Please cite the Published Version

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines)

A comparative study of formal coaching and mentoring programmes in higher education

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to evaluate two coaching and mentoring programmes focused on the increasingly important aim of enhancing the chances of professional-level employment for undergraduate students at two UK universities. It offers recommendations for enhancing coaching and mentoring success within higher education (HE).

Design/methodology/approach: Two similar programmes are compared; the first study is a coaching programme delivered in two phases involving over 1,500 students within the Business School. The second study is a mentoring programme involving over 250 students over a 10-year period within the Business School at a different institution.

Findings: The two programmes were compared against the key success criteria from the literature, endorsed by coaching and mentoring experts. The results highlight the importance of integrating with other initiatives, senior management commitment, budget, an application process, clear matching process, trained coaches and mentors, induction for both parties, supportive material, ongoing supervision, and robust evaluation and record keeping.

Research limitations/research implications: The research focuses on two similar institutions, with comparable student demographics. It would have been useful to dig deeper into the effect of the diverse characteristics of coach/mentor and coachee/mentee on the effectiveness of their relationships, as well as test the assumptions and recommendations beyond these two institutions, to validate the reach and application of these best practice recommendations further afield.

Practical implications: The results identify a number of best practice recommendations to guide HE institutions when offering coaching and mentoring interventions to support career progression of their students.

Originality/value: There are limited comparison studies between universities with undergraduate career-related coaching and mentoring programmes and limited research offering best practice recommendations for coaching and mentoring programmes in HE. The top 10 factors offered here to take away will add value to those thinking of facilitating similar programmes within HE.

Keywords: Coaching and mentoring; Student intervention; Best practice; Recommendations

A comparative study of formal coaching and mentoring programmes in higher education

Introduction

'Finding professional employment after graduation is one of the most important reasons for going to university' (Dandridge, 2021 p. 1). Universities endeavour to support and prepare a diverse student population towards their future careers within a HE system driven by league tables, market competition and the notion of 'teaching excellence' across the sector (Stevenson *et al.*, 2017). The Teaching Excellence Framework, introduced by the UK Government in 2017 to assess, rate and improve the quality of teaching in universities, is further pressuring universities to be measured and rewarded according to the percentage of graduates gaining professional-level employment (Office for Students [OfS], 2021). The drivers for these improvements are placing increasing demands on universities to prepare and equip students with the knowledge and skillset to access a meaningful career outside formal study (Nagarajan and Edwards, 2015). As a consequence, when hiring new recruits, employers seek 'transferable skills' which are common to and cut across many occupations, such as problem solving, critical thinking and communication, commonly referred to as transversal competencies or 'soft skills' (Sneider and Bakhshi, 2017). These drivers, coupled with the global COVID-19 pandemic making the employment market more unpredictable and uncertain, render the provision of tailored learning and development interventions for students even more essential for developing their skillsets and equipping them for future employment.

While coaching and mentoring is becoming an increasingly popular intervention within higher education (HE) to support students during their studies, context-specific best practice is limited. This research aims to establish a better understanding about how formal coaching and mentoring programmes can best be structured to support students. It follows a similar

approach to that of Dawson (2014) and compares two separate programmes to expedite a starting point for other institutions.

The key areas for investigation are:

- What worked well within these programmes?
- What can be changed for future improvement of such programmes?
- What can be recommended for future coaching and mentoring programmes within HE?

Defining coaching and mentoring

Coaching and mentoring are supportive, developmental, learning relationships where support and challenge are provided to achieve personal outcomes and to realise potential (Daloz, 1986; Garvey *et al*., 2014). Coaching and mentoring nurture professional and personal development by enhancing performance and work satisfaction (Dahling *et al.*, 2016; Ellinger 2013; Tan *et al.*, 2018; Usmani *et al.*, 2011). Coaching is often regarded as performance orientated and mentoring as career orientated, although other descriptors can be associated with these interventions, such as career coaching and executive mentoring, to add confusion. Bozeman and Feeney (2007) and Western (2012) suggest the multiple meanings of mentoring have added complexity, confusion and, in some instances, ambiguity. The same is true for coaching.

Although often considered two differently focused interventions using a similar skillset (Clutterbuck 2015; Garvey *et al.,* 2014; Koopmann *et al.,* 2021; Western, 2012), for the purposes of this research, the terms are used interchangeably. Irrespective of the titles given to the programmes, they were interventions both similarly focused upon enhancing final-year

student employability, developing specific knowledge and skills for the future, raising aspirations and developing networks for future job opportunities.

Formal coaching and mentoring

The two programmes compared in this research are both formal programmes organised by the universities for the specific purpose of assisting students to understand their strengths and weaknesses, enhancing graduate knowledge, skills and abilities and raising aspirations.

Formal mentoring is positively related to commitment, job satisfaction and personal learning in an organisational context (Lankau and Scandura, 2007; Ragins *et al.,* 2000). Formal coaching is established to support improved communication (Peng *et al.,* 2019), increased awareness to facilitate diversity acceptance (Amos and Klimoski, 2014; Hentschel *et al.,* 2013; Suiryan, 2013), improved decision-making (Chughtai and Buckley, 2011), internal wellbeing (Nielsen and Randall, 2012), and the appreciation of the right social environment for optimal functioning (Joseph and Bryant-Jefferies, 2008). A critical requirement of these programmes is to enable the students to take ownership of their learning, improve skills and progress towards their career goals, and it was felt that a planned, formal approach was the best way to achieve this.

Despite an increase in popularity (Koopmann *et al.,* 2021), there is no one-size-fits-all approach to the design, delivery and evaluation of such programmes. A lack of consistency in approach can give rise to a variation in quality and effectiveness of coaching and mentoring (Hobson *et al.,* 2009). Research shows that one in three (formal) programmes fail, with a need for two of the three to be revitalised over time (Owen, 2011), so it is important to find a formula that works and reduces the chances of failure. Cranwell-Ward *et al.* (2014) suggest that a framework is helpful but should not be developed around strict rules. Hutcheson (2006) explains that too much formality and structure may result in the benefits being outweighed by

the costs and burden of administration and coordination. Parsloe and Wray (2016) suggest

that while formal clarification of roles, responsibilities and relationships are essential, so too

is flexibility within the process. Despite differences of opinion, Cranwell-Ward *et al.* (2014)

and later Clutterbuck (2015) suggested a highly effective programme may involve the best

aspects of both: a clear purpose and direction but with relationships that operate as informally

as possible. Having agreed that mentoring needs to have some formality and flexibility,

Garvey *et al.* (2014) declared mentoring programmes need a 'light touch', and core factors

need to be considered such as volunteerism and choice for both mentor and mentee, a clear

recruitment strategy, training for mentors and mentees, a clear and transparent matching

policy and ongoing support for mentors and mentees if required. Further, according to Alred

and Garvey (2010), other key considerations are establishing reviewable ground rules,

ongoing reviews with both parties, working with the mentee's agenda and accepting

mentoring as legitimate work.

