George's Community College, Degree/Extension Centers and Special Programs.
- Kemp, A. D. (1990). From matriculation to graduation: Focusing beyond minority retention. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 18, 144-149.

- Kerr, J., & Chung, K. (2001, August). *Evaluating watershed management projects*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Lee, W. Y. (1999). Striving toward effective retention: The effect of race on mentoring African American students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(2), 27-43.
- Mallinckrodt, B. (1988). Student retention, social support and dropout intention: Comparison of Black and White students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29(1), 60-64.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Student retention and the use of campus facilities by race. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Journal*, 24(3), 28-32.
- Micheletti, L. (2001). A historic perspective on the experiences of women and African Americans at Carolina. *The Fountain*. Retrieved on December 7, 2002, from http://gradschool.unc.edu/fountain/spr_01/inclusion.html
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Digest of education statistics, 2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Education Association (NEA). (2002). *Minority mentoring*. Retrieved December 7, 2002, from <http://www.nea.org/he/jsmentor.html>
- Nettles, M. T. (1988). Introduction: Contemporary barriers to Black student equality in higher education. In M. T. Nettles (ed.), *Toward Black undergraduate student equality in American higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Newburger, E. C., & Curry, A. E. (2000). *Educational attainment in the United States (update): Population characteristics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Pace, C. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences*. Los Angeles: University of California, Higher Education Research Institute.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 51, 60-75.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Petruolo, G. P. (1998). *Mentoring of undergraduate students: The assessment of mentor effectiveness (quality of mentoring) and its relationship to student outcomes*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA).
- Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Rossi, P. H., & Freeman, H. E. (1993). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shingles, R. D. (1979). College as a source of Black alienation. *Journal of Black Studies*, 9(3), 267-289.
- Short, L., Hennessy, M., & Campbell, J. (1996). Tracking the work. In *Family violence: Building a coordinated community response: A guide for communities*. Chicago, IL: American Medical Association.
- Spanier, G. B. (1998). Student access must be paramount. *Returning to our roots: Student access*. Available <http://www.nasulgc.org>
- Stampen, J. O., & Cabrera, A. F. (1988). The targeting and packaging of student financial aid and its effects on attrition. *Economics of Education Review*, 7, 29-46.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2002, June). CIPP evaluation model checklist. Evaluation Checklists Project. Available: www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists
- Szelenyi, K. (2001). *Minority student retention and academic achievement in community colleges*. *ERIC digests*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED451859)
- Texas Commission on a Representative Student Body. (1998). *Report of the Texas Commission on a Representative Student Body*. Retrieved on December 11, 2002, from <http://www.uhsa.uh.edu/TCRSB/report.html>
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.

- Tracey, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1984). Noncognitive variables in predicting academic success by race. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 16*, 171-178.
- Tracey, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1985). The relationship of noncognitive variables to academic success: A longitudinal comparison by race. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*, 405-410.
- Tripodi, T. (1983). *Evaluative research for social workers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Tripodi, T., Fellin, P., & Meyer, H. (1983). *The assessment of social research: Guidelines for use of research in social work and social science* (2nd ed.). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *2000 census*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Vonk, M. E., Markward, M. M., & Arnold, E. (2000). Social work practice in higher education: Two case studies. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(2), 359-371.
- Yeomans, R., & Sampson, J. (Eds.). (1994). *Mentoring in the primary school*. London, England: Falmer Press.