
MENTORING YOUTH ON PROBATION

August 2016

The Criminology Research Group
The University of Montana, Missoula

Patrick McKay
Dusten Hollist
Ally Guldborg
Abby Hobza
Jessica Mayrer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Definitions	1
Literature Review	1
Mentors	3
Matching	3
Age of Mentor	3
Commitment Length	4
Mentor Compensation	4
Best Practice Programs	5
Type of Program	5
Mission Statement and Outcomes	5
Recruitment and Screening	6
Best Activities	7
Training	8
Collaboration	9
Appropriate Referrals for Mentoring	9
Mentoring Programs in United States	10
General Population	10
At-Risk Population	11
Mentoring Programs in Montana	11
General Population	12
At-Risk Population	12
Recommendations	13
References	22

INTRODUCTION

Youth mentoring programs are used across the United States to increase a host of pro-social behaviors. They also constitute a strategy for decreasing anti-social behaviors. Whether mentoring programs provide structured activities for juveniles with too much free time or facilitate a one-on-one relationship with a positive role model, all such programs share the same goal: to increase the potential for future success. A wealth of evidence indicates that mentoring programs fulfill that mandate. A review of the literature exploring the efficacy of such programs indicates that a variety of positive outcomes result when programs are strongly linked to theory-driven and evidence-based practices (See DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, and Cooper 2002). Seeking to provide guidance for Montana's juvenile justice system, this report itemizes best practice models and techniques employed by the nation's most successful mentoring programs.

DEFINITIONS

Mentoring: "Most commonly, the central feature is a one-on-one relationship between a provider (mentor) and a recipient (mentee) for the potential of benefit for the mentee ... [M]entoring will be defined by the following four characteristics: (1) interaction between two individuals over an extended period of time; (2) inequality of experience, knowledge, or power between the mentor and mentee (recipient), with the mentor possessing the greater share; (3) the mentee is in a position to imitate and benefit from the knowledge, skill, ability, or experience of the mentor; (4) absence of the role inequality between provider and recipient that typifies most helping or intervention relationships where the adult is in authority over of directing expertise toward the child in need of teaching or specific help ... Thus, mentoring differs from professional-client relationships such as counseling or therapy, and from parenting or formal educational relationships" (Tolan, Henry, Schoeny, Lovegrove, and Nichols 2014).

Group mentoring: Herrera, Vang, Gale (2002) describe group mentoring as an effort to serve a greater number of children, "based on the idea that volunteers who interact regularly with small groups of youth can fulfill the role of a mentor - to be a trusted counselor or guide - by developing a number of successful and productive relationships simultaneously ... These programs can provide mentors to a large number of youth without depleting scarce volunteer resources" (p. i).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Recent research indicates that adverse side effects result from traditional juvenile justice system treatments. In 2010, Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, and Carver pinpointed three important findings from such investigations. The researchers stated: (1) Probation and court monitoring, group homes, correctional facilities, and other similar facilities provide limited favorable effects on subsequent recidivism, with some evidence presenting modest negative effects (Lipsey and Cullen, 2007; Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, and Guckenburg, 2010). (2) Deterrence-oriented programs that discipline, survey, and threaten punitive consequences such as Scared Straight, boot camps, and intensive probation supervision show no positive effect, with some evidence indicating an increase in recidivism (Lipsey, 2009). Finally, (3) several "therapeutic" programs meant to increase constructive behavior have shown demonstratively positive effects, even for serious offenders (Lipsey 2009, Lipsey and Cullen 2007, Lipsey and Wilson 1998). If the juvenile justice system's goal is to reduce subsequent problem behavior, findings such as those itemized here indicate that low-risk youth should be diverted from the juvenile justice system. The evidence further indicates that

offenders with a moderate to high risk for reoffending should be subject to minimal supervision with an emphasis on therapeutic services. Any additional punishment beyond what is necessary to preserve public safety is likely to decrease the probability of future success (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, and Carver 2010).

In contrast to findings that link negative outcomes to punitive approaches, research indicates that positive outcomes result from youth mentoring. Studies of mentoring programs applied to the general juvenile population commonly find that mentoring improves academic performance and other school-related outcomes (Jekielek, Moore, and Hair 2002; Rhodes, Grossman, and Resche 2000; Thompson and Kelly-Vance 2001; Karcher 2008; Portwood, Ayers, Kinnison, Waris, and Wise 2005). Other gains have been found in self-perception and attitude (Lerner 2007) and parent-child interactions (Rhodes, Spenser, Keller, Liang, and Noam 2006; Rhodes et al. 2000). Existing literature indicates further that mentoring strengthens peer support and social acceptance (Rhodes et al. 2000).