Whether highly structured, informally driven or a mixture of both, setting up and

coordinating coaching and mentoring programmes can be a balancing act. This paper

suggests the key factors that can be considered when thinking about the loose–tight

framework aspects to choose.

Coaching and mentoring programmes in education

Various authors have suggested key areas to think about when setting up a coaching and/or

mentoring programme within an educational context, such as training for mentors and

mentees so both parties better understand their responsibilities, obligations and rights;

establishing formal mechanisms for complaint resolution (Barnett, 2008), clarity and

consensus of roles (Storrs *et al.,* 2008); the need for a well-planned and resourced programme

(Ehrich *et al.,* 2004; Goodlad, 1998); and adhering to best practice guidelines (Husband and

Jacobs, 2009). The most recent common insights gained from a variety of educational

coaching and mentoring interventions are summarised in Table 1.

(Please insert Table 1 here)

Table 1. Other authors' views on requirements for educational coaching and mentoring
interventions

Cranwell-Ward *et al.* (2014) suggest that mentoring 'lives or dies by its reputation', so it is

essential to get the framework right to facilitate success for both the mentees and mentors

(Busse *et al.,* 2018).

Research approach

This study is a reflection by the authors, the two programme leaders, based on their personal

experiences and feedback gained throughout from students (through regular group review

sessions, feedback sheets, reflective assessments and follow-up interviews) and the

coaches/mentors (through formal and informal group sessions, supervision and feedback

sheets), all mentioned later. Ethical approval was agreed through both universities. Clear

information was shared with both the coaches/mentors and students about the research and

how their information would be used, and voluntary informed consent was attained. The

intention is not to share this detailed analysis but to share the key themes in order to explain,

clarify and demystify what makes a successful, formal coaching and mentoring programme

within HE. Through comparing and contrasting two successful case studies within a similar

organisational context, the aim was to uncover an appreciation of similar and different

realities (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Cohen *et al.,* 2017; Easterby-Smith *et al.,* 2012) and a

better understanding of what works.

A case study approach was taken to contextualise and provide descriptive richness of the two

programmes. As Yin (2009) indicates, case studies help us to bring to life and better

understand the world. Gillham (2001) suggests that the fundamental characteristic of a case study approach is to seek a variety of evidence, implying that no one source is likely to be valid on its own. As already stated, for this research, multiple information sources were analysed across the duration of the programmes – feedback sheets, interviews, reflective assessments (coaching programme), mentee and mentor group feedback sessions and mentee one-to-one interviews (mentoring programme) – so that the full 'story' of these two programmes could be located. For qualitative research, Guba and Lincoln (1985) recommend being mindful of dependability, confirmability, trustworthiness (reliability), credibility, transferability, authenticity and plausibility (validity).

As responsibility for leading the respective programmes lay with the authors, it was important to reduce implicit bias within the discussion and evaluation of the respective studies to ensure credibility and authenticity of the information used. Triangulation (Denzin, 1970) was achieved through each author and programme lead-checking for and confirming patterns within the feedback from multiple sources of each other's programme, namely, coaches, mentors and students. In addition, as the coaching programme was based on 2 years' data compilation and the mentoring programme on 10 years, both offered an ongoing dependable, plausible and trustworthy account of their success, not influenced by the authors. Finally, the points of comparison criteria (Table 3) were created from already published literature, and their potential transferability was later confirmed with key coaching and mentoring academic and practitioner experts within the field, which again was not influenced by the programme lead authors.

Overview of the two programmes

For ease of reference, Table 2 summaries the comparison of the two programmes.

(Please insert Table 2 here)

Table 2. Summary of the two programmes

Case Study 1: coaching programme

The aim of the coaching programme was to support students to better understand, appreciate and leverage their skills towards future employment opportunities (Andreanoff, 2016). The coaching programme engaged external qualified, experienced coaches to deliver one-to-one and group coaching sessions to final-year Business Studies students. All 40 external coaches were qualified up to postgraduate equivalent Level 7 and were required to have personal indemnity insurance, two references and an interview before joining the team. The coaches attended a mandatory briefing day and received a handbook which mirrored the student version. Students completed a self-assessment which informed the discussion for the coaching sessions. During Phase 1 of the programme, students were offered two individual coaching sessions and two coach-led group sessions. One-to-one sessions were mandatory prior to attendance in group sessions to establish an agenda and to facilitate peer sharing and connectedness in the group sessions (Karcher, 2008). During Phase 2, the session duration was lengthened to 1 hour (from 45 minutes) over three sessions which included two individual and one group session. In both phases, the students were asked to create a portfolio of their journey including a self-assessment analysis and reflection of their experience. The two phases of the coaching programme supported over 1,500 students; 53% of the students involved were male, 73% were from a Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) background, 25% were mature students, 20% had a disability and 29% were first-generation students.

Case Study 2: mentoring programme

This mentoring programme was similarly aimed at supporting career aspirations of final-year Business School students. It was a volunteer scheme that involved students as mentees with regular meetings with a local business director (an Institute of Directors member) towards

gaining clarity about career aspirations, available opportunities, an improved CV, improved

interview skills and developing networks. The first pilot programme involved 12 mentoring

pairs increasing to 40 annually over time. The mentoring programme was offered to a new

cohort every academic year and had been operating for 10 years, supporting over 250

students altogether; 45% of the students involved were male, 58% were from a BAME

background, 20% were mature students, 10% had a disability and 69% were first-generation

students.

As a precursor, the students completed an application form which facilitated a match with an

appropriate mentor based on student aspirations – for example, a finance student with a

finance director. Students did not choose their mentors, nor did mentors choose their mentees.

Once both parties had been introduced, rapport established and a contract completed, regular

monthly meetings were held with an expectation that mentors and mentees attend four group

review sessions throughout the academic year. The group sessions were an opportunity for

mentees to meet other mentors and receive wider support for CV development, mock

interviews, career support and to so, and for mentors to receive continuing professional

development (CPD) and supervision. Continuous feedback was gathered throughout the

duration of the mentoring relationship from both parties, individually and via group sessions.

Table 3 represents the top 10 key themes drawn from a distillation of the key literature

previously discussed.

(Please insert Table 3 here)

Table 3. Comparing the programmes against agreed requirements

As a starting point, it was important to better understand and distil what was already stated in

the coaching and mentoring literature and what aspects practitioners considered most

essential. Ten points of comparison, drawn from the literature review, were shared with three

coaching and three mentoring master practitioners established within either the ICF

(International Coaching Federation), the AC (Association for Coaching) and/or the EMCC

(European Mentoring and Coaching Council) membership bodies; all endorsed the 10 points

and gave some additional guidance, shared in the Findings section. This created and shaped

the focus of the Findings section, which helps to ensure the subsequent discussion is topical

and useful to practitioners. The findings were also compared to and aligned to the

International Standards for Mentoring and Coaching Programmes.

