Executive Summary

Formal mentoring programs have become popular because many organizations believe these programs help to grow and keep good employees. From 2011 through 2014, the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, offered the Level II Mentoring Program to all civilian employees located at the Defense Supply Center Columbus (DSCC) and its detachments located around the world. The Level II Mentoring Program, designed to assist in the development and retention of a knowledgeable workforce, is geared towards those employees who aspire to one day assume a leadership position. One of the objectives of this research was to determine if the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Level II Mentoring Program has the elements that make up a successful mentoring program. Other objectives were to determine if the Level II Mentoring Program is an effective leadership development and employee retention tool and to make recommendations to the leadership of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, to improve the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program.

The research utilized a program evaluation of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program. The scope of this research was limited to the civilian employees who participated in the Level II Mentoring Program in program years 2011 through 2014. Through the literature review, it was discovered that several critical elements make up a successful mentoring program. Once the critical elements of a successful mentoring program were identified, the researcher collected Level II Mentoring Program data from published program booklets, the contracted vendor, and the acting program manager to determine the program elements. The Level II Mentoring Program elements were then evaluated
in comparison to the critical elements of a successful mentoring program found in the literature review.

To further evaluate the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program, hypothesis testing was used. The first research hypothesis suggested that many of the Level II Mentoring Program former mentees would be promoted. The results showed the former mentees are not promoted, at least not in the short term. However, the longer a former mentee remained with the agency, the more likely they would receive a promotion.

The second hypothesis proposed that the turnover rate of the former mentees would be lower than the agency employee turnover rate. In this case, the results showed the Level II Mentoring Program is not an effective employee retention tool. The mentees who participated in the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program from 2011 to 2014 had a much higher turnover rate than that of the agency overall.

Since a lot of time and money is invested in the Level II Mentoring Program offered by the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, the leadership is encouraged to determine why former mentees of the program leave the agency at a much higher rate than that of other employees who leave the agency. Perhaps by working with the DLA Human Resources Services, the DLA Land and Maritime Activity can develop exit survey questions related to the employee’s involvement with the Level II Mentoring Program to provide insight to the problem. Along with exit survey questions, a post-program survey and evaluations of the former mentee’s performance metrics could be implemented to further gauge the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio.
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Chapter 1

Definition of the Problem

Introduction

With the aging of the Department of Defense (DoD) workforce, there is growing concern regarding the loss of leadership and the wealth of institutional knowledge these leaders will take with them upon retirement. The DoD agencies recognize the impact this loss of leadership and expertise could have on the continued success of their programs as well as their ability to attract and retain high performing employees with leadership potential. To address this problem, many DoD agencies have implemented programs geared towards acquiring and retaining high potential and engaged employees to fill leadership roles. Such programs include new on-boarding processes, job rotation opportunities, and tuition assistance, along with leadership and executive development programs. These programs are designed to facilitate knowledge transfer and help newer employees gain the experiences and skills necessary to move in to productive journeyman positions and leadership roles as they become available.

The DoD’s Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio, strongly encourages its employees to participate in leadership development and job rotation programs. In the early 2000’s, the DLA Land and Maritime Activity took leadership and career development one step further by implementing several mentoring programs. One of the programs, the Level II Mentoring Program, is geared towards high-potential engaged employees who desire to move into leadership positions. The focus of this research was to determine if the DLA Land and Maritime Activity’s Level II Mentoring Program is effective as a leadership development and employee retention tool.
**Problem Statement**

The effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio is unknown.

**Scope**

The population for this study included all civilian government employees at the Defense Supply Center Columbus (DSCC) situated in Columbus, Ohio who are employed by the DLA. This included employees of the primary level field activity known as the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, and its detachment personnel located across the globe along with other DLA tenant activities located at the DSCC. The sample consisted of the total number of mentees who participated in the Level II Mentoring Program as established by the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, in program years 2011 through 2014.

**Overall Research Plan**

The overall research plan for this study included four research objectives to address the problem statement. The four research objectives were achieved using two research hypotheses and two research questions, as shown in Figure 1.

---

**Figure 1: Overall Research Plan**
Research Objectives (ROs)

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio. The research objectives (ROs) and related research hypotheses (RHs) and research questions (RQs) that guided this research are listed below:

- RO#1: To identify the critical elements that make a mentoring program a successful leadership and employee retention tool
- RO#2: To determine if the current Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio, has the critical elements that make up a successful leadership development and employee retention tool.
- RO#3: To determine the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio, based upon the proportion of mentees promoted to leadership positions and mentee retention rate compared to the Agency employee retention rate.
- RO#4: To make recommendations to leadership at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio, to improve the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program.

Research Hypotheses (RHs)/Research Questions (RQs)

- RH#1: Many participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio are promoted to leadership positions.
- RH#2: The turnover rate for participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio is lower than the Agency employee turnover rate.
- RQ#1: What are the critical elements that make a mentoring program a successful
leadership development and employee retention tool?

- RQ#2: Does the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio have the critical elements that make up a successful leadership development and employee retention tool?

- What actions should leadership at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus, Ohio take to improve the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program?

**Summary List of Assumptions**

1) The mentees in the Level II Mentoring Program were participants of the DLA Pathways to Career Excellence (PaCE) Program who entered the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, with a target promotion grade of General Schedule (GS)-11. This means that at the end of the PaCE two-year program period, the mentee was likely promoted to the GS-11 pay grade. Therefore, any promotions to the GS-11 pay grade were ignored for purposes of analyzing the promotion rate of the Level II Mentoring Program mentees.

**Summary List of Limitations**

1.) The employee retention rate data reflects the number of employees who left the DLA during the time period studied and does not include those employees who transferred from the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, to another location or hiring activity within the DLA.

2.) The mentee promotion data does not reflect the General Schedule (GS) pay grade of those mentees who are no longer employed by the DLA. The researcher was unable to determine the GS grade level of those former mentees at the time of their departure from the Agency.
3.) With respect to the number of promotions and the turnover rate, the time frame of the study was limited to program years 2011 through 2014. The promotion and retention rate of former DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, mentees prior to the time frame studied was unknown.

