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Foreword

This evaluation of the Mentoring At-Risk Youth project was initiated by Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) in October of 2007, adding to an extensive body of research that P/PV had conducted on mentoring over several decades. When P/PV ceased operations in July of 2012, this report was still in development. Our colleagues at MDRC generously agreed to publish the report. The findings and conclusions are solely those of the authors.
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Introduction

More and more, mentoring programs are being asked to serve higher-risk youth—for example, those in foster care or the juvenile justice system or youth with a parent who is incarcerated.\(^1\)\(^2\) This impulse is understandable: Studies have illuminated the varied benefits that mentoring programs can provide, including improving academics and relationships with others and reducing involvement in problem behaviors.\(^3\) Higher-risk youth are clearly in need of such support.

While these youth are often viewed through the lens of likely future costs to their communities, they also embody enormous unrealized potential. With the right kinds of support, these young people could put themselves on a path toward bright, productive futures, and make vital contributions to their families, neighborhoods and nation. Many hope that mentoring programs can help make this vision a reality. Yet few studies have examined and compared the benefits of mentoring for youth with differing types or sources of risk.

The Role of Risk: Mentoring Experiences and Outcomes for Youth with Varying Risk Profiles presents findings from the first large-scale study to examine how the levels and types of risk youth face may influence their relationships with program-assigned mentors and the benefits they derive from these relationships. The study looked closely at the backgrounds of participating youth and their mentors, the mentoring relationships that formed, the program supports that were offered, and the benefits that youth accrued—and assessed how these varied for youth with differing “profiles” of risk. We believe the study’s results provide useful guidance for practitioners, funders and policymakers who want to know which youth are best suited for mentoring and how practices might be strengthened to help ensure that youth facing a variety of risks get the most out of their mentoring experience.

This summary highlights the major findings and implications from the full report, which is available at www.mdrc.org and www.wamotoress.org.

Key Findings from the Study

This study examined mentoring program relationships, experiences and benefits for higher-risk youth, with five key findings:

- Without substantial effort beyond their normal outreach strategies, programs were able to reach and serve youth facing a wide range of challenges.
- Youth with differing risk “profiles” (that is, levels and types of risk) had relationships of similar strength and duration and derived similar benefits from program participation.
- However, the challenges reported by mentors and the reasons matches ended differed as a function of youth’s risk profile.
- The strongest program benefit, and most consistent across risk groups, was a reduction in depressive symptoms—a particularly noteworthy finding given that almost one in four youth reported worrisome levels of these symptoms at baseline. Findings also suggested gains in social acceptance, academic attitudes and grades. Youth did not appear to benefit in their relationships with parents or in their positive or negative behaviors.
- Mentors who received early-match training and consistent program support met more frequently and had longer-lasting relationships with their mentees. Youth whose mentors received training also reported higher-quality relationships.

About the Study

In 2007, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation commissioned an independent evaluation to examine the services and effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth with different profiles of risk. Washington State Mentors (WSM) served as the project’s intermediary, providing implementation oversight and support to participating programs. WSM selected seven mentoring programs serving youth in Washington State\(^4\) to participate in the initiative. All the programs utilized volunteers to provide one-to-one mentoring to youth in community settings.\(^5\) Five of them were operated by Big Brothers Big Sisters agencies.
The programs were asked to reach out to “higher-risk” youth—that is, youth who faced significant personal and/or environmental challenges. We then collected information about:

- **Youth risk**, through a detailed survey administered to parents at enrollment;
- **Youth outcomes**, through surveys administered to youth (and, for a portion of the sample, parents) first at program enrollment and then again at a 13-month follow-up;
- **Mentor program experiences**, through surveys completed by mentors;
- **Mentoring relationship quality**, through surveys of mentors and youth;
- **Mentor-youth meetings, match duration and program supports**, through program records and surveys completed by the supervisors of case managers; and
- **Program practices**, through surveys administered to program staff.

### Who Did the Programs Reach?

All participating programs were asked to reach out to “higher-risk” youth. One of the issues we set out to explore was how successful they were in these efforts.