Findings

This section is framed within the 10 factors agreed by key authors and practitioners as

essential elements to consider in a coaching and mentoring programme framework, shown in

Table 3.

Links with other initiatives

Learning and development interventions need to be integrated and aligned with a wider

organisational strategy (Garavan, 2007) with attention and support fully implemented and

embedded (Guthrie *et al.,* 2002).

The coaching programme did not relate to any other university initiatives but was associated

with a specific unit/module. Formal links with careers advisers, counselling and follow-on

mentoring support were met as requested – for instance, alerting coachees to an alternative

mentoring scheme for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

The mentoring programme also did not link with any other university initiatives but was

advertised as part of the Business School undergraduate package as an optional opportunity

for final-year business students. It was briefed at induction and during final-year reinduction

but did not integrate into any specific module/unit of study. This was a key lesson learnt over

the period of running the two programmes: to have improved integration with the University

Careers Service, offering additional support for CVs, applications, mock psychometric testing and self-evaluations. For the mentoring programme, this was integrated from Year 4: 'Making the connection with the Careers Service was really helpful as I've been here 3 years and never accessed them, but now with the help of my mentor, I've had double the support' (Mentee, Cohort 7).

Senior management commitment

Senior management support is required for any organisational initiative to survive and thrive. Their support of the scheme will have a direct impact on the potential success of any programme and this applies equally to coaching and mentoring (Cranwell-Ward *et al.,* 2014; Flynn and Nolan, 2008; Way *et al.,* 2011). Senior managers need to be interested, involved and demonstrate the importance of participation and role-model the programme ethos (Ellinger, 2013); they can do this through marketing but also through attending and supporting the training, induction, ongoing support opportunities, and celebration events.

For the coaching programme, there was clear support from the dean who was the driving force behind setting up and marketing the initiative plus gaining sponsorship from education and employability departments. A robust communication strategy was coordinated with all internal stakeholders (module leaders, personal tutors), creating one clear message: seamless delivery and support for the participating students.

For the mentoring programme, there was a clear and ongoing commitment from the dean who was instrumental in setting up and initially marketing the scheme. The dean provided gravitas when inducting new mentors and greeting new mentees and was available to present certificates and gifts to the mentors at the end of each programme. An enduring management support structure is a clear recommendation for the success of future programmes.

Funding/budget

If senior management commitment is gained, there is high probability that the required budget and resources will follow (Cranwell-Ward *et al*., 2014; Zachary 2005). Coaching and mentoring initiatives are often coordinated and run by its advocates, although where external coaches and mentors are involved, senior management is required to support and validate the running costs (Ehrich *et al.,* 2004).

Within the coaching programme, funding was gained to support remuneration for the external coaches. During Phase 1, additional funding was available for an administrator to manage coach bookings. During Phase 2, the coaches were employed directly as associate tutors with access to university systems, negating the cost and need for additional administration. One of the big challenges with the budget was the potential degree of wastage either because there were not enough interested students to fill the paid coaches' time slots or because some students turned up without really engaging with the process. This highlights the need to be clear about how coaches are paid (for example, paying the coaches by appointments met, rather than just appointments made), managing expectations with both parties at the outset and building in flexibility to take account of the unpredictable flow of student take-up.

No funding was available for the mentoring programme, and the mentors were not remunerated. A limited budget contributed towards refreshments, printing handbooks, and thank you gifts for mentors each year.

> It could be assumed that paying for mentors would ensure a higher quality mentor but we were very careful about the membership body that we connected with for our mentors and our selection process, so we were confident that we were using strong mentors. (Programme Lead)

However, there is still some debate about the greater benefits gained from working with more qualified (paid) practitioners, and if it were possible to pay the mentors and/or to offer them some accredited training, this would be helpful to secure their continued commitment year on year.

Selection/application process

It is important that those who engage with a coaching or mentoring scheme are volunteers to the process (Johnson, 2002) as parties coerced will not receive the same amount of learning as those who engage voluntarily (Clutterbuck, 2015).

For the coaching programme, a rigorous recruitment process was undertaken to hire the coaches and a particular cohort of students chosen to participate in the programme. The first coaching team was recruited at short notice, but for the second year, there was an opportunity to be more selective. As a result, the new coaching team was built around coaches with previous experience of working with students and who had a trusted relationship with the institution: 'My motivations for the project was the idea of coaching back to back and coaching a more socially diverse group than probably I've ever coached before, or so intensively' (Coach, Cohort 1). The coaching programme was part of a unit/module with a 10% weighting towards the students'/coachees' final grade, reliant upon proven engagement and submission of a written reflection relating to their experience of the programme. The assigned weighting generated a higher level of student engagement. Non-engagement across both cohorts was measured between 9% and 15%.

For the mentoring programme, there was no application form for mentors to complete as, following a call-out for support, they offered their services as members of the Institute of Directors. A discussion of their CV and related work experience followed before sign-up. While the mentors were not regarded as mentoring experts, they were considered experts in

identifying potential opportunities within the work environment. To participate in the programme, students were required to complete a short application form which outlined the expectations of the programme (i.e. timescales, commitment) and asked for clarity about their career aspirations and their need for mentoring. Any student who completed the application was allocated a mentor based within the career they were keen to work in. The drop-out rate was approximately 12%.

Matching

There are differing views on whether matching within coaching and mentoring needs to be scientific or more loosely defined (Allen *et al.,* 2009). While Stewart and Knowles (2002) suggest there is no evidence that a systematic matching process makes any difference with undergraduate students, the overarching view is that matching needs attention to avoid a mismatch and an ineffective relationship (Thomas and Douglas, 2004; Way *et al*., 2011). Mentoring relationships will differ in quality, depending on whether the participants have choice or the pairings are formally assigned. Machida and Schaubroeck (2011) suggest that in addition to supportive relationships, mentoring by credible others is a source of self-efficacy, whereas if the mentor does not have this credibility, negative mentoring will be observed (Eby *et al.,* 2010). Sensitivities with matching are much debated, specifically in relation to relational demography such as race, ethnicity and gender (Joshi *et al.,* 2011; Richard *et al.,* 2019); some authors suggest that similarity will more likely create greater quality relationships (Allen *et al.,* 2000) and others the opposite (Sosik and Godshalk, 2000).

For the coaching programme, matching was a challenge given the high cohort numbers (Phase 1, 792; Phase 2, 725), although students were offered the opportunity to select a coach based upon their online profile. Some students did ask for and maintain the same coach throughout the programme.