Studies evaluating the efficacy of mentoring programs for delinquent or at-risk youth also detail positive outcomes. More specifically, research concludes that the continued use of mentoring constitutes a sound strategy for decreasing antisocial behavior (Britner, Balcazar, Blenchan, Blinn-Pike, and Larose 2006; Aos, Lieb, Mayfield, Miller, and Pennucci 2004; Hall 2003; DuBois et al. 2002; DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Silverthorn, and Valentine 2011; Rhodes 2002; Rhodes, Bogat, Roffman, Edelman, and Galasso 2002; Lipsey and Wilson 1998; Wilson, Gottfredson, and Najaka 2001; Tolan et al. 2014). In their meta-analysis, James, Stams, Asscher, De Roo, and Laan (2013) discovered modest positive effects resulting from mentoring programs overall. Those researchers observed further that programs that are well implemented, consist of one-on-one mentoring, and are aimed at older, at-risk youth have the greatest impact. Similarly, DuBois et al. (2002) observed after conducting a meta-analysis of mentoring programs that only small benefits resulted from youth programs overall, but juveniles from disadvantaged or high-risk backgrounds were most likely to benefit. DuBois et al. (2002) found program effectiveness significantly enhanced when a greater number of theory-based and empirically-based best practices are utilized. Strong relationships between mentors and youth also improved the likelihood of positive outcomes. In the latest meta-analysis on mentoring outcomes, Tolan et al. (2014) discovered a similar pattern. As stated in the 2014 study, "Mentoring high-risk youth found positive effects for delinquency and for three other associated outcomes: aggression, drug use, and academic performance (p.197). Overall, research indicates that mentoring programs constitute useful interventions to decrease problem behaviors, recidivism, and substance abuse among juveniles (Britner et al. 2006; James et al. 2013; Yelderman and Thomas 2015; DuBois et al. 2002; Keating, Tomishima, Foster, and Alessandri 2002).

The literature devotes more attention to one-on-one mentoring than group mentoring, and studies evaluating the latter yield mixed results. Herrera, Vang, and Gale in 2002, for example, found that group mentoring reaches mentors who are uninterested in one-on-one mentoring and increases the ability of programs to reach more youth. Group mentoring programs have been shown to increase social skills and aid in relationship building with individuals outside of the group (Herrera et al. 2002). They have also been linked to a modest positive impact on academic performance and attitudes (Herrera et al. 2002). More recently, the 2014 Project Research to Action in Mentoring, a collaborative effort conducted by the University of Missouri-St. Louis and two St. Louis-based social service agencies compared mentor groups with the one-on-one model. Within that study sample, individual mentoring provided more promise than group mentoring for maintaining mentoring relationships (Johnson 2014). Aside from that deduction, the study found no difference in outcomes between the two. The sample size in that study was small, however, and outcomes could have been

influenced by outside effects. While group mentoring does show potential benefit for programs struggling to encourage sufficient volunteer participation, more research is necessary to determine the impact group mentoring has on at-risk or delinquent youth.

MENTORS

Because quality mentors play a key role in successful programs, screening, training, and matching adults with juvenile mentees constitute essential steps for achieving program success. Due to the limited number of volunteers on hand to participate in mentoring programs, however, program administrators too often overlook those vital tasks.

MATCHING

Research indicates that pairing juveniles with mentors based on specific demographic and social characteristics is beneficial (Yelderman and Thomas 2015; National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention (NCMHP) 2009). Pairing mentors with mentees who are alike increases the likelihood that they will bond. As strong relationships stand to reap the greatest benefit for the mentee, such ties are important (DuBois et al. 2011).

Shared societal or cultural experiences provide a foundation for relationships between mentees and mentors to grow. Mentors able to empathize with barriers a mentee has experienced are well equipped to provide advice on how to successfully navigate and overcome such barriers (Yelderman and Thomas 2015). Research findings suggest that matching mentors and mentees based on race and ethnicity could be beneficial, as shared cultural identities and life experiences stand to undergird strong bonds. Gender, however, is likely the most common match requirement explored in the literature. Holsinger and Ayers (2004) found, for instance, that gender-focused mentor programs increase the likelihood that strong bonds will form between mentors and mentees. Similarly, the National Center Brief on Recruiting and Retaining Mentors (2009) states that mentors are more effective when working with a young person of the same gender.

Though research indicates that shared demographics set the stage for strong mentorship bonds, study findings from the NCMHP in 2009 and elsewhere indicate also that a mentor's personal qualities are important. The NCHMP report states further that exposing youth to mentors with different life experiences can also be beneficial. Additional matching criteria includes activities that mentors and mentees enjoy, such as sports, music, and educational pursuits (Yelderman and Thomas 2015). This type of matching, which is constructed upon finding common ground between mentor and mentee, has been shown to increase program effect (DuBois et al. 2011).

AGE OF MENTOR

Depending on program goals, mentor age can constitute an important variable in the relationship between mentor and mentee. Yelderman and Thomas (2015) describe "cross-generational mentoring" as beneficial for at-risk youth. Research on non-parent adult mentors indicates that mentorships are more successful when aspects of secure parenting relationships are present, rather than simply a peer relationship (VanderVen 2004). Adult experiences overcoming adversity in employment, familial bonds, finances, and health can provide mentees with valuable insight into problem-solving strategies (Yelderman and Thomas 2015).

College students, too, can be a valuable mentorship resource. In the article “Recruiting and Retaining Members” from the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, the authors characterize college students as an underutilized resource. The authors explain that programs could align with college institutions to give college students experience and possible credit for being mentors. This strategy benefits the mentee, while also growing the pool of available mentors (NCMHP 2009). It also serves the college student who stands to gain course credit and the satisfaction that can come from community involvement.