4.) The total number of DLA employees who have participated in a mentoring program Agency-wide is unknown. The sample population was derived solely from one activity, known as the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio.

**Summary**

In an effort to retain and further develop their newer employees, the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, like many organizations, implemented mentoring programs. The agency’s Level II Mentoring Program was designed to retain and help high-potential employees acquire basic leadership skills. The focus of this research was to determine if the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program is an effective employee leadership development and retention tool.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

There is a wealth of information regarding the benefits of mentoring programs in the workplace. Many of the studies and articles focus on what it takes to establish a mentoring program and the various elements or features that make a mentoring program a success. While there are some variances in the literature with regard to what makes up a good mentoring program, five factors appear to be essential to ensuring program success. These five factors, or critical elements, are voluntary participation, program training, a structured matching process, goal setting with measurable outcomes, and management support (Davis, 2005; Johnson, 2015; Kahle-Piasecki, 2011; McCauley, 2007).

Theory

What is Mentoring? Before considering what makes up a successful mentoring program, mentoring needs to be defined first. According to Sambunjak and Marusic (2009, p. 2591), mentoring is defined as “a dyadic relationship between a more experienced or senior person (mentor) and a less experienced or junior person (mentee)”. This definition also tells us what mentoring is not; it is not formal job training, supervising, counseling or peer-to-peer coaching. A mentoring relationship can be informal or formal and is a developmental opportunity for both the mentee and the mentor (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992).

Many times informal mentoring relationships occur within an organization (Sambunjak & Marusic, 2009). This type of mentoring relationship usually begins through casual interactions between senior and junior associates which may, or may not, be work related (Chao, et al., 1992). As a result of these exchanges, the potential mentee may gain favor and prove to be
worthy of the mentor’s guidance and attention (Chao, et al., 1992). When this happens, the
senior associate takes a more junior associate under his or her “wing” and helps to guide the
mentee along their career path (Chao, et al., 1992). One unique characteristic of an informal
mentoring relationship is usually both participants exhibit a high level of commitment to the
relationship and its goals (Sambunjak & Marusic, 2009). This close bond more readily enables
the exchange of institutional information as well as new ideas and may, or may not, be supported
by the organization at which both participants work (Sambunjak & Marusic, 2009). Along with
this, the duration of an informal mentoring relationship is not predetermined and often lasts for
long periods of time (Sambunjak & Marusic, 2009).

A formal mentoring relationship develops from a program sponsored by an organization
and is usually designed to develop targeted goals and employee populations within a limited time
frame (Douglas & McCauley, 1999). A survey of 246 companies conducted by Douglas and
McCauley (1999), found that thirty percent of mentoring programs are started in order to develop
high-potential employees with the intention of filling future senior-level or other key leadership
positions. These types of mentoring arrangements are established for a specific time period with
particular organizational as well as mentee/mentor goals in mind (Douglas & McCauley, 1999).
Formal mentoring differs from informal mentoring in that the relationship is initiated in a much
different manner (Douglas & McCauley, 1999). Where informal mentoring begins with mutual
interests and casual interaction, formal mentoring begins with mentees being matched with
mentors via a systematic process oftentimes administered by an external company (Wanbert,
**Previous Research Studies**

**Voluntary participation.** A mentee has much to gain from their participation in a mentoring program such as greater networking opportunities and possible career advancement. The support and guidance from a more senior associate can help to boost the mentee’s operational knowledge and self-confidence, thereby making the mentee a more productive part of the organization at a faster rate than employees who do not participate in a mentoring program (Davis, 2005). Although mentees stand to gain personal and career advantages, it seems a mentee who volunteers may realize more value for participation over those who do so involuntarily. According to Davis (2005), the mentee-mentor relationship may be more beneficial to a voluntary mentee because they are more likely to be open to developmental tasks and criticism.

It is quite obvious that mentors are essential to a successful mentoring program in that if there are not any mentors, then the mentees would not have the support they are looking for, nor would the organization even have a mentoring program. When choosing mentors, it is important to select those individuals who reflect the organization’s desired management skills, qualities, and attitudes so that mentees can experience these characteristics first-hand (McCauley, 2007). Good interpersonal and communication skills are other traits necessary to enable the mentor to offer guidance or coaching in a meaningful way (McCauley, 2007).

Although it is very important to carefully select the mentors who will provide guidance to the organization’s future leaders, the research indicates the manner in which the mentor is brought into the program plays a large part in its overall success. Parise and Forret (2007) concluded that voluntary mentor participation is positively related to perceived benefits and a rewarding experience by the mentor. The mentors who participate voluntarily may look at the
program differently than those who are instructed to participate (Parise & Forret, 2007). For instance, mentors who volunteer may get a sense of satisfaction from passing on knowledge and skills to the next generation of leaders. Along with this, voluntary mentors may enjoy possible recognition from peers and leadership for going above and beyond in the course of their work to ensure organizational continuity (Davis, 2005). On the other hand, when a mentor is an unwilling participant, the mentoring process may be viewed as a burden. When this occurs, the mentee as well as the mentoring relationship may not be developed to its full potential, whether it’s due to perceived time constraints, lack of interest in the process, or resentment because of the additional workload (Davis, 2005; Foster, 2009). All of this could have an impact on the time invested by the mentor as well as the quality of the mentoring, especially if the mentor feels pressured by other job priorities and commitments (Parise & Forret, 2007). As Deborah Holmes of Catalyst, a non-profit research organization, stated, “When you force someone to be a mentor, you get a crummy mentor” (Boyle, 2005, p. 14).