For the mentoring programme, due to the small and specific pool of mentors, students were matched to mentors by similarity in discipline/course and career aspiration. Where there were not enough mentors with a specific background, mentors were chosen for their wider skills and experience. Recognising that it was better for those seeking a relationship to exercise their freedom of choice (James *et al.,* 2020), mentees had the opportunity to change their mentor if they wished after their first few meetings (a small number did), but the matching was generally successful as if mentors were not exactly what the mentee had in mind, they had many industry networks they could signpost them to instead:

> At first I was unsure about my mentor, as he was not from the same background as me, but he had a huge amount of experience within the industry of my dreams, so he was extremely helpful opening doors for me. (Mentee, Cohort 9)

Coach/mentor training

From best practice recommendations, training is cited as a key success factor (Clutterbuck, 2011; Kane and Campbell, 1993; Kasprisin *et al.,* 2008; Thomas and Douglas, 2004; Way *et al.,* 2011). It is important to ensure mentors and coaches are clear about the expectations of their roles and key skill requirements. While there is much debate about the type, focus, quality and timing of training (Maltbia *et al.,* 2014), it is agreed that coaches and mentors should receive specific training as it should not be assumed they know what is expected or possess the right skills to interact with undergraduates. As part of the training, it is very important to highlight the ethical principles that underpin professional practice: do no harm, duty of care, know your limits, respect client's interests and respect the law (Brennan and Wildflower, 2014), and these are contained in the Global Code of Ethics (2021). Clutterbuck (2011) also insists on post-training support.

For the coaching programme, as already mentioned, all coaches were Level 7 qualified prior to engagement. The programme included a mandatory 1-day briefing to discuss the code of ethics and professional practice, agree and document aims and objectives, and discuss coaching style, tools and approaches for inclusion within a toolkit for coaches and students.

> There was a marked difference in the ethos, team dynamic, and to some extent professionalism between the first coaching team (who were recruited at very short notice) and the Year 2 team who had more experience of the student context. (Coach, Cohorts 1 and 2)

For the mentoring programme, new mentors attended an initial training session covering aims, the code of ethics and professional practice, expectations, skills required, and processes involved in the programme. They were further provided with a mentor handbook including contracting and boundary management, suggestions for running meetings, diagnostic tools and so on. All returning mentors had an optional refresher session at the start of each academic year.

Induction for coachees/mentees

While it is important for mentors and coaches to be trained, they should not be relied upon to convey key information or concerns from students back to the university. More recent research has suggested the importance of training the mentee or coachee (Haden, 2013) or running brief induction sessions (Andreanoff, 2016) to manage boundaries and discuss expectations. The concept of preparing people to be good coachees and mentees is recommended good practice and supports the comments earlier about ensuring commitment early, that everyone is behaving professionally and getting the most out of the relationship.

Upon launch of the coaching programme, introductory sessions were delivered at student lectures explaining the aims and objectives, expectations and the step-by-step stages of the

programme. During Phase 1, many students attending the coaching sessions came

unprepared, so a coach-ready programme was introduced during Phase 2 which included

videos from the coaches and previous students summarising the benefits, code of conduct and

expectations, both in terms of what was expected of them and what they could expect from it.

Several student drop-in briefing sessions were also offered. 'Time restraints didn't facilitate

chemistry sessions between coaches and students at the start. Some coaches noted this

hampered their ability to create rapport, whilst others observed it hinged upon the style and

personality of the coach' (Programme Lead).

For the mentoring programme, introductory sessions were delivered at student final-year

inductions, explaining the aims and objectives, expectations and the step-by-step stages of the

programme. An additional, managing expectations briefing session was held with joining

mentees to introduce them to previous student mentees, to provide a clear understanding of

expectations of them and their mentors, the code of conduct and expected outcomes, and to

offer an opportunity to voice collective concerns. These were then shared with the mentors in

an open forum session with both mentees and mentors before the first meeting.

Supporting toolkit/handbook/contract

Toolkits are essential to support all coaches and mentors to cover the code of practice, ethical

guidelines, contractual obligations, models, tools and techniques specific to each programme.

Handbooks are endorsed by professional bodies such as the EMCC, AC, ICF and key authors

(Clutterbuck, 2007) as essential for any coaching or mentoring intervention, reinforcing

expectations of the programme to avoid potential disappointment (Clutterbuck, 2007).

For the coaching programme, an online toolkit was created for both coaches and students,

providing additional resources to signpost students towards:

> The online toolkit was, from my point of view, very useful. It provided additional resources I could point students to, and helped ensure that we could keep the coaching sessions focused on support that the student couldn't access elsewhere. It also helped provide a common focus for the coach practitioner team. (Coach, Cohort 1)

It included a contract template setting out the basic rights and expectations of the relationship, and the students were responsible for sending a signed copy of their contract to their chosen coach in advance of booking a coaching session, during which the coach would provide a counter signature.

For the mentoring programme, a paper-based mentor handbook was provided that included models, techniques, meeting guidelines and supportive CPD-related paperwork. A generic contract was included in the mentor handbook covering the purpose of the programme, mentor–mentee rights and roles, required time commitment and motivation, confidentiality, and contact points for help. It was the mentee's responsibility to return the signed contract (by both parties) to the programme leader. All this information was also available on the mentoring intranet webpages.

Support and supervision for both parties

Supervision is a key requirement for coaches and mentors as verified by the EMCC Global Code of Ethics and supported by key authors (Hawkins and Schwenk, 2006).

For the coaching programme, the leader was available for issue resolution and offered weekly online drop-in supervision sessions. The purpose of the supervision sessions was to allow space for reflection, share issues and best practice during programme delivery and ensure consistent messaging. Coaches also shared resources and practice at informal group sessions.

The mentoring programme planned four formal group review sessions every 2 months for participants to meet and receive support for related aspects – for example, mock interviews.

These sessions facilitated wider network sharing plus an opportunity for the two groups to meet separately for supervision and CPD, supporting understanding and feedback for programme improvement. 'The group sessions were a great way of finding out what other mentors were up to, but also to give the mentees further opportunities to expand their industry contacts' (Mentor, Cohort 4).

Record keeping/evaluation

Evaluation is hard to achieve tangibly within any learning and development intervention yet is vital to understanding what moderates, helps and hinders the process. Typically, the outcomes and the impact of coaching and mentoring are measured through the four evaluation levels of Kirkpatrick: reaction, learning, application and return on investment levels (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development [CIPD], 2020; Kearns, 2005; Kirkpatrick, 1983; Tamkin *et al.,* 2002), Andreanoff (2016) references the importance of record keeping to capture what has occurred from a student's, coach's, mentor's and university's perspective to inform understanding of the outcomes and impact of the programme.