COMMITMENT LENGTH

Mentors are typically volunteers prepared to provide only indefinite time commitments, which can present challenges from an organizational perspective. Research shows that mentor-mentee relationships that last for one year or longer have the greatest positive outcomes for the mentee (Grossman and Rhodes 2002; Rhodes 2008). Roughly half of all formal mentoring relationships, however, end within a few months (Rhodes 2002). Early termination of a mentor-mentee relationship can adversely impact youth (Dubois et al. 2002). Regardless of the reason for termination, the mentee may perceive early termination as an intentional rejection (Downey and Feldman 1996; Dubois et al. 2002). Such instances can foster negative self-perception for the juvenile and increase negative behaviors the program sought to decrease.

Despite negative outcomes associated with early termination, the literature indicates that programs structured to be short term (e.g. six months) can be effective for at-risk youth (Keating, Tomishima, Foster, and Alessandri 2002). Setting defined commitment lengths with mentors and ensuring mentees understand the program length is an important factor to consider when establishing a new program.

MENTOR COMPENSATION

Recruiting and retaining mentors is a common challenge for mentoring programs. It is typical for the number of mentees to exceed the number of mentors needed (Bruce and Bridgeland 2014). Mentors are more reluctant to volunteer for positions when more severely at-risk youth are involved and there is a greater chance of early termination (Grossman and Rhodes 2002). A sizeable body of evidence indicates that training, clear expectations, and quality support from program staff positively impact mentor-mentee relationships and increase relationship duration (Herrera, Sipe, McClanahan, Arbretton, and Pepper 2000; Herrera, Grossman, Kauh, Feldman, McMaken, and Jucovy 2007; DuBois et al. 2002). One strategy to overcome challenges inherent to a limited pool of quality mentors while also increasing commitment length is to compensate mentors for their work on a part-time basis or with full-time employment (Adler and Trepanier-Street 2007).

Research into whether paid mentors forge more successful relationships with children yields mixed results. When conducting a meta-analysis of program outcomes, DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Silverthorn, and Valentine (2011) found no evidence of differential effects between programs in which mentors were compensated for their time and those in which they volunteered. McBride Gonzales, Morrow-Howell, and McCrary (2011), however, found that stipend volunteers served for more hours per week and for longer periods of time than non-stipend volunteers. Stipend mentors also reported higher perceived benefits of participation for themselves and for youth mentees. Some programs hire mentors as full-time employees who solely devote their attention to mentoring. These programs refer to such staff as “professional mentors” (Smith 2004). Lakind,

Eddy, and Zell's (2014) research on professional mentors found that those who perceived their role as a full-time job were more likely to feel confident in their ability to effectively serve high-risk youth. As stated by Lankind et al. (2014), "(A) mentor's sense of themselves as competent experts was seen as vital in navigating complicated and delicate situations effectively. They attributed this competency in part to their previous youth work experience, as well as to their on-the-job training as professional mentors" (p. 720). Tolan et al. (2014) found similar patterns, yet with larger effect sizes, when professional advancement motivated mentor participation. Tolan et al. assert this discovery should raise questions about whether relying solely on volunteers constitutes the best approach for mentoring programs.

BEST PRACTICE PROGRAMS

Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, and Carver (2010) detail three approaches for translating research on effective programs into practice. Those approaches include: (1) implementing with fidelity a program from a list of model programs certified by an authoritative source as demonstrating an acceptable level of evidence to show effectiveness; (2) putting into practice a type of program shown to be effective on average by a meta-analysis of many studies on that program type and doing so in a manner that the research indicates will yield the average effect or better (p. 17); and (3) direct evaluation of each individual program used in practice to confirm its effectiveness and, if it is found ineffective, to use that evidence to improve or terminate it.

TYPE OF PROGRAM

All mentoring can be categorized by how it incorporates three broad elements. Those elements include: (1) connection; (2) setting; and (3) program purpose or intent (Anastasia, Skinner, and Mundehenk 2012). The first component, connection, encompasses how the mentoring relationship is formed. Connection can form naturally, or be assigned. Naturally formed mentor relationships occur spontaneously without an organization aiding the relationship. Alternatively, assigned connection mentor programs utilize an organizational structure that matches mentors with mentees, often also providing training and other support. All mentoring programs utilize assigned connection. The second element, setting, includes community-based or school-based mentor services. School-based programs tend to focus on school-related outcomes, such as improving grades or attendance, while community-based programs often include more diverse goals, such as making behavioral, emotional, and relationship gains (Anastasia et al. 2012). Research indicates that a combination of settings constitutes best practice for mentoring programs (DuBois et al. 2002). The final component, intent, is used to classify whether a program is designed to satisfy either prescriptive or developmental purposes. Prescriptive mentoring emphasizes behavioral and attitudinal goals and has been found to be effective (Rhodes, 2007; Spencer 2007). Research indicates that developmental programs, which have been characterized as "youth driven and activity focused" (Langhout, Rhodes, and Osborne 2004; Anastasia et al. 2012), are more effective (DuBois et al. 2002).

MISSION STATEMENT AND OUTCOMES

A strong mission statement guides a program toward logical goals and objectives. As such, the mission statement constitutes a key organizational building block for at-risk mentoring programs (Thomas 2014; Yelderman and Thomas 2015). Characteristics of effective mission statements: (1) emphasize the organization's core values; (2) recognize the major spheres of interest in which the organization operates; (3) provide a long-term or strategic point of view; (4) focus on a limited

number of goals; and (5) point to desirable organizational outcomes (Thomas 2014). Short, memorable, and meaningful mission statements are most effective.