Training. As with any new role or job function, it is important to teach the mentor and mentee the various aspects of the mentoring program. This may include an orientation, the mentoring process, describing the roles of the each participant, and how those roles contribute to the overall goals of the program and ultimately the organizational goals. The participants should also be taught how to develop a meaningful relationship that facilitates knowledge transfer quickly; for the benefit of the mentee, the mentor, and the organization (Poulsen, 2006). The importance of this type of training cannot be overstated. The more the mentees and mentors understand the process and what is expected of them, the quicker they will be able to establish a rapport that will enable them to accomplish the goals of their organization as well as those goals specific to their relationship (Hegstad, 2002).
According to McCauley (2007), it is very important for the mentor to know their responsibilities and role limitations. The mentor must know the difference between mentoring and supervising their mentees so as not to overstep boundaries or micromanage them. Understanding that knowledge transfer is likely one of the organizational goals of the program, the mentor must be taught to provide guidance rather than direction or solutions when presented with a mentee’s specific dilemma (McCauley, 2007).

Mentor training is also tied to the mentor’s overall satisfaction with the mentoring process and outcomes. The level of training is directly related to the mentor’s perception of the program and their willingness to positively affect the program results (Parise & Forret, 2007). Accordingly, management will realize a higher level of commitment and performance by the mentors if the mentors feel they have received adequate training to fulfill their roles, especially if the mentor is new to the mentoring process and the program (Parise & Forret, 2007).

As for the mentees, their overall perception of the organization and the program may be substantially impacted by the level of program training received. If the organization is willing to invest significant time and effort into the training portion of the program, the mentees may very well view this in a positive light and be more committed to positive outcomes not only for themselves but for the organization as well (Allen, 2006).

**Structured matching process.** Another important aspect of a quality mentoring program is the matching process between the mentor and the mentee. Matching processes vary widely, and in some cases the mentees are paired with a mentor about whom they know little or nothing about, amounting to something akin to a blind date (Chao, 2008). In cases such as this, it can be difficult, if not impossible, to build a successful mentoring relationship (Chao, 2008). On the other hand, according to Koltin (2014) mentees should not be allowed to select their
mentor without some limitations. Since the availability of high-performing mentors is limited, the mentors should work with leadership to be paired with high-potential mentees (Koltin, 2014). Although this may not be popular with the mentee pool, it may make the best use of the firm’s available leadership talent and resources in their effort to grow future leaders (Koltin, 2014).

Whereas some programs do allow the mentee to choose their mentors and vice versa, the more successful programs match the participants based upon common experiences, interests, or background (Kahle-Piasecki, 2011) while keeping the organizational goals in mind. According to Kahle-Piasecki (2011), a good way to match participants is to use a cognitive style approach. A formal personality test such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI Basics, 2016), would be given to the program participants in an effort to reveal personality traits that indicate how they react to social situations or their decision-making processes. By matching like personalities, there is a greater likelihood that the mentoring relationship will be successful (Kahle-Piasecki, 2011).

In either case, a mentoring program should have a “way out” for either the mentor or the mentee if the relationship is not working for them (Hibbard, 2006). Having a plan in place that makes it easier to terminate a poor mentoring relationship eases the discomfort for the parties involved in the termination. This also allows the mentee to readily establish another relationship with a better suited mentor (Hibbard, 2006).

**Goals setting with measurable outcomes.** One the most critical elements that will determine whether or not a mentoring program is successful is goal setting that includes measureable outcomes. As stated earlier, one of the reasons companies implement mentoring programs is to fill voids in leadership roles as well as increase employee retention rates. The program should improve not only the individual mentee’s professional career, but also increase
the mentee’s overall value to the organization through increased job performance, morale, job knowledge and willingness to remain with the company (Johnson, 2015). For this reason it is imperative to have procedures in place that will enable the program manager and senior staff to measure the success of the program. Regular reviews of the program that evaluate whether or not the company is meeting goals also helps to keep the program on track and enables management to make adjustments if an element of the program does not produce the desired results (McCauley, 2007). More importantly, if mentee progress is measured throughout the program period and at later intervals beyond program year end, management will be able to identify the mentoring program’s strengths and weaknesses and make changes as necessary (Coley, 1996).

Another reason to have stated goals is to ensure that mentoring is really taking place. Goals that are measurable require that the program managers monitor the relationships to ensure the participants meet on a regular basis and are engaged in other program activities (Lawrence, 2008). The program managers should be informed on the progress of each relationship and report the outcomes to senior leadership (Lawrence, 2008).

**Management support.** Perceived organizational support is critical to the connection between management and employees especially with respect to employee commitment and turnover (Dawley & Buckley, 2010). Perceived organizational support theory supposes that employees’ perception of an organization’s support for their professional growth and wellbeing can affect their dedication and continued effort towards the goals and mission of the organization overall (Dawley & Buckley, 2010). Since mentoring programs are not considered a standard job training tool, the existence of such a program can be viewed as a benefit by employees and may enhance the employee-employer relationship as well as their perception of the level of
management support (Dawley & Buckley, 2010). Management support is one of the most essential elements that make up a successful mentoring program (Dawley & Buckley, 2010). It was noted in almost every study or article reviewed that if a mentoring program does not have organizational and management support it will most likely fail.

Not only does lack of management support affect the quality of the program due to probable lack of funding, it will also impact the quality of mentoring received by the mentees because the mentors will likely feel their participation is not worth the extra effort (Parise & Forret, 2007). However, when mentors have a high perception of management support researchers in one study found they are more likely to positively affect their mentees’ attitudes towards the organization (Hu, Wang, Yang, & Wu, 2014). When mentors feel supported and valued they will be actively involved in the mentoring process thereby increasing the likelihood that their mentees will be an engaged, productive, and long-term associates (Hu, et al., 2014).

In addition to overall management support, it is also a good idea to have a senior leader as a champion for the program. By doing this, the organization signals the program is deserving of the participants’ time and energy, and will help to maintain the focus of the program (Johnson, 2015).