For the coaching programme, ongoing feedback was gathered from both parties, and an end-of-programme review session was hosted with the coaches as a reflective exercise to better understand the outcomes and impact, while the elements of the programme were still fresh in their minds, too. Many positive outcomes were shared in respect of personal learning and plans for the future, together with programme recommendations to feed forward. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 20 coaches, plus interviews with several students for guidance on what to retain and what to change in future programmes with analysis of reflections revealing additional impact from a knowledge, skills and network perspectives: 'This experience supplied the ability to gain skills such as helping to build my

confidence, gain the ability to work independently, obtain self-awareness of my strengths and

build on the weaknesses' (Coachee, Cohort 2).

For the mentoring programme, the first three levels of Kirkpatrick (1983) were evaluated

through asking for feedback during the ongoing one-to-one and group sessions and end-of-

programme evaluations to better understand outcomes and impact:

> With regular mentor meetings, I have felt more confident and feel that I can advertise
>
> myself better towards employers in every aspect. The help my mentor has given me,
>
> will not only give me help for the remainder of the scheme but for the rest of my life.
>
> (Mentee, Cohort 10)

As with the coaching programme, many comments were shared about the knowledge, skills

and networks gained throughout and at the end. In addition, some funding was acquired in

Year 7 to contact previous mentees to assess the impact of mentoring on their current career

progression. The mentees who responded cited positive examples of how they had applied the

skills gained through mentoring in their current workplace. While expectations were met in

achieving their reactions to application-level outcomes, the task of assessing a clear return on

investment remains elusive.

Discussion

The above 10 aspects create a priority list for the successful implementation of a coaching or

mentoring programme within HE. While the coaching and mentoring programmes had

considered all these aspects, there were clear lessons to be learnt through further

investigation. Following is a summary of the reflections from the two programme leaders.

What worked well within these programmes?

Feedback was overwhelmingly positive, with reports that the programme was life-changing and over 20% of students reporting they had secured professional-level appointments within their aspirational areas as a result of the coaching/mentoring support given. Students also reported greater personal clarity and awareness and confirmed that they would engage a coach or mentor again if they were able to do so. Aspects in *italics* below are the key areas that worked well across both programmes. *Senior management commitment was crucial* to the success of both studies, as was securing a budget for recruiting external coaches for the coaching programme. While a small budget was acquired for the mentoring programme, a larger contribution would have secured more resources for training and supporting the mentors plus the possibility of recruiting mentors with more specialist skills and experience. *Training was well received.* However, training internal staff to coach and mentor students may be preferable than the cost of securing the services of external coaches/mentors as internal staff may better understand the university context, student and diversity challenges. *Applications supported matching.* To manage student expectations and secure commitment, the student being able to choose their coach/mentor seemingly benefited the relationship. This was not possible within the mentoring programme due to limited availability of mentors, although offering a choice of two to three mentors would make students feel more empowered and potentially provide a better choice of personal characteristics – for example, experience, gender, role position and so on. *Training the coach/mentor was crucial* within both programmes as was a briefing/induction session with the students to set boundaries and explain and manage expectations of both them and their coaches/mentors. The contract within the supporting toolkits/handbook proved a helpful resource for consistency. *Review sessions for individuals and groups provided a timely opportunity to support both parties* and evaluate the programmes in real time. Planned feedback sessions were effective, but

conversely, the opportunity for informal drop-in sessions were invaluable to coaches, mentors and students alike. Group sessions worked better than anticipated due to a broadening and sharing of experience between students respecting and valuing peer feedback beyond their coach/mentor.

What can be learnt for future improvement of similar programmes?

Although both programmes had hugely successful outcomes for the students, reviewing the literature with the key findings created some areas for improvement, documented below in italics. *Integrating the coaching and mentoring initiatives within the wider university* curriculum would have made the programme potentially more available to all students. *Having a greater connection with the employability-related career services* at the university would have raised greater awareness of the related central career support offered. *Focussing on the selection process and how to target harder to reach students* through tutor insight/knowledge and/or integrating directly into the curriculum may have increased take-up from diverse groups. *Involving the key stakeholders earlier* – for example, course leader colleagues – in the design and delivery expectations of the programme would have helped to raise awareness and clarify key roles and responsibilities to sell the programme and encourage students to engage. *Making clearer the coaching/mentoring roles;* some coaches were not willing or able to facilitate group sessions, placing a greater workload on remaining coaches. *Mandatory supervision for all;* although supervision sessions were offered, some participants were unable to attend. The contract agreement should insist that coaches, mentors and students attend a minimum number of supervisory sessions per programme, the importance of which to be reiterated at the training and briefing sessions. This would support and develop practice and provide useful evaluation of programmes. *More comprehensive (online) handbooks;* while the handbooks were a helpful contribution to both programmes and participants, they should contain a comprehensive toolkit including sample meeting and

communication templates for consistency between participants, self-assessment

opportunities, personal scoring charts and tools to assist capture of student progress. *Having a*

designated coach/mentor intranet portal where toolkit and supporting resources could be

updated and accessed by all stakeholders would be helpful and reduce coordinator

administration. *Embed a coaching/mentoring style of support as early as possible in the*

student journey; as there are now coaching, mentoring and/or peer support programmes

within primary schools, the generation of coach-/mentor-aware and enabled students will start

to filter through to university. As such, there will be an expectation for such initiatives to be

available as an integral part of their learning experience.

Best practice recommendations for coaching and mentoring programmes within HE

Based upon the findings, discussion and reflections on these two programmes, using the

already shared literature about successful coaching/mentoring schemes, the following

illustrates an expansion of these recommendations targeted at coaching/mentoring

programmes within a HE context: (1) make clear links with other university initiatives, and

do not let it stand alone, (2) ensure continuous senior management commitment within the

faculty, (3) establish internal or external funding/budget, (4) create a formal selection and

application process for all students and coaches/mentors, (5) allow students choice when

matching, (6) offer coach/mentor training and make clear the boundaries with other

university roles, (7) ensure an induction for coachees/mentees and coaches/mentors to

manage expectations and boundaries, (8) have a supporting (online) toolkit/handbook on the

intranet which details the mandatory contract expectations, codes of conduct and so on, (9)

offer ongoing support and mandatory supervision for both parties and (10) keep robust

records to evaluate the outcomes and impact.

(Please insert Table 4 here)

Table 4. Our 10 recommendations for HE in more detail

Recognising that these programmes have continued, albeit virtually, throughout COVID-19, these recommendation still hold true for a virtual and/or hybrid approach to coaching and mentoring programmes. Training, induction, meetings and supervision can all be held virtually, and the purpose, progress, outcomes and impact can still be the same.