A strong mission statement that articulates a concise yet comprehensive vision should serve as a roadmap to achieve outcome goals (Mihalic, Irwin, Fagan, Ballard, and Elliot 2004). Such guiding documents also directly influence the type of mentors a program recruits and the training mentors receive. All mentoring programs share a primary directive: to achieve successful outcomes for youth. Successful outcomes can be defined in a number of ways. Anastasia, Skinner, and Mundehenk (2012) summarize the concept of success for the general juvenile population as it applies to mentoring into four major categories. Those categories include: (1) becoming a long-term contributing member of society; (2) improving self-worth; (3) increasing potential for success; and (4) improving communication skills. At-risk or delinquent youth programs often include goals specific to the demographic they serve, such as striving to increase community safety, pro-social behavior, and family functioning, while also reducing substance abuse (Yelderman and Thomas 2015). Mentoring programs are most effective when there is a clear link between agency outcome goals and prevention methods.

RECRUITMENT AND SCREENING

Individuals are more inclined to volunteer as a mentor for a program if it has a solid reputation and community support (NCMHP 2009). Strategies used to recruit potential mentors are diverse and include program representative attendance at volunteer and career fairs and outreach among community groups, local leaders, the media, and religious organizations (Yelderman and Thomas 2015; NCMHP 2009). Recruitment strategies are based on the type of mentors a program seeks to employ, whether a program is hiring a professional mentor, for instance, versus mentors who will receive a stipend or college credit. Also, according to Garringer et al. (2015 p. 13), it is beneficial in the recruitment stage to explain how volunteering can positively impact the potential mentor, conveying, for instance, “enjoyable interactions with mentees, feeling satisfied and fulfilled as a mentor, and receiving personal development opportunities both through receiving mentor training and helping a younger protégé.” For programs seeking to recruit mentors from colleges or high schools, research indicates that conducting outreach directly on campuses is the best approach. The literature indicates further that the propensity to be a mentor declines with age. “Volunteers 16 to 24 years old are the most likely to be mentors, making college age adults and even high-school students prime candidates to be recruited as mentors” (Foster-Bey, John, Nathan Dietz, and Robert Grimm Jr. 2006).

Screening adult volunteers and staff constitutes an essential task for mentoring program administrators. Thorough vetting better ensures mentors are qualified and equipped to serve, while also preserving mentee safety. In addition to examining candidate backgrounds, the screening processes should provide potential mentors with a realistic picture of complexities they may encounter while working with youth (NCMHP 2009). Basic screening practices commonly utilized among mentoring programs include criminal background checks, in-person interviews, personal reference checks, and an evaluation of employment history (Yelderman and Thomas 2015). Interviews serve a foundational purpose for mentoring programs, assisting with screening and also serving to collect information that helps match mentors with mentees. Interviews should seek to determine mentor motivation and experience. They should also gauge what type of time commitment the candidate is capable of fulfilling. Other important questions to answer during the screening process include to what extent if any candidates have engaged in substance abuse and whether racial and cultural sensitivities are present (NCMHP 2009).

In addition to vetting mentors, mentees should be screened for information on their potential needs. Because there is a high prevalence of trauma exposure and traumatic stress among justice-involved youth (Dierkhising, Ko, and Goldman 2013), it is especially important to screen for trauma among criminally involved juveniles. “Children affected by developmental trauma need adults in their lives who can understand the pervasive impact of their experiences and who recognize that the pain from ruptured connections can lead to a range of challenging behaviors. They need adults who can develop trauma-informed approaches that promote healing and connection” (Bath 2008). Successful programs must address specific mentee needs by way of screening, ongoing training for mentors, and collaboration with other key juvenile justice system stakeholders.

BEST ACTIVITIES

While investigating the building blocks required to construct successful mentor-mentee bonds, Keller and Pryce (2012) found that a mentor’s willingness to engage in a child’s life corresponded to relationship quality and youth outcomes. More specifically, the researchers discovered that the “sage/counseling” type of mentor, or one, “who focused on really learning about the student as an individual and also offering support and guidance as the adult in the relationship” (p. 61), was rated most favorably by mentees on multiple quality measures.

The sage/counseling role is characterized by a flexibility around shared activities, a capacity to adjust to mentee needs and overall warmth and caring. Additionally, sage/counseling mentors demonstrate a hierarchical approach when interacting with their mentee. These relationships include verbal sharing by the mentee as well as advice and counsel offered by the mentor. “The verbal sharing often resulted from the mentor expressing interest in the mentee’s personal views, goals and life circumstances” (Keller and Pryce 2012 p. 56). Mentors then draw on their experiences, maturity, and expertise to serve as a role model for the mentee. Relationships tend to be slightly more formal with greater advice and counsel than a friendly “horizontal” relationship. The sage/counseling mentor has the capacity to establish rapport with the mentee and have fun, but they are also willing and able to be an adult counselor in the relationship. Clear boundaries and known expectations are important for this role to be successful.