**Employee promotion and retention.** In a report by the U. S. Government Accountability Office, by September of 2017 almost 600,000 federal employees will be eligible for retirement (2014). The loss of these long-term employees could place a tremendous burden on federal agencies with respect to continuity, knowledge sharing, and available leadership expertise. To help reduce the impact of losing so many employees to retirement, agencies have implemented mentoring programs in an effort to retain employees and develop those with high potential into future leaders (Office of Personnel Management, 2008).
The private sector, which is also dealing with a large number of baby boomer retirements, incorporates mentoring programs into their employee training toolkit for the same reasons as the federal government. One company, Sun Microsystems, published the results of an internal study of their own mentoring program which found that more than half of their former mentees had received a promotion (2009). Along with this, over a 5-year period, 20% of the mentees were likely to receive a raise (Dickinson, Jankot, & Gracon, 2009). The results also showed that the mentee retention rate was higher than that of the general employee population at Sun Microsystems (Dickinson, et al., 2009).

Summary

Formal mentoring programs have gained popularity in recent years because organizations believe they help to grow and keep good employees. The research indicates that in order to for an organization to reap the benefits of a successful mentoring program, the program should incorporate several critical elements. These elements are voluntary participation, training, a structured matching process, goal setting with measurable outcomes and management support (Davis, 2005; Johnson, 2015; Kahle-Piasecki, 2011; McCauley, 2007).

According to the literature review, not only do organizations stand to gain from implementing a mentoring program, the participants do as well. Mentees who participate may have more opportunities for advancement and pay increases than employees who do not take part in the available programs, while organizations who offer mentoring programs may see a reduction in their employee turnover rate.
Chapter 3

Research Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this research project was to evaluate the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program as it was administered in program years 2011 through 2014, and whether or not it has the critical elements of a successful mentoring program. Additionally, research was conducted to determine the proportion of former mentee promotions and mentee retention rate as compared to the DLA as a whole. Ultimately, the goal of this research was to assist the leadership of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, when deciding if the Level II Mentoring Program should be continued, modified or discontinued in its entirety.

Data Collection Plan

This research utilized a program evaluation of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program. The research was both qualitative and quantitative in nature.

Secondary Data

The DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Level II Mentoring Program data were collected from the mid-year survey and end-of year reports, the program booklets, and the 2011 through 2014 program year mentee list as provided by the vendor, as well as a brief interview of the acting program manager for clarification purposes. The data derived from these sources were used solely to evaluate the Level II Mentoring Program and for no other purpose. The researcher received permission to use these materials from the Deputy Commander of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio (see Appendix B).
The researcher also used the current employment status as provided by the DLA Learning Management System to determine whether or not the former mentees who participated in the Level II Mentoring Program in plan years 2011 through 2014 are still employed by the DLA. The DLA Learning Management System also provided the current grade level of each of the former mentees. Both the turnover and grade level information was used as the basis to evaluate Research Hypotheses #1 and #2. In an effort to prevent disclosure of personally identifiable information per the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Deputy Commander research permission letter (see Appendix B), all names and other forms of personally identifiable information were not included in the research paper data and tables.

Sample Size

The DLA Land and Maritime Activity’s Level II Mentoring Program is open to all employees of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, including detachment personnel located around the world. This program is also offered to DLA tenant activities located at the Defense Supply Center Columbus (DSCC), Columbus, Ohio. The sample size for this study consisted of all 172 former mentees who participated in the Level II Mentoring Program as administered by the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in program years 2011 through 2014 (The Training Connection, personal communication, March 7, 2016).

Data Analysis Plan

An evaluation of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program documentation provided the overview of the Level II Mentoring Program as offered to the organization’s mentor and mentee pool. A review of materials such as advertisements, recruiting materials, printed handouts, and surveys also provided details regarding the program elements. Most importantly, once the existing components were
determined, the analysis compared the current program elements to what the literature review has determined to be fundamental features to a mentoring program’s success.

Leadership development is a key reason organizations implement mentoring programs (Lawrence, 2008). To achieve a leadership position within an organization, an employee usually has to be promoted to a higher paid position. To determine if the Level II Mentoring Program mentees had received a promotion, a list of former mentees from program years 2011 through 2014 was collected from the contracted vendor that included the name, job title, and pay grade of each mentee who participated in the program years. This list was then used to compare the mentee’s pay grade when they enrolled into the Level II Mentoring Program to their pay grade in the organization’s Learning Management System at the time the study was conducted.

Employee retention is another reason given for having a mentoring program (Lawrence, 2008). Using the previously mentioned list of mentees, the turnover rate of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, former Level II Mentoring Program mentees was compared to the Agency’s overall turnover rate.

Hypothesis Test Steps

- RH#1: Many participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, are promoted to leadership positions.

1. Determine the null and alternative hypotheses:

   \[ H_0: \Pi \geq .50 \]

   \[ H_1: \Pi < .50 \]

2. Determine the level of significance:

   \[ \text{Alpha} = .01 \]

3. Determine the test statistic:
Z calculated = $\frac{P - \Pi}{\text{SP}}$ where \( \text{SP} = \sqrt{\frac{PQ}{n}} \)

4. Determine the critical value:

\[
Z \text{ critical value} = -2.33
\]

5. Make calculations from sample data (see Chapter 4).

6. Make statistical decision (see Chapter 4).

7. State conclusion and make recommendations (see Chapter 5).

- RH#2: The turnover rate for participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, is lower than the Agency employee turnover rate.

1. Determine the null and alternative hypotheses:

\[
\text{H0: } \Pi \leq .071
\]

\[
\text{H1: } \Pi > .071
\]

2. Determine the level of significance:

Alpha = .01

3. Determine the test statistic:

\[
Z \text{ calculated} = \frac{P - \Pi}{\text{SP}} \text{ where } \text{SP} = \sqrt{\frac{PQ}{n}}
\]

4. Determine the critical value:

\[
Z \text{ critical value} = -2.33
\]

5. Make calculations from sample data (see Chapter 4).

6. Make statistical decision (see Chapter 4).

7. State conclusion and make recommendations (see Chapter 5).
Summary

Qualitative descriptions were used to present the majority of the data. This will enable the researcher to show the critical elements of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program and how the elements are implemented within the program. Hypothesis testing was used to evaluate the promotion and turnover rates of former mentees who participated in the Level II Mentoring Program.
Chapter 4
Data Analysis

Introduction

According to the literature reviewed, a successful mentoring program should have at a minimum these five critical elements. These critical elements are voluntary participation, training, a matching process, goal setting with measurable outcomes, and management support (Davis, 2005; Johnson, 2015; Kahle-Piasecki, 2011; McCauley, 2007). Analysis of the Level II Mentoring Program as administered by the Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, indicates the program does have the five critical elements of a successful mentoring program. The findings of this research are described in the following paragraphs.