Limitations and future directions

While these findings are helpful in reaffirming the key aspects of programme design, delivery and maintenance in these HE contexts, it would be useful in the future to test the assumptions and recommendations beyond these universities, with different types of institution and perhaps further education colleges with similar programmes, to validate the reach and application of the suggestions made. Also, recognising that not all coaching/mentoring relationships are formal one-to-one relationships, and there is scope for informal and group coaching/mentoring too, these are other avenues to compare with and to evaluate the outcomes against for the future too. Another potential limiting factor with the programmes related to the similarity of student demographics (except for first-generation statistics) and degree of compatibility within these two widening participation institutions. It was clear there was a high degree of diversity within the student body within both programmes, and for future research, it would be interesting to explore this further in respect of the selection and application process (did this appeal to all diverse groups?), the matching (were some matches less popular and less effective than others, and if so why?), and the differing experiences and outcomes of those from differing backgrounds, gender, ethnicity, beliefs and so on (were those matched with differing or similar characteristics more effective?) Diversity was not the primary focus of this study but highlights a future opportunity to dig deeper into the interrelationships and the intersectionality aspects at play, together with the potential related

ethical dilemmas, to investigate further what contributes equality of opportunity and success for all students (James *et al.,* 2020).

Conclusion

A successful coaching programme and a successful mentoring programme within the HE context were explored, through an application of the key literature together with multiple sources – that is, feedback from the key stakeholders involved: coaches, coaches, mentors, mentees, coaching and mentoring experts and the programme leaders – to determine what is fundamental to a successful coaching/mentoring programme in HE. The research aims were to investigate what worked well within these programmes, what can be learnt for future improvement of such programmes and what are the recommendations for future coaching and mentoring programmes within HE. The ultimate aim was to further develop Dawson's (2014) recommendations by analysing how best to design, deliver and maintain a coaching and mentoring programme within HE. In respect of the design, the summary suggestions were to make wider organisational linkages, ensure senior management commitment and agree funding. In terms of delivery, have a formal application and selection process, offer student choice when matching, offer training, ensure induction for both parties and have a supportive toolkit/handbook. In terms of maintenance, offer ongoing support and mandatory supervision, with robust evaluation and record keeping.

The initial recommendations were considered and endorsed by coaching and mentoring experts, both as academics and practitioners. The recommendations are not suggested as a one-size-fits-all approach, rather a suggestion based upon experience of what works in a HE context. There is no endpoint here, just ideas and a start of a conversation as referenced by Nixon (2007): 'Excellence is a process of growth, development and flourishing; it is not just an endpoint' (p. 22).

References

Alred, G. and Garvey, B. (2010), *Mentoring Pocketbook,* Management Pocketbooks Ltd, Alresford, UK

Allen, T. D., Finkelstein, L. M. and Poteet, M.L. (2009*), Designing Workplace Mentoring Programs: An evidence-based approach,* Wiley, UK.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L. and Russell, J. E. A. (2000), "Protégé selection by mentors: What makes the difference?" *Journal of Organization Behavior*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 271–282.

Amos, B. and Klimoski, R. J. (2014), "Courage: making teamwork work well" *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 110 –128.

Andreanoff, J. (2016), *Coaching and Mentoring in Higher Education: A step by Step Guide to Exemplary Practice,* Red Globe Press, London.

Andrews. J. and Clark, R. (2011), *"Peer Mentoring Works!"* Aston University & Applied Science, available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/aston_what_works_final_report_1.pdf (accessed 07 December 2021)

Barnett, J. E. (2008), "Mentoring, boundaries, and multiple relationships: opportunities and challenges", *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 3-16.

Bozeman, B. and Feeney, M. K. (2007), "Toward a Useful Theory of Mentoring A Conceptual Analysis and Critique", *Administration & Society,* Vol. 39 No. 6, pp. 719-739.

Brennan, D. and Wildflower, L. (2014), "Ethics in Coaching", Cox, E., Bachkirova, R and Clutterbuck, D (Eds.), *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, 2nd edn, Sage, London, pp. 430–444.

Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2015), *Business Research Methods* , 4th edn, OUP, UK.

Busse, H., Campbell, R. and Kipping, R. (2018), "Examining the wider context of formal youth mentoring programme development, delivery and maintenance: A qualitative study with mentoring managers and experts in the United Kingdom", *Children and Youth Services Review,* Vol. 95, pp. 95-108.

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). (2020), "Evaluating Learning and Development", *CIPD Factsheet*.

Chughtai, A.A. and Buckley, F. (2011), "Work Engagement, antecedents, the mediating role of learning goal orientation and job performance", *Career Development International,* Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 684-705.

Clutterbuck, D. (2007), "An International Perspective on Mentoring", Ragins. B. R and Kram, K. E (Eds.), *Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory Research and Practice.* Sage, London, pp. 633-658.

Clutterbuck, D. (2011), *Coaching the Team at Work 2: The definitive guide to Team Coaching,* Nicholas Brealey International, London.

Clutterbuck, D. (2015), *Everyone needs a Mentor,* 5th ed, CIPD, London.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2017), *Research Methods in Education*, 8th ed, Routledge, London.

Cranwell-Ward, J., Bossons, P. and Gover, S. (2014), *Mentoring – A Henley Review of Best Practice*, 2nd ed, Palgrave MacMillan, Hampshire, UK

Dahling, J. J., Taylor, S. M., Chau, S. L. and Dwight, S.A. (2016), "Does Coaching Matter? A Multilevel Model Linking Managerial Coaching Skill and Frequency to Sale Goal Attainment", *Personnel Psychology,* Vol. 69 No. 4, pp. 863-894.

Daloz, L. (1986), *Effective teaching and mentoring,* Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Dandridge, N. (2021), "New measure shows substantial differences in likely job and study outcomes for students", OfS website, available at: https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/news-blog-and-events/press-and-media/new-measure-shows-substantial-differences-in-likely-job-and-study-outcomes-for-students/ (accessed 07 Dec 2021)

Dawson, P. (2014), "Beyond a Definition: Toward a Framework for Designing and Specifying Mentoring Models", *Educational Researcher,* Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 137–145.

Denzin, N.K. (1970), "The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods" Gill, J and Johnson, P (Eds.), *Research Methods for Managers,* 4th edn*,* Sage, London.

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. and Jackson, P.R. (2012), *Management Research,* Sage, London.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M. M., Durley, J. and Ragins, B. R. (2010), "Are bad experiences stronger than good ones in mentoring relationships? Evidence from the protégé and mentor perspective", *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* Vol. 77 No. 1, pp. 81–92.

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B. and Tennent, L. (2004), "Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: A review of the literature", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 518-540.

Ellinger, A .D. (2013), "Supportive supervisors and managerial coaching: Exploring their intersections", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 3, pp. 310-316.

Flynn, G. V. and Nolan, B. (2008), "The Rise and Fall of a Successful Mentor Program: What Lessons Can Be Learned?" *The Clearing House*, Vol. 81 No. 4, pp. 173-179.