While investigators have broadly examined what ingredients are required to form solid mentor-mentee bonds, existing research offers little insight into how shared participation in specific activities, such as sports, affect long-term outcomes. Seeking further insights, Tolan et al. in a 2014 meta-analysis investigated the question, “Are there activities or underlying purposes of activities that are defining of mentoring ... across mentoring programs [that] could account for differences in effects?” (p. 183). Broadly, Tolan et al. found four common components responsible for shaping effects. Those components include: (1) mentee identification with the mentor that helps motivate, shape positive behavior, and engage in prosocial behavior; (2) provision of information or teaching that stands to help the recipient manage social, educational, legal, family, and peer challenges; (3) advocacy for the recipient in various systems and settings; and (4) mentor emotional support and friendliness that promotes self-efficacy, confidence, and sense of mattering (p. 183).

Despite commonalities identified by Tolan and his colleagues, the researchers stated that their meta-analysis reflected limitations stemming from a systemic lack of empirical data. “The notable lack of adequate reporting of specific components, implementation procedures, and adherence, and measurement of targeted process to permit comparison on these important features is seen as a major impediment to advancing knowledge about the value of this popular approach to youth intervention” (p. 199).

The lack of empirical study relevant to mentor program activities illuminates the importance of creating and adhering to a specific curriculum. If a specific protocol is followed, positive outcomes can be replicated.

TRAINING

Mentoring organizations have underemphasized training. This may be due to a common misconception that mentoring is inherently a natural process where an experienced adult shares their knowledge with a younger mentee. While this may be true for some programs, the importance of providing mentor training can't be overemphasized. Instruction provides mentors with tools to help reduce burnout and frustrations that naturally arise. Additionally, training and ongoing support provide a means to increase fidelity to the organizational mission, thereby serving as a blueprint for full program implementation. It is important to note also that a program administrator presence at mentor training sessions can help grow a culture of support (Mihalic et al. 2004).

Once recruited, mentors should receive an orientation and pre-service training, or lessons given in advance of meeting mentees. "The amount of time spent providing pre-and post-match training to mentors has been found to be related to match outcomes . . . Specifically, less than two hours of pre-match training has resulted in mentors who reported the lowest levels of closeness with their mentees, spent less time with their mentees, and were less likely to continue their relationships with their mentees in a second years compared to mentors who received at least six hours of training" (Garringer et al. 2015:40). As preparatory training has been shown to be more effective in combination with ongoing training (DuBois 2007), continuing education should be provided even after mentors become established program participants (DuBois et al. 2002; Anastasia et al. 2012). Research indicates that mentee and parent training serves as another effective strategy to increase program performance (Cannata, Garringer, Rummell, Arevalo, and Jucovy 2007).

According to Cannata et al. (2007), the goals of pre-service training are to:

- Help participants understand the scope and limits of their role as mentors
- Help mentors develop the skills and attitudes they need to perform well in their role
- Introduce mentors to the concept of positive youth development
- Provide information about the strengths and vulnerabilities of youth in the program
- Provide information about program requirements and supports
- Answer questions mentors have about the experience as a whole
- Build mentor confidence while they prepare to work with mentees

Program directives shape pre-service training goals. If a program seeks to reduce substance abuse, for example, mentors should be trained in juvenile substance abuse issues and educated about challenges inherent to working with that demographic. As noted earlier in this report, if the mentee has experienced trauma, it is imperative that mentors are trained to address that history in a way that is most beneficial for the child (Dierkhising, Ko, and Goldman 2013).

Continued education focuses on providing mentors with new skills as the relationship with mentee progresses (Cannata et al. 2007). As bonds grow, the mentor may notice potential problem areas in the youth's life. Ongoing training should enable mentors to address such issues as they arise. Monthly or quarterly training sessions are recommended as best practice for mentors (Cannata et al. 2007).

Mentee and parent training are also recommended as best practice models (Cannata et al. 2007). Such training and orientations have been found to increase parental and mentee involvement, while also giving stakeholders a greater understanding of program goals.

COLLABORATION

Collaboration can be defined as the extent to which all members of a program work together toward the same intended outcome. Collaboration is highlighted as a key component in mentoring programs utilized by juvenile treatment drug courts (Yelderman and Thomas 2015). Important collaborators with mentoring programs that serve criminal justice-involved youth include: juvenile probation, school boards, prosecutors, and public defenders, among others. According to Michalic et al. (2004), effective interagency collaboration is essential for successful program implementation. One strategy to increase collaboration, as is now done in a handful of program sites, is to include the mentor in court hearings and case planning. “Allowing mentors to listen in and even speak up during these sessions can enhance the overall mentoring relationships and potentially provide relational insight in discussions about the youth, their progress, and challenges while in the treatment drug court” (Yelderman and Thomas 2015, p.13). Similarly, Keller (2005) presents a systemic model of mentoring that emphasizes the importance of the interdependent network of relationships established among stakeholders including the mentor, child, parent/guardian, and caseworker. “The overall effect of the mentoring intervention on the child’s behavior and well-being may be the consequence of establishing a cohesive alliance of three caring adults who collectively support the child’s development” (p. 183). Community support is also an important factor driving mentoring program success in juvenile treatment drug courts (Yelderman and Thomas 2015).