Summary of Data Collected

The DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program is a formal mentoring program managed within the agency by a program manager located in the DLA Human Resources Services, DLA Training Activity (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). The program manager works with the contracted vendor to coordinate and oversee the program once the funding is established and the contract is awarded. According to Amy Brumfield, acting program manager for the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program, during program years 2011 through 2014, the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity in Columbus Ohio was administered by The Training Connection, Inc., a contractor based in Prince William, Virginia (personal communication, March 17, 2016). Working in partnership with Dynamic Enterprise Solutions, Inc., The Training Connection developed The Mentoring Connection, a complete, feature
packed, web-based tool developed to enable organizations to easily establish and run a formal mentoring program (The Training Connection, 2016).

**Voluntary participation.** Participation in the Level II Mentoring Program is entirely voluntary for all participants as noted in the promotion materials (Defense Logistics Agency, 2015, p. 2). At the onset of the program year the program manager works with the vendor to establish the Level II Mentoring Program schedule (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). Once the schedule is set, the program manager advertises the program and application process to the DLA Land and Maritime Activity employee population in a variety of different ways such as brochure emails and informational seminars (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). Any employee in a General Schedule (GS)-09 through GS-12 graded position with an interest in leadership development is encouraged to apply as a mentee (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016).

Mentors are recruited in much the same way as the mentees except the program manager includes emails to former mentees to participate as mentors in the upcoming program year (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). The program manager also maintains email distribution lists of current and former mentors and intermittently solicits their participation in the program (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016).

Using the web-based mentoring program tool (The Training Connection, 2016), potential mentees must apply to the program. The application allows the potential mentee to select the competencies or skills they want to improve upon, state their career goals, and articulate what their expected outcomes are as a result of participating in the Level II Mentoring Program (The Training Connection, 2016). The application helps the employee to focus on their strengths and weaknesses and put on paper areas they acknowledge can be improved (Brumfield, personal
communication, March 17, 2016). The application, along with the DISC assessment (discussed in the following section), will also assist the employee in selecting their mentor based on their development needs and desired outcomes. The employee’s supervisor must approve the application and once approved, the employee becomes part of the mentee pool in the Level II Mentoring Program year (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). After all the mentees and mentors are selected the program year begins.

**Training.** The Level II Mentoring Program officially begins with the orientation held at the start of the program year (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). It is during the orientation session that the participants learn the mechanics of the program and the level of engagement and involvement expected by each of them (Drahosz, 2013). The program manager also explains the curriculum and extra-curricular activities specifically required of the mentees (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). These extra-curricular activities are stretch assignments designed to provide leadership roles in an effort to introduce the desired leadership qualities the DLA Land and Maritime Activity hopes to develop through the Level II Mentoring Program (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016).

During the orientation, The Training Connection facilitator thoroughly covers the various aspects of the DiSC assessment (Drahosz, 2013). This is so the mentee gains a better understanding of the results and how he or she may react in certain situations. The mentors and mentees also receive guidance on how to complete the Mentoring Agreement Form and the Mentoring Action Plan, both of which help to define their roles and objectives while in the mentoring relationship (Drahosz, 2013).

**Structured matching process.** One the employee’s application is approved, the vendor distributes and administers The Target Training International DiSC assessment, a behavior
assessment tool based on behavioral theory introduced by psychologist William Moulton Marston (Talent Insights, 2016). Developed by Target Training International, the DiSC assessment focuses on four behaviors: dominance, influence, steadiness, and compliance, thus the acronym DiSC (Talent Insights, 2016). The participating mentors also complete the assessment. Each mentee and mentor receives a detailed report that describes how he or she will likely react when asked about situations illustrating the four behavior dimensions (Drahosz, 2013). This report is intended to be used as a guide in conjunction with the mentee’s application and the mentor’s biography, to assist the mentee when selecting their mentor (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). The DiSC assessment can then be used in conjunction with the Mentoring Agreement Form and the Mentoring Action Plan to develop meaningful goals and additional tasks or projects that further develop the competencies identified in the mentee’s application (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016).

At their initial meeting, the mentee and mentor complete the Mentoring Agreement Form and the Mentoring Action Plan together. The Mentoring Agreement Form helps the mentor and mentee identify the logistics of their mentoring relationship. It requires that the two define their roles, discuss when they will meet, the frequency of the meetings and who is responsible for setting up the meetings (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). The Mentoring Agreement Form also facilitates the discussion as to the acceptable form of communication, i.e., phone call or email and how the mentee can reach out to the mentor in the event of an unusual circumstance (Drahosz, 2013). It is especially critical that the parties develop an exit strategy in the event that the relationship does not move forward in a manner that is a positive and conducive to achieving the goals of the mentoring relationship (Hibbard, 2006).
Where the Mentoring Agreement Form details the logistics of the relationship, the Mentoring Action Plan provides the written vision and goals of the mentoring relationship. Not only does the mentor help the mentee to develop their vision, he or she ties the mentee’s goals to the stated developmental competencies selected in the application process (Drahosz, 2013). Working together they assign learning activities with specific start and end dates that will develop one or more of the competencies (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016).

**Goal setting with measurable outcomes.** One of the most critical elements of a successful mentoring program is for the program to have stated goals with measurable outcomes (Hegsted, 2002). The Level II Mentoring Program has specific over-arching goals geared towards the development of the employees who participate in the program. According to the most recent End of Program Report for the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, the stated goals are

1) build and retain a well-rounded cadre of employees,
2) enhance communication and collaboration at all levels within DLA Land and Maritime,
3) foster an open environment where information is shared and knowledge is transferred, and
4) improve individual performance, productivity and innovation (The Training Connection, 2015, p. 1).