The seven programs reached youth facing a wide range of challenges—without significant effort beyond their normal outreach strategies. The programs enrolled 1,310 youth in the study, who ranged in age from 8 to 15 (and averaged a little over 11 years old). About half were male, and 57 percent were ethnic minorities. As in many mentoring programs around the country, a large proportion of the youth came from single-parent homes (about two thirds) and low-income households (about two fifths had annual incomes below $20,000). In addition, nearly three quarters (71 percent) faced some type of “individual-level” risk—for example, academic struggles, behavior problems or mental health concerns.

Considering various criteria and definitions, the youth in the study are, as a whole, best categorized as “higher risk” rather than “high risk.” As a group, the youth in our study were much more likely to face a number of risk factors than the average child in the US, but few had engaged in behaviors like substance use or crime that are often used to determine “high-risk” status, perhaps in part because they were fairly young. Thus, overall, the youth in the study are best thought of as “higher risk”—a designation that falls somewhere between what would typically be characterized as “at risk” and “high risk.” However, there was substantial variability in both the levels and types of risk that these youth experienced.

**Assessing Youth Risk**

The study’s approach to assessing risk drew on past research suggesting that both “environmental” risk (that is, challenges in the youth’s surrounding life circumstances, such as poverty or living in a dangerous neighborhood) and “individual” risk (that is, challenges in the young person’s behavior, social or academic functioning, or health) may shape the extent to which youth benefit from mentoring. Based on a survey of parents, we categorized youth into four distinct risk profiles:

- Youth relatively high on both individual and environmental risk (the “highest-risk” youth in the sample),
- Youth with relatively low individual but high environmental risk,
- Youth with relatively high individual but low environmental risk, and
- Youth relatively low on both types of risk (the “lowest-risk” youth in the sample).

### What Kinds of Relationships Did Youth Experience?

The relationships between youth and their mentors are the central route through which mentoring is generally thought to benefit young people, and research has linked stronger and longer mentoring relationships to more favorable youth outcomes. In this study, we found that:

Mentors and youth reported fairly strong relationships. We explored three aspects of youth-reported relationship quality: 1) closeness; 2) the extent

...
to which the relationship included opportunities for learning and working toward goals; and 3) the extent to which the mentor considered the youth's interests and input. Almost three quarters of youth reported at least a moderately positive relationship with their mentor across all three of these dimensions. Mentors, on average, also reported fairly strong feelings of closeness toward their mentee.

Yet, almost half of the youth had experienced at least one match closure by the time of our 13-month follow-up survey. Some of these youth had been rematched, yielding an average of 9.6 total months of mentoring across all matches. Still, overall, only about 60 percent of participants were in an active match at follow-up. Mentors reported initiating the end of the match more than half of the time. Two of the most common reasons cited by mentors were “not enough youth interest” (33 percent) and, similarly, the impression that the youth did not seem to need a mentor (17 percent). Despite the serious challenges faced by many of these youth, in only about 10 percent of cases did mentors report that the match closed because the youth’s needs were too severe.

Importantly, match quality and length did not vary notably based on the youth’s risk profile. The frequency of meetings between youth and their mentor and the total number of hours the match met throughout the study period were also, for the most part, consistent across the risk groupings.

The similarities in relationship quality and duration across the risk groups belie very different challenges and reasons why matches ultimately ended. For example, mentors who were matched with youth who were relatively high on individual risk were more likely to report significant challenges with their mentee’s behavior. In contrast, mentors matched with youth high on environmental risk were more apt to report challenges connecting with and getting support from the mentee’s family as well as frequent cancellations of match meetings by youth. Mentors matched with the lowest-risk youth were most likely to report relationships ending due to a lack of youth interest or the youth not seeming to need a mentor.

**Assessing Youth Outcomes**

The evaluation’s design allowed us to assess the effects of mentoring program participation in two ways:

- **Experimental/Random Assignment Component:** In the first year of the evaluation, in the two largest programs, about half of the youth were randomly selected to be matched immediately with mentors (the “treatment group”), while the remaining half (the “control group”) were not eligible for matching until after the study’s 13-month follow-up assessment. To assess impacts, we compared the change over time in the outcomes of youth in the treatment group to that in the control group.