APPROPRIATE REFERRALS FOR MENTORING

In the report titled, “Referring Youth in Juvenile Justice Settings to Mentoring Programs,” Miller, Miller, Barnes, Clark, Jones, Quiros, and Peterson (2012) recommend that youth on probation be referred to mentorship programs on a case-by-case basis. Miller et al. state that placement determination should be based on several considerations, including youth needs and those of their families. In particular, juveniles who lack a parental figure or caring adult will benefit greatly from a mentoring program. Further, the youth’s criminal offense is an important factor. Miller et al. explain that youth charged with a violent and/or sex offense are often not considered appropriate for referrals to mentoring services. The length of the youth’s probation could also play a significant role in program success. Juveniles will not benefit from a mentoring program that last less than six months. And finally, youth and family commitment to the mentoring process/program is noted as an important determining factor. Juveniles and/or parents who are unwilling to fully commit to a mentoring program will likely have unsuccessful outcomes. “Unmotivated or dissatisfied mentees may employ various strategies to avoid contact, minimize communication, or otherwise disengage” (Keller and Pryce 2012 p. 49).

In addition, risk assessment should be considered when assigning juveniles to a mentoring program. Juvenile justice intervention programs are most effective for youth deemed high risk. High-risk youth have more room for improvement than lower-risk youth (Lipsey et al. 2010).

MENTORING PROGRAMS IN UNITED STATES

GENERAL POPULATION

To evaluate mentor program efficacy, this report draws from two youth development rating systems. The first, Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development offered by the Center for the Study of Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado at Boulder, is a registry of evidenced-based youth development programs designed to promote wellbeing among children and teenagers. Blueprints uses two program rating categories, “Promising” and “Model.” Promising programs are those that have demonstrated at least some effectiveness for changing targeted behavior and developmental outcomes. Model programs, meanwhile, meet a higher standard. That higher standard led Blueprints evaluation specialists, comprised of experts in the fields of child psychology, criminology, and policy, to conclude that the program is capable of changing behavior and developmental outcomes. The second rating system used in this report is the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Model Programs Guide, which contains information about evidence-based juvenile justice and youth prevention, intervention, and reentry programs. As with the Blueprints registry, the OJJDP Model Programs Guide ranks programs based the presence of empirical evidence demonstrating improved outcomes for youth. The OJJDP uses a three-tiered rating system. The highest rating is “Effective,” meaning there is strong evidence a program is achieving intended outcomes. The second category, “Promising,” indicates there is some evidence the program is achieving desired results. The final OJJDP rating category is “No Effects,” meaning strong evidence exists that a program did not achieve intended outcomes. Examples of popular programs implemented across the United States are listed below:

1. Big Brothers Big Sisters of America

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBS) is a nationally recognized mentoring program with a Blueprints rating of Promising and an OJJDP rating of Effective. BBBS aims to build healthy and supportive relationships between youth and prosocial adults in order to reduce the risk of negative behaviors. Youth selected for participation in BBBS are typically from low-income neighborhoods, at risk for trauma and violence, and sometimes have a parent who is incarcerated. BBBS culture is rooted in social control theory, which emphasizes that attachment to prosocial individuals and commitment to prosocial activities can reduce negative behaviors. This program facilitates one-on-one relationships in which mentor and mentee meet for three to five hours per week. The match is supervised by a BBBS case manager, and appropriate relationship goals are developed through collaborations among case managers, juvenile mentees, and guardians.

2. Career Academy

Career Academy has an OJJDP rating of Effective. Career Academy focuses on a specific professional exploit, with students provided vocational and educational opportunities in school and the community. Career Academy students are placed into groups of between 50 and 75 students who receive curriculum and guidance from a small number of teachers throughout their high school career. The close-knit environment fostered by the Career Academy encourages students to form relationships with peers and teachers and to build a small community. Career Academy does not follow the individual mentoring model, but instead focuses heavily on community and group mentoring.

AT-RISK POPULATION

1. Adolescent Diversion Project

Michigan State University's Adolescent Diversion Project (ADP) has an OJJDP rating of Effective. Youth are selected for participation in ADP because of involvement in the juvenile justice system. The goal of ADP is to prevent further delinquency by forming prosocial relationships, increasing access to community resources, and diverting youth from the formal juvenile justice system to avoid the stigma attached to criminal involvement. Mentors are Michigan State University (MSU) Psychology Department students who receive training and mentorship experience through a two-semester course. During that course, student volunteers learn advocacy and behavioral management techniques. Following the training period, MSU student volunteers participate in 18 weeks of intensive mentoring with juveniles referred by the local juvenile court. Mentors act as caseworkers, spending six to eight hours weekly working one-on-one with juveniles, tailoring programs to their unique needs. The mentoring relationship focuses on growing the juvenile's individual strengths, so those strengths may be called upon when the mentoring relationship ends.

2. Eisenhower Quantum Opportunities

Eisenhower Quantum Opportunities is rated Effective by OJJDP. The four-year program serves high school students at risk of academic failure. Program "associates," as they're called, receive intervention throughout their high school careers. Youth are matched with a mentor in their freshman year, with the mentoring relationship continuing through the youth's senior year. Mentors regularly attend parent-teacher conferences, get to know the student's family and friends, and provide advocacy for program participants. Quantum Opportunities relies upon fulfilling five central components. The first is to provide tutoring to youth on subjects with which they struggle. Paid tutors, who also serve as mentors, collaborate with teachers to ensure the student is completing homework assignments correctly. The second component includes the provision of opportunities for individual and group mentoring. Third, Quantum Opportunities youth receive life-skills training from mentors. Fourth, associates are empowered through youth leadership opportunities, with program participants required to achieve a personal goal and a community goal by the end of their Quantum Opportunities involvement. Finally, youth are given a \$1.25 hourly stipend for program participation.