Achievement of the stated goals is then measured through two different surveys conducted within the program year. The first survey occurs midway through the program and provides feedback from the first-line supervisors as well as overall program effectiveness from the perspective of the mentees, as well as the mentors (The Training Connection, 2014). The second survey is conducted at the end of the program year and becomes part of the End of Program Report (The Training Connection, 2015). The outcomes of the program are clearly
detailed for presentation to the leadership of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, within the End of Program Report provided by the contracted vendor, The Training Connection (2015).

**Management support.** Of all the critical elements of a successful mentoring program, the most important is management support or perceived organizational support. The Level II Mentoring Program offered by the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, has an abundance of support from senior leadership all the way down to the front-line supervisors. The mere fact that senior leadership at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, budgets for the Level II Mentoring Program is an indicator that the program is supported at the highest levels within the organization. Even during the budget cuts and employee furloughs as directed by former DoD Secretary Hagel in May 2013 (Hagel, 2013), the Level II Mentoring Program continued, signifying the great value senior leadership places on developing its employees. Along with the funding, leadership ensures personnel are available to adequately manage the program according to the acting program manager Amy Brumfield (personal communication, March 17, 2016).

Not only does the DLA Land and Maritime Activity senior leadership support the Level II Mentoring Program, the mid-level and front-line supervisors do as well. As stated previously, the Level II Mentoring Program mentors participate in the program voluntarily, most of whom are managers or supervisors says Ms. Brumfield, (personal communication, March 17, 2016). They are not required to participate and their involvement is not part of their regular job duties, yet many continue to do so for multiple program years (Brumfield, personal communication, March 17, 2016). Furthermore, though the number of supervisors who do not volunteer to be mentors in the program outnumber those who do, these supervisors also support the program by
actively monitoring the progress of the mentees and regularly submitting program surveys when requested to do so (The Training Connection, 2015).

**Employee promotion and retention.** Along with the analysis of the elements that make up the Level II Mentoring Program as administered by the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, two other indicators of success were also studied. The two aspects considered were leadership development and employee retention. To this end, the mentee list provided by the contracted vendor (personal communication, March 7, 2016) and employment status and current grade level extrapolated from the DLA Learning Management System (Defense Logistics Agency, 2016) were consolidated into Table 1 below. The information, broken down by program year, provides the number of mentees who participated as well as the number of mentees who left the agency since the end of their program year. The table also provides the number of former mentees who were promoted since their participation in the Level II Mentoring Program. These data were then used to complete the Hypothesis Test Steps that follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Participants*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Number That Left DLA**</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Number of Mentees Promoted to GS-12 or higher**</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number derived from The Training Connection Mentee List
** Number derived from DLA Learning Management System

**Table 1: Level II Mentoring Program Consolidated Mentee Data**
RH#1. Many participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, are promoted to leadership positions. With regard to acquiring a leadership position, one would expect to receive a promotion to a higher grade level. For purposes of this research, it was assumed that many, at least 50%, of the former mentees of the Level II Mentoring Program would be promoted to General Schedule pay grade 12 or higher after participating in the Level II Mentoring Program.

Hypothesis Test Steps

- RH#1: Many participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, are promoted to leadership positions.

1. Determine the null and alternative hypotheses:

   \[ H_0: \pi \geq .50 \]
   \[ H_1: \pi < .50 \]

2. Determine the level of significance:

   \[ \text{Alpha} = .01 \]

3. Determine the test statistic:

   \[ Z \text{ calculated} = \frac{P - \pi}{SP} \]
   \[ \text{where } SP = \sqrt{PQ} \]

4. Determine the critical value:

   \[ Z \text{ critical value} = -2.33 \]

5. Make calculations from sample data.

   \[ P = .372 \]
   \[ Q = 1 - P = 1 - .372 = .628 \]
   \[ SP = \sqrt{(\frac{.372)(.628)}{172}} = .037 \]
6. Make statistical decision.

Since the \( Z \) calculated = \(-3.46\) < \( Z \) critical = \(-2.33\), reject the null hypothesis.

The mentees in the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program are not being promoted 50% or more of the time.

7. State conclusion and make recommendations. (see Chapter 5).

Based on the results of the hypothesis testing, the null hypothesis was rejected because the results show that less than 50% of the former mentees of the Level II Mentoring Program in program years 2011 through 2014 had been promoted to a grade level of 12 or higher.

Analysis of the individual years’ promotion rates indicate that a longer period of time is needed to secure a promotion to a higher grade level. The promotion trend of former mentees indicates the longer a mentee remained with the DLA Land and Maritime Activity after completing the program the greater the likelihood he or she would be promoted. The exception to this trend is calendar year 2013 when the Federal Government was experiencing the effects of Sequestration and reduced budgets, and as a result, the Department of Defense lost a high number of employees across the board (Hagel, 2013). Figure 2, shown below, depicts the promotion trend of former mentees of the Level II Mentoring Program for the program years 2011 through 2014. The graph shows that the longer a former mentee of the Level II Mentoring Program remains with the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, the more likely they will receive a promotion.
Figure 2: Level II Mentoring Program Mentee Promotions by Year

RH#2. The turnover rate for participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, is lower than the Agency employee turnover rate.

Since employee retention is one of the stated over-arching goals of the Level II Mentoring Program (The Training Connection, 2015, p. 1), research was conducted to evaluate the turnover rate of the former mentees of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program as compared to the turnover rate of the Agency as a whole. The researcher predicted that the turnover rate of former mentees of the Level II Mentoring Program would be lower than that of the DLA. According to data published by the Office of Personnel Management (2016), the average turnover rate of DLA employees for fiscal years 2011 through 2014 was 7.1% as depicted on Table 2. The average turnover rate of the former mentees for the same time period was 15.1% (see Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Employees Beginning</th>
<th>Number of Employees Ending</th>
<th>Number of Separations</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25,290</td>
<td>25,377</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25,377</td>
<td>25,316</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25,316</td>
<td>23,998</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23,998</td>
<td>23,671</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99,981</td>
<td>98,362</td>
<td>7,009</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Personnel Management (2008)

**Table 2: Defense Logistics Agency Employee Turnover Rate**

**Hypothesis Test Steps**

- RH#2: The turnover rate for participants in the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, is lower than the Agency employee turnover rate.