Garavan, T. (2007), "A Strategic Perspective on Human Resource Development", *Advances in Developing Human Resources,* Vol. 9 No. 11, pp. 11-30.

Garvey, B., Stokes, P. and Megginson, D. (2014), *Coaching and Mentoring – theory and practice,* 2nd ed, Sage, London.

Gillham, B. (2001), *Case Study Research Methods,* Continuum, London.

Global Code of Ethics. (2021), "Global Code of Ethics *",* available at: https://www.globalcodeofethics.org/ (accessed 07 December 2021)

Goodlad, S. (1998), *Mentoring and tutoring by students,* Kogan Page, London.

Guba, E. and Lincoln, Y. (1989), *Fourth Generation Evaluation,* Sage, California.

Guthrie, J., Spell, C. and Nyamori, O. (2002), "Correlates and Consequences of High Involvement Work Practices: The Role of Competitive Strategy", *International Journal of Human Resource Management,* Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 183–97.

Haden, S. (2013), *It's not about the Coach: Getting the most from coaching in business, sport and life*, Business Books, Winchester.

Hawkins, P. and Schwenk, G. (2006), *Coaching Supervision: Maximising The Potential of Coaching*, CIPD, London.

Hentschel, T., Shemla, M., Wegge, J. and Kearney, E.(2013), "Perceived diversity and team functioning: The role of diversity beliefs and affect", *Small Group Res.* Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 33–61.

Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A. and Tomlinson, P. D. (2009), "Mentoring Beginning Teachers: What We Know and What We Don't", *Teaching and Teacher Education* Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 207-216.

Husband, P.A. and Jacobs, P. A. (2009), "Peer Mentoring in Higher Education: A review of the current literature and recommendations for implementation of mentoring schemes", *The Plymouth Student Scientist* Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 228-241.

Hutcheson, P. G. (2006), "Creating a Development Culture through Mentoring", *Employment Relations Today, Wiley InterScience Periodicals* pp. 25-31.

James, K., Bain, R., Duncan, N., Martin, M., Mole, J., Williamson, M. and Wilson, B. (2020), "Critically analysing the ethical dilemmas arising from lecturer and student relationships at the university: pushing social boundaries for institutional revolution", *Educational Process: An International Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 139-152.

Johnson, W.B. (2002), "The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring", *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, Vol. 33 No. 1pp. 88–96.

Joseph, S. and Bryant-Jefferies, R. (2008), "Person-centred coaching psychology", Palmer, S. & Whybrow, A. (Eds.), *Handbook of coaching psychology: A guide for practitioners,* Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp.211-228.

Joshi, A., Liao, H. and Roh, H. (2011), "Bridging domains in workplace demography research: A review and reconceptualization", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No.2, pp. 521–552.

Kane, I. and Campbell, A. (1993), "Mentor and mentor-training in the North West Articled Teacher Scheme", *Mentoring,* Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 16–22.

Karcher, M. J. (2008), "The Study of Mentoring in the Learning Environment (SMILE): A randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of school-based mentoring", *Prevention Science,* Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 99-113.

Kasprisin, C. A., Single, P. B., Single, R. M., Ferrier, J. L. and Muller, C. B. (2008), "Improved mentor satisfaction: Emphasising protege training for adult-age mentoring dyads", *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 163–174.

Kearns, P. T. (2005), "From Return on Investment to Added Value Evaluation: The Foundation for Organizational Learning", *Advances in Developing Human Resources,* Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 135-145.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1983), "Four steps to measuring training effectiveness", *Personnel Administrator*, Vol. 28 No. 11, pp. 19-25.

Koopmann, R., Englis, P. D., Ehrenhard, M.L. and Groen, A. (2021), "Reflections from the Field - The Chronological Development of Coaching and Mentoring: Side by Side Disciplines", *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 137-151.

Lankau, M. J., and Scandura, T. A. (2007), "Mentoring as a forum for personal learning in oganizations" Ragins, B. R and Kram, K. E (Eds.).*The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practices*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 95–122.

Machida, M. and Schaubroeck, J. (2011), "The role of self-efficacy beliefs in leader development", *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 459–468.

Maltbia, T. E., Marsick, V.J. and Ghosh, R. (2014), "Executive and Organizational Coaching: A Review of Insights Drawn From Literature to Inform HRD", *Advances in Developing Human Resources* Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 161-183.

Nagarajan, C. V. and Edwards, J. (2015), "The Role of Universities, Employers, Graduates and Professional Associations in the Development of Professional Skills of New Graduates", *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice,* Vol.3 No. 2, pp. 26-37

Nielsen, K. and Randall, R. (2012), "The importance of employee participation and perceptions of changes in a teamwork intervention", *Work and Stress*, Vol 26, No. 2, pp. 91-111.

Nixon, J. (2007), "Excellence and the Good Society", Skelton, A. (Ed), *International Perspectives on Teaching Excellence in Higher Education,* Routledge, UK, pp. 15–31.

Office for Students. (2021), "Projected completion and employment from entrant data (Proceed) Updated methodology and results report", available at: https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/b4bd5b29-0ddb-4e68-9ebf-811c111f150f/proceed-updated-methodology-and-results.pdf (accessed 07 December 2021)

Owen, H. (2011), *The complete guide to mentoring: how to design, implement and evaluate effective mentoring programmes,* Kogan Page, London.

Parsloe, E. and Wray, M. (2016), *Coaching and Mentoring: Practical Techniques for Developing Learning and Performance,* 3rd ed, Kogan Page, London.

Peng, Z., Gao, B. and Zhao, H. (2019), "Coaching leadership and subordinates' career success: The mediating role of leader–member exchange", S*ocial Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 47 No. 11, pp. 1-8.

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L. and Miller, J. S. (2000), "Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes", *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 1177–1794.

Richard, O.C., McKay, P.F., Garg. S. and Pustovit, S. (2019), "The impact of supervisor–subordinate racial-ethnic and gender dissimilarity on mentoring quality and turnover intentions: do positive affectivity and communal culture matter?", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 30 No. 22, pp. 3138-3165.

Sneider, P. and Bakhshi, H. (2017), *"The Future of Skills: Employment in 2030",* Nesta Report, available at: https://www.nesta.org.uk/report/the-future-of-skills-employment-in-2030/ (accessed 07 December 2021)

Sosik, J. J. and Godshalk, V. M. (2000), "The role of gender in mentoring: Implications for diversified and homogenous mentoring relationships", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 102–122.

Stevenson, J., Whelan. P. and Burke. P. J. (2017), "Teaching Excellence in the Context of Frailty", Kinchin, I. M and Winstone, N. E (Eds.), *Pedagogic Frailty and Resilience in the University*, Sense Publications, pp. 63–77.

Stewart, J. and Knowles, V. (2002), "Mentoring in Undergraduate Business Management Programmes" Paper presented at the *European Conference on Educational Research*, University of Lisbon.