MENTORING PROGRAMS IN MONTANA

Several mentoring programs are used to address the needs of youth in Montana. As the use of mentoring varies widely among communities, however, such programs can be tough to track. For this reason, the list of mentoring programs provided here is not exhaustive. The authors of this report faced an additional hurdle: there is little information available regarding the effectiveness of many of the state's mentoring programs.

GENERAL POPULATION

1. Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBS)
Website: Each chapter has its own webpage.
BBBS in several Montana locations facilitates one-on-one mentoring relationships to children who are found to be at risk for trauma and violence. The Missoula BBBS chapter also provides a mentoring program specifically for children of incarcerated parents. BBBS of America has been given a rating of Effective by OJJDP.
2. Child Advancement Project (CAP)

Website: <https://allthrive.org/programs/child-advancement-project-cap/>
The Child Advancement Project provides individual mentoring for youth attending Bozeman Public Schools. This program matches volunteer mentors with children while seeking to “increase academic and social competency and to enhance opportunities for academic challenge.” In 2012, the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration’s (SAMHSA) National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices drew from quasi-experimental studies to find that CAP program participants had fewer unexcused absences from school than a control group and fewer discipline referrals. SAMHSA stated further that sixth grade students participating in the CAP program had a more positive sense of self than the control group.
(<http://legacy.nreppadmin.net/ViewIntervention.aspx?id=310>)
3. Roosevelt Middle School Youth Mentorship Program:

Website: <http://www.rlacf.org/initiatives/youth/>
Roosevelt Middle School Youth Mentorship Program provides individual mentoring for children attending Roosevelt Middle School in Red Lodge. The goal of this program is to facilitate positive relationships for children.

AT-RISK POPULATION

1. Mountain Peaks, Incorporated (MPI) Re-Entry Mentoring Program (CHAMPion)

Website: <http://www.mountainpeaksinc.com/?p=mentoring>
Mountain Peaks, Incorporated contracts with the Montana Department of Corrections to provide mentoring for youth who have been incarcerated. Mentors work with juveniles released from detention to develop life goals and objectives, while also providing information about community resources to the families of criminal justice-involved youth.
2. Big Sky Youth Empowerment

Website: <http://www.byep.org/>
Big Sky Youth Empowerment is a group mentoring program offered in the Bozeman and Belgrade area that seeks to facilitate positive relationships for teenagers. Youth must voluntarily apply for the program, which provides group mentoring for minors facing adversity. Mentoring groups meet twice weekly, once for an outdoor activity and once for a life-skills workshop.

3. Missoula Outdoor Explorers

Website: <https://outdoorexplorers.wordpress.com/>

Missoula Outdoor Explorers is a program offered to Big Brothers Big Sisters participants in the Missoula area. The program exposes at-risk youth to a variety of healthy outdoor activities, such as wilderness trips, led by University of Montana students and University of Montana Wilderness Association members. All current BBBS matches are eligible to participate in this program.

4. Youth Dynamics Family Support Assistants

Website: <http://www.youthdynamics.org/get-involved/fsa-mentoring/>

This program is available to juveniles participating in the Youth Dynamics program. Youth Dynamics provides behavioral health treatment to youth who have been diagnosed as severely emotionally disturbed (SED). Youth Dynamics Family Support Assistants are paid mentors who, while seeking to develop supportive relationships, provide individual mentoring to children for between six and 10 hours weekly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a proposed mentoring program design based on the findings from this report and model programs used throughout the United States. The proposed design was inspired by Big Brother Big Sisters and Michigan's Adolescent Diversion Project, which calls for a community-based one-on-one mentoring program for youth on probation and at risk of recidivism, educational failure, dropping out of school, negative peer influences, and substance abuse.

Mission statement: The following serves as an example of an appropriate mission statement for the suggested program design: To provide youth in the juvenile justice system a second chance at success using a rehabilitative approach with caring professional mentors who are committed to supporting, not punishing; teaching, not lecturing; and encouraging future successes, rather than dwelling on past failures.

Program goals: To reduce juvenile delinquency and substance abuse among at-risk youth; to improve the academic performance of at-risk youth; and to reduce the dropout rate for at-risk youth. Each mentee in the program will have a set of measurable goals that should be assessed after program completion.

Objectives: Program objectives will be created for each youth entering the program. Objectives will be crafted by the program coordinator and case manager based on the reasons the youth is on probation. Goals and objectives will be documented in the youth's file and will be linked to a plan for the mentor to implement. Below are examples of objectives that can be further broken down into action items:

- Provide general guidance to at-risk youth
- Promote personal and social responsibility among at-risk youth
- Increase participation of at-risk youth in elementary and secondary education and enhance student ability to benefit from such schooling
- Discourage use of illegal drugs and firearms, involvement in violence, and other delinquent activity

- Discourage involvement with delinquent peers
- Encourage participation in service and community

Program design

Staff: Mentoring program staff includes a case manager, a program coordinator, an assistant program coordinator (optional), and mentors. The number of mentors needed will be based on the number of youth in the program.