1. Determine the null and alternative hypotheses:

   \[ H_0: \mu \leq 0.071 \]

   \[ H_1: \mu > 0.071 \]

2. Determine the level of significance:

   \[ \text{Alpha} = 0.01 \]

3. Determine the test statistic:

   \[ Z \text{ calculated} = \frac{P - \mu}{SP} \quad \text{where} \quad SP = \sqrt{\frac{PQ}{n}} \]

4. Determine the critical value:

   \[ Z \text{ critical value} = 2.33 \]

5. Make calculations from sample data.

   \[ P = .151 \]
\[ Q = 1 - P = 1 - 0.151 = 0.849 \]

\[ SP = \sqrt{0.151 \times 0.849} = 0.27 \]

\[ Z \text{ calculated} = \frac{0.151 - 0.071}{0.027} = 2.96 \]

6. Make statistical decision.

Since \( Z \) calculated = 2.96 > \( Z \) critical value = 2.33, reject the null hypothesis.

The turnover rate of the mentees in the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program former mentees was higher than the DLA as a whole.

7. State conclusion and make recommendations (see Chapter 5).

As the hypotheses testing shows, the mentees who participate in the Level II Mentoring Program have more than twice the turnover rate as that of the overall employee population of the DLA. In other words, the retention rate of former mentees of the Level II Mentoring Program at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, was lower than that of the agency as a whole.

**Summary**

According to the literature, a successful mentoring program should have at least five critical elements: voluntary participation, training, a matching process, goal setting with measurable outcomes, and management support. An analysis of the Level II Mentoring Program as administered by the Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, indicates the Level II Mentoring Program is well-developed and does have the five critical elements of a successful mentoring program. However, hypotheses testing indicated that the DLA Land and Maritime
Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program may not be an effective employee retention and employee development tool.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to analyze the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio Level II Mentoring Program. Data from the existing Level II Mentoring Program were evaluated to determine if the program has the critical elements of a successful mentoring program as described in the literature review in Chapter 2. This study also looked at the promotion and turnover rates of the former mentees who participated in the Level II Mentoring Program in calendar years 2011 through 2014 as possible indicators as to the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program with respect to mentee leadership development and retention rates. Specific recommendations are offered in order to improve upon the Level II Mentoring Program as it is currently administered.

Summary

In the very near future, almost 31% of the Federal workforce is expected to retire (Government Accountability Office, 2014). As those who are eligible to retire leave the government, they will take with them an abundance of institutional knowledge and leadership that will be difficult to replace. In an effort to avoid the impact of losing this institutional knowledge and leadership, many agencies are implementing mentoring programs (Office of Personnel Management, 2008). One such agency is the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), whose Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, has implemented several different mentoring opportunities, one of which is the Level II Mentoring Program.

Leadership development is one of the many reasons organizations implement a mentoring program (Lawrence, 2008), and more often than not, advancement to a leadership position...
usually means a promotion. Although a promotion is not guaranteed, the program is geared towards those who aspire to leadership positions as suggested by the promotional materials (Defense Logistics Agency, 2015). The promotion rate of the former mentees was assumed to be at least 50% which is the success rate Sun Microsystems claimed in their study published in 2009. Analysis of the promotion data of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program former mentees for the program years 2011 through 2014 showed only 37.2% of those who participated in the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Level II Mentoring Program were promoted to a General Schedule (GS) grade 12 or higher. However, the research also indicated that the longer the former mentees remained with the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, the greater the likelihood they would receive a promotion to a GS-12 pay grade or higher.

Employee retention is one of the stated goals and objectives of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program (The Training Connection, 2015, p. 1). The research showed that from 2011 through 2014 the overall DLA employee turnover rate was 7.1%. During that same time period, the turnover rate of former mentees of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program was at 15.1%. Analysis of the data determined that the Level II Mentoring Program was not a successful employee retention tool based upon mentee turnover rate as compared to the overall Agency turnover rate.

Conclusions

The existing industry research indicates that mentoring programs can be successful leadership development and employee retention tools (Koltin, 2014; Johnson, 2015) that should include voluntary participation (Davis, 2005; Foster, 2009; McCauley, 2007; Parise & Forret, 2007), training (Allen, 2006; Parise & Forret, 2007), a structured matching process (Kahle-
Piasecki, 2011), stated goals with measurable outcomes (Coley, 1996; Johnson, 2015) and management support (Dawley & Buckley, 2010; Hu, et al., 2014; Parise & Forret, 2007). The evaluation of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program as it was administered during program years 2011 through 2014 shows that it is clearly comprised of these critical elements.

The Level II Mentoring Program is completely voluntary for those prospective mentees and mentors who wish to participate, and training is provided through information seminars even before the program year begins. The mentor/mentee matching process is structured and includes an individual behavioral assessment that enables mentees and mentors to be matched based upon common ground. The goals of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program are unambiguous and measured mid-year and at the end of the program year through comprehensive surveys. To evaluate knowledge transfer and the employee development goals of the program, the surveys included feedback not only from the participants of the program, but the mentees’ first-line supervisor as well (The Training Connection, 2014). Finally, leadership support for the Level II Mentoring Program is unmistakable. From senior leadership down to the first-line supervisors of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, support for the Level II Mentoring Program is shown by participating as mentors in the program, encouraging employees to participate as mentees, and ensuring that funding is provided, even in times of fiscal constraint.