- **Quasi-Experimental Component:** In the other five programs and during the second year at the two largest programs, all eligible youth were enrolled in the evaluation and offered a mentor. In this study component, we compared the change over time in the outcomes of all youth who were offered a mentor without going through random assignment to that in the control group from the random assignment portion of the study (in this context, referred to as a “comparison group”).

**How Did Youth Benefit?**

Findings suggest that mentoring benefited youth’s emotional/psychological well-being, peer relationships, academic attitudes, and grades. At the 13-month follow-up assessment, findings from the quasi-experimental portion of the evaluation indicated that mentored youth were doing significantly better than youth in the non-mentored comparison group on a number of important outcome measures. In particular, these youth reported:

- Fewer depressive symptoms;
- Greater acceptance by their peers;
- More positive beliefs about their ability to succeed in school; and
- Better grades in school.

We also wanted to assess whether mentored youth did better overall across the set of outcomes we tested. Mentoring is believed to address the distinct needs of participating youth, suggesting that only
some youth may benefit in any particular area (a gain that might be missed when examining change in individual outcomes across an entire group). Thus, we developed a measure of aggregate positive change for this study and found that mentored youth in fact showed meaningful improvement in a greater number of our key outcomes than youth in the comparison group.

In the random assignment portion of the study, we found evidence of significant benefits for only two outcomes: depressive symptoms and the aggregate measure of positive change. Because these two impacts were found in both components of the evaluation, we believe the study provides particularly strong evidence about the programs’ benefits in these areas. The evidence for mentoring’s ability to influence academics and peer relationships is more moderate.

Program benefits were not evident in either portion of the evaluation for the other outcome measures we assessed:

- Positive behavior toward peers;
- Skipping school;
- Misconduct; or
- Parent trust.

Youth also did not differ on our aggregate measure of the number of outcomes for which there was evidence of negative change.

**Did Impacts Vary by Youth’s Risk Profile or Other Background Characteristics?**

Overall, program benefits were fairly similar for youth regardless of their risk profile and other background characteristics. Indeed, youth in all four risk groups appeared to derive at least some gains from their participation. The study’s findings as a whole thus suggest that the benefits of volunteer-centered community-based mentoring are not confined to youth with particular types or levels of risk. There were some exceptions to this general pattern—most notably a trend toward somewhat stronger and more consistent benefits for youth who were relatively high on individual but not environmental risk.

**How Were the Matches Supported?**

Programs varied in the types and amount of support they offered to participating matches. And even within each program, matches varied in their experience of key supports—for example, how much training mentors received and the extent to which they felt training and support were sufficient. As part of their involvement in the study, three programs also implemented specific enhancements that were designed to increase the support available to matches. When we examined various program practices, we found that:

Matches received fairly similar types and levels of support regardless of youth’s risk status, with one notable exception. Mentors paired with youth who were relatively high on individual risk were more likely to have had early-match training and regular support contacts with program staff. They also reported lengthier support calls.

Mentors’ self-reported training/support needs did differ markedly depending on their mentee’s risk profile. For example, mentors paired with the highest-risk youth were more likely to say they needed help learning how to interact with the youth’s family or navigating social service systems, while those whose mentees were high on individual risk reported greater concerns about dealing with youth’s social and emotional issues.

The supports received by mentors, parents and youth were linked with key match outcomes.

Mentors who received early-match training met more frequently with their mentee and were more likely to have a match that lasted at least 12 months. In addition, youth paired with these mentors rated their mentoring relationship as being of higher quality. Regular support calls from case managers to mentors were also linked with longer-lasting matches and more frequent meetings between mentors and youth. The findings suggest that the quality of case manager support was important as well, contributing to both the strength and longevity of the match. Finally, matches in which parents and youth received regular support calls from case managers met more frequently than matches without this level of support.
Implications for Practitioners and Funders

The findings from this study have several noteworthy implications for practitioners and funders:

1. **Training and support for matches should be tailored to the types and levels of risk experienced by youth.** We found significant differences in the challenges and support needs that mentors recounted, based on their mentee’s risk profile. Although matches involving higher-risk youth seemed to present greater challenges, all matches, including those with the lowest levels of risk, brought distinct issues and concerns. This highlights the need to tailor program training and support to the specific levels and types of risk faced by participating youth. To do this effectively, programs will need to systematically assess youth risk at intake, gathering information about difficulties in the youth’s environment and about personal challenges, such as behavior problems or mental health issues. Funders should support programs’ efforts to better measure youth risk and to tailor the training and support they offer accordingly.