Storrs, D., Putsche, L. and Taylor, A. (2008), "Mentoring expectations and realities: An analysis of metaphorical thinking among female undergraduate protégés and their mentors in a university mentoring", *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 175-188.

Suiryan, K. (2013), "Emergent leadership paradigms for corporate sustainability: a proposed model", *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 173-182.

Tamkin, P., Yarnall, J. and Kerrin, M. (2002), "Kirkpatrick and Beyond: A review of models of training evaluation", *IES Report,* Brighton, UK.

Tan, Y. S., Teo, S. W. A., Pei, Y., Sng, J. H., Yap, H. W., Toh, Y. P. and Krishna, L. K. R. (2018), "A framework for mentoring of medical students: thematic analysis of mentoring programmes between 2000 and 2015", *Advances in Health Sciences Education: Theory and Practice* Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 671–697.

Thomas, S. J. and Douglas, P. J. (2004), *Structured Mentoring: A New Approach that Works*, ASTD Press, US.

Usmani, A., Omaeer, Q. and Sultan, S. T. (2011), "Mentoring undergraduate medical students: Experience from Bahria University Karachi", *Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, Vol. 61 No. 8, pp.790–794.

Way, C., Kaye, B., Scheef, D., Thomas, S. and Douglas, P. (2011), "Tools for effective mentoring programs", *Human Capital* Vol. 28 No. 1112, pp. 1-24.

Western, S. (2012), *Coaching and Mentoring - A Critical Text*, Sage, London.

Yin, R. K. (2009), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods,* 4th ed, Sage, London.

Zachary, L. J. (2005), *Creating a Mentoring Culture: The Organization's Guide,* Jossey-Bass, UK.

	Condell *et al.* (2011)	Andrews and Clark (2011)	Andreanoff (2016)	Busse *et al.* (2018)
Intervention type	Peer-assisted learning	Peer coaching	Coaching and mentoring	Management support youth mentoring
Design **Development**	Clear expectations Clear leadership	Effective marketing On-going staff engagement	Identify/recruit coaches or mentors Identify/recruit suitable learners Right to decline or accept or withdraw Awareness and understanding for all stakeholders	Generate idea Gain support Decide model Obtain funding
Delivery	Qualified competent facilitation Boundary clarity Pre-training Skill development and support	Rigorous selection process Recruit early Match mentees and mentors within subject/discipline areas, demographic, criteria relevant in targeted mentoring Implement high-quality training	Develop and deliver mentor/coach training Ensure learners are aware of responsibilities and relationship boundaries Match mentors/coaches with learners Ensure accommodation is available for sessions	Set up programme Develop infrastructure and policies Assess risk management Work with partners Programme for context Manage relationships
Maintenance	Timetable for increased engagement	On-going peer support for mentors and mentees Introduce flexibility if required (mentees to swap mentors) Ongoing evaluation Listen and act upon feedback Introduce formal recognition of peer mentor efforts (a certificate of achievement/participation)	Provide ongoing support for the duration of relationships Identify and resolve issues linked to maintaining the relationship Obtain regular feedback from mentors/coaches/learners and stakeholders Evaluate midway	Ensure funding Manage partnerships Engage mentees and mentors Continued assessment and evaluation Adapt for long-term sustainability

Table 1. Other authors' views on requirements for educational coaching and mentoring interventions

Points of comparison	Case Study 1 (coaching)	Case Study 2 (mentoring)
Employability focus	Key skills	CV, applications, interviews
Context	HE	HE
University	UK – widening participation	UK – widening participation
Faculty	Business School	Business School
Established	2 years	10 years
Student participation	1,500	250
Duration	3 months – final year	9 months – final year
Coach/mentor	External	External
Early diagnosis of needs	Pre-assessment	None
Support material – coachee/mentee	Handbook and communication updates	None
Support material – coach/mentor	Toolkit	Handbook
Coach/student ratio	1:6	1:2 (max)
Key learning	Knowledge/cognitive skills affective-related networks	Knowledge/cognitive skills affective-related networks

Table 2. Summary of the two programmes

Points of comparison	Case Study 1 (coaching)	Case Study 2 (mentoring)
1. Link with other initiatives	Standalone	Standalone
2. Senior management commitment	Yes	Yes
3. Funding/budget	Yes	No
4. Selection/application process	Yes	Yes
5. Matching	Some student selections	Programme leader chooses
6. Coach/mentor training	Qualified/trained externally	Volunteers/trained internally
7. Induction for coachee/mentees	Yes	Yes
8. Supporting toolkit/handbook/contract	Yes	Yes
9. Support and supervision for both parties	Yes – weekly drop-in	Yes – planned every 2 months
10. Record keeping/evaluation	Yes	Yes

Table 3. Comparing the programmes against agreed requirements

Recommendations	Additional detail
1. Link with other initiatives	Make clear links with other initiatives at course/unit level and related university services (careers).
2. Senior management commitment	Ensure senior management commitment (Dean and Head of School) at the start and throughout. Encourage them to support the marketing (budget/advertising), highlighting benefits for both parties and to be involved in meetings, induction, celebrations.
3. Funding/budget	Agree funding from external projects or internal initiatives. Be clear about what paying for: experience, appointments only. Manage expectations with both parties at the start (to maximise/target spend).
4. Selection/application process	Formal recruitment process for coaches/mentors; consider 'qualifications' of the coach/mentor, their experience with students and connection with the institution. For students, provide clarity on eligibility, programme timeframe. Active participation in the application process makes a clear commitment from the start.
5. Matching	Permit student choice from list of coaches/mentors from diverse backgrounds, experience etc. Be aware of matching sensitivities. Offer opportunities to change, after they have had first meetings.
6. Coach/mentor training	Provide training for coaches/mentors with clear definitions, roles/responsibilities, code of conduct/ethics, sensitivities, boundaries with other university roles, skills, clarity about focus, meetings, process, expectations.
7. Induction for coachees/mentees	Provide induction sessions for students to clarify expectations (both ways), timescales (an academic year), importance of contract, ethics, code of conduct etc. It is important to ensure that expectations are clear about how to be a good coachee and mentee. Invite previous students to share their experiences.
8. Supporting toolkit/handbook/contract	Create and share an (e-)handbook including code of conduct, contract, models, tools, key signposting for students, complaints procedure. Use intranet/webpages to host information; keep up to date. Share with both.
9. Ongoing support/supervision for both coach/mentor and students	Offer formal supervision-type sessions, mandatory attendance. Consider informal too: 'virtual coffees' and CPD/masterclasses.
10. Record keeping and evaluation	Evaluate impact and outcomes via multiple feedback opportunities and record keeping. Use intranet to share, collate information; consider e-options.

Table 4. Our 10 recommendations for HE in more detail