Though expressly excluded as a stated goal of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program (Defense Logistics Agency, 2015), the potential for mentees who participate in the program to be promoted to a pay grade that may lead to a leadership position is less than that of mentees who participate in other organizations’ mentoring programs within the
4-year time period analyzed. However, when each individual years’ promotions are analyzed, the trend indicated that the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program former mentees are promoted at a similar rate as those who participate in the Sun Microsystems mentoring program.

Employee retention is specified as one of the major goals of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program (The Training Connection, 2015, p. 1). Unfortunately, this goal is not being met based on analysis of the retention rate of former mentees who participated in program years 2011 through 2014. When compared to the agency’s average turnover rate during the 4-year period studied, the average turnover rate of the former mentees is more than double the turnover rate of the agency during the same 4-year period.

**Recommendations**

1. *Since a lot of time and money is invested in the Level II Mentoring Program, DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, should determine why former mentees are leaving the DLA at a higher rate than employees who leave the Agency overall.*

The personnel responsible for administering the program should work with the DLA Human Resources Services to develop a short exit survey that includes questions regarding a departing employee’s level of participation in the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program. The surveys should be responsive in that if the employee answers “Yes” to being asked whether or not they participated in the Level II Mentoring Program, the next one or two questions should be structured to extract additional information pertaining to the employee’s perception of whether or not the Level II Mentoring Program helped them in their professional development. For instance, a follow-on question could be “Do you feel your participation in the
Level II Mentoring Program had a positive impact on your ability to successfully perform the duties of your job while employed at the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio?"

Additional survey questions could also help the DLA Land and Maritime Activity leadership discover if the exiting employee will continue to be employed and if so, where. It is quite possible the former mentee is transferring to another hiring activity within the Federal Government. If this is the case, although the DLA may feel the loss, the former mentee will still be a contributing member of the Federal Government workforce. Ultimately, the survey should delve into the reasons behind why the employee, or former mentee, decided to leave the agency. Once the reasons for the departures are known, the leadership can then address the high turnover rate of the Level II Mentoring Program mentees.

2. **Add a 6 month post-program survey to the Level II Mentoring Program.**

The program as it exists now does a very good job of evaluating the effectiveness of the program during the actual program year. However, once the program year is completed, there is no follow-up to evaluate the program’s long-term effectiveness. A post-program evaluation six months from the end of the program year would help to further evaluate the effectiveness of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity Level II Mentoring Program.

One post-program survey should be geared more towards the mentee’s perception of their professional development as a result of their participation in the Level II Mentoring Program. For instance, mentees could be asked if the networking opportunities they were introduced to in the program continued to be of benefit six months later. The former mentees could also be asked to describe how they have applied the knowledge, skills and abilities learned from their mentoring experience to their current job. Not only could the questions be tailored to provide insight to the success of the program with respect to employee development, the questions could
also give an indication as to the level of employee satisfaction the former mentee is experiencing. This would enable management to address a problem that may or may not impact an employee’s decision to stay with the DLA.

3. **Evaluate the effectiveness of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program based on quantitative metrics along with the qualitative evaluations.**

   Currently the mentees’ supervisors are asked whether or not their employee’s current job performance was impacted positively or negatively as a result of the mentee’s participation in the Level II Mentoring Program. They are also asked if their employee has applied new interpersonal and technical skills to their job. These type of questions are important because it makes sense that management would not want an extra-curricular activity such as the Level II Mentoring Program to take away from their employee’s ability to perform their regular job duties. However, it is also important to know whether or not the mentee’s actual job performance has increased as a result of their participation in the Level II Mentoring Program.

   A survey of the mentee’s supervisor should include questions geared towards understanding how much their employee’s level of performance improved as a result of their participation in the Level II Mentoring Program. A comparison of the employee’s productivity before and after their participation in the program would further establish the effectiveness of the Level II Mentoring Program. Since improved individual performance, productivity and innovation is a stated goal of the Level II Mentoring Program a review of the actual performance metrics would determine whether or not that goal is being met.
Future Research Recommendations

With ever-shrinking budgets, it is important for government agencies such as the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, to continually evaluate programs established to retain and develop good employees which, in the end, should enhance the agency’s ability to achieve its mission. The results of this study showed that in the long-term, those mentee’s who remain with the agency do realize the opportunity for professional advancement to leadership positions, which ultimately benefits the agency. However, the results clearly indicated that many of the former mentees left the agency at a rate that is more than double that of the agency turnover rate. This information has opened the door for further research to determine why the mentees choose to leave the agency. Once the reasons for the former mentees departure from the agency are understood, modifications to the Level II Mentoring Program can be made in an effort circumvent their leaving the agency.

Not only is it important to understand why the former mentees leave, it is also important to find out where they go when do leave. Programs such as the Level II Mentoring Program are expensive to run and administer and in some cases, under-utilized by the employee population. Although the time and expense developing the former mentees is borne by the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, it could be that the Federal Government still reaps the benefits of the employee development effort. If that is the case, the dollars spent would be a worthwhile investment, but at this time, this information is unknown.

Study Contribution

The research conducted yielded mixed findings as to whether the DLA Land and Maritime Activity, Columbus, Ohio, Level II Mentoring Program is successful. The Level II Mentoring Program is a robust program that has the critical elements of a quality mentoring
program as suggested by previous research studies. However, by looking at quantitative data, not just qualitative data, such as the mentee turnover rate compared to the agency turnover rate, this study provides important insight as to whether the program is meeting the overarching goals that signify it is a successful program.
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Appendix A

List of Terms and Definitions

Activity: The moniker for a cost center or supply chain within the DLA.

Defense Logistics Agency (DLA): A federal Department of Defense Agency. The primary mission of this Agency is to support the Warfighter.

Defense Supply Center Columbus (DSCC): The physical location of the DLA Land and Maritime Activity located in Columbus, Ohio.

General Schedule (GS): The pay scale designation for the white-collar workers at the DLA and other Federal Government agencies.

Land and Maritime: A primary level field activity within the DLA whose primary customers are Army (Land) and Navy (Maritime).

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: An inventory of 16 different personality types to help an individual understand their own personality and how better to relate with others (MBTI Basics, 2016).
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