2. **Mentoring should be broadly available, as youth with varying levels and types of risk appear to derive important benefits.** Overall, the study did not find strong evidence that mentoring benefited youth differently based on their risk profile or other background characteristics. These findings argue against restricting eligibility or recruitment efforts to youth with particular risk profiles or backgrounds, at least for programs that are structured similarly to the ones in this study. At the same time, for programs interested in targeting higher-risk youth, the study’s findings provide optimism that such youth can be recruited and that, with the right supports in place, these youth can derive significant benefits from mentoring.

3. **Greater emphasis should be placed on the mental health needs of youth and the benefits that mentoring can provide in this area.** Depression has been linked to a host of short- and long-term problems for young people, including suicidal behavior, academic and social difficulties, and increased risk for substance abuse and teen pregnancy. It was striking that almost one in four youth in this study reported high levels of depressive symptoms at baseline. Our findings offer robust evidence that participation in mentoring programs can ameliorate and/or prevent the emergence of depressive symptoms. This is highly encouraging, given the number of other areas (personal, social and academic) that may benefit from better mental health. One key implication for programs is the importance of careful screening for mental health issues, both at intake and over the course of a young person’s involvement in the program, in combination with referral mechanisms for youth who are in need of additional support. At the funding level, the findings from this study suggest that mental health outcomes should be given greater weight in designing and evaluating the success of mentoring initiatives.

4. **Efforts should continue to improve the strength and consistency of the benefits that youth derive from mentoring programs.** As a whole, the findings of this study point to a positive, but somewhat inconsistent pattern of benefits for youth who had access to volunteer-centered, one-to-one community-based mentoring over a 13-month period. For example, the evaluation found no evidence that mentoring helped to curb youth involvement in problem behavior. This aspect of the study’s results underscores a need for moderation when forecasting the likely impact of mentoring as an intervention strategy. The findings also suggest, however, that by improving program supports (such as the training provided to mentors or to the staff who support the matches), it may be possible to strengthen mentoring relationships and potentially, in turn, increase the impact of program involvement on youth outcomes. Funding support will be necessary to make large-scale in-roads in this area. These efforts should include support for intermediary organizations that can broker needed technical assistance and bring programs together to share lessons about effective practice.

While these caveats are important to keep in mind, we believe the findings from the study support an optimistic outlook about the role that mentoring programs can play in the lives of youth facing a wide variety of risks—including those who are often deemed “hardest to serve” in social programs (that is, those who are relatively high on both environmental and individual risk). In sum, the high hopes that policymakers and funders have had for mentoring programs serving higher-risk youth may
be well founded, particularly if programs continue to refine their efforts to ensure that matches get the targeted training and support they need.

**Endnotes**


2. In this report, “higher-risk” youth also include youth with other types of serious challenges, such as mental health difficulties and those experiencing relatively large numbers of risk factors across different life domains.


4. One program was based in Oregon, but agreed that at least 80 percent of participating youth would live in adjacent Washington communities that also were part of its service area.

5. In one program, mentors did not meet with youth on their own in the community. However, because the matches met in a variety of settings (at the university that houses the program, in youth’s schools, and at monthly family activities), it was characterized as, at least in part, a community-based mentoring program.


9. This total reflects the amount of time the youth had been mentored at the time of their follow-up survey. Many of these matches were ongoing, however. Thus, they ultimately lasted longer than what we measured at follow-up.

10. “Training” in the initiative needed to have several characteristics, including being interactive and curriculum-based; thus, a basic orientation to program guidelines and expectations would not qualify as training.