The juvenile probation officer assigned to the youth on probation will serve as the mentoring program case manager. Case manager responsibilities include working with the program coordinator to establish a set of objectives and goals for each youth. Goals and objectives will vary for each individual juvenile depending on what outcomes the youth is working to achieve. It is important for the case manager to maintain contact with the program coordinator to ensure youth objectives and goals are being met and to assist with breaking down barriers that may impede the juvenile's progress. Case managers must also monitor outcomes and adjust the program when necessary.

The program coordinator is charged with most program implementation, as well as acting as program champion. It is recommended that a program coordinator be employed a minimum of 20 hours per week. An assistant program coordinator may be necessary, depending on the number of youth and mentors involved. The following position description is based on program coordinator requirements for the Boys & Girls Club and will serve as a model for this program:

- Work with probation officer(s) to establish goals for each youth assigned to the program
- Oversee the provision of day-to-day program activities in accordance with established requirements, standards, and goals
- Allocate and monitor work assigned to program volunteers and staff, providing ongoing feedback and regular appraisal
- Identify and support training and development opportunities for assigned mentors and staff
- Participate in coordinator training throughout the year (e.g. webinars and conferences)
- Oversee proper record keeping and reporting, including for activities and events, daily participation figures, notable achievements, and problems/issues that may arise
- Ensure productive and effective performance by all program staff and mentors
- Coordinate all youth mentoring
- Provide support and guidance to all mentors to ensure program success
- Coordinate mentor recognition events and program incentives
- Oversee performance measure tracking related to youth mentorship
- Develop mentorship program evaluation criteria based on established requirements, standards, and goals
- Oversee the mentor application process
- Verify the absence of a criminal history among recruits; train, assign, and retain mentors
- Coordinate/implement mentor training

- Coordinate program data collection from staff, mentors, and mentees for reporting purposes; maintain confidentiality of program data
- Complete and submit monthly program reports
- Control program and activity expenditures within the approved budget
- Submit expense documents according to approved procedures
- Maintain contact as needed with external community groups, schools, mentee parents, and others capable of assisting with problem resolution

Highly qualified mentors trained in the sage/counseling method will work one on one with juvenile program participants. The sage/counseling method emphasizes the mentor's role as a supportive adult who makes a point to learn about the youth so they may better offer guidance. As discussed above, this mentoring role requires a balance between the differential influences of a vertical mentor relationship and the friendly mutuality of a horizontal relationship. College students make great candidates for this style of mentoring, because they are at an age where they can be the adult in the relationship but also youthful enough to build rapport with the mentee. Mentors will work closely with the program coordinator to provide updates and discuss problems and unforeseen situations that may arise in the youth's life. Mentors will receive training before and during the mentorship. It is recommended that mentors be paid. Compensation allows mentors to distinguish themselves as professionals working with a vulnerable population. Recruitment and retention constitutes a significant challenge for any mentor program. Paying mentors, therefore, will give this program an advantage. Mentors must commit at least one year to the program, agreeing also to meet with youth for between one and two hours weekly. Shared mentor-mentee activities will vary depending on the individual youth's goals and objectives. Activities should range from formal to informal, allowing for educational and bond-strengthening pursuits. Formal activities will be based around the youth's goals and provide guidance to strengthen the juvenile's ability to resist anti-social behavior. Below are examples of informal activities to engage in from the Mentoring for Success program:

- Homework assistance or regular help with a challenging subject for the student
- If attendance is an issue, brainstorm strategies to improve attendance and monitor the results; if needed, make adjustments together
- Visit student in the classroom to check in and provide support
- Have breakfast or lunch (or bring ingredients to make a healthy breakfast or lunch)
- Play games (cards, checkers, chess, puzzles, dominoes, Mancala, Legos, Jenga, etc.)
- Play outside (basketball, jump rope, play catch with a ball, Frisbee, etc.)
- Work out; bring the mentee to the gym
- Research an area of interest to the student using computer and library
- Volunteer to do community service together at school (put up a bulletin board about positive school behavior, read to younger students, start a "keep our school clean" campaign, etc.)
- Photography (give student a disposable camera to take pictures of their neighborhood, family, friends, or a pet to compile in a journal; learn to use digital camera technology, etc.)
- Hold conversations, discussing what the student wants to be when they grow up; school subjects they like or don't like and why; what extra support they may want with schoolwork; how they can set and accomplish goals; what they're good at, and how to begin incorporating new interests and talents into their lives (e.g. arts, dance, sports, computers/tech, affection for animals, poetry, etc.)

- Teach the student a favorite hobby; examples include jewelry making, pottery, knitting, playing a musical instrument, and building model cars
- Visit a college campus together
- Information from Mentoring For Success
www.healthiersf.org/MentoringForSuccess/Forms/

As described above, collaboration is important to ensure program success. Mentors and program coordinators may be asked to attend court hearings and/or case planning for youth. Such meeting attendance enhances the mentoring relationship and builds trust between the mentor and mentee. The program coordinator and case manager will decide what collaborations are appropriate to pursue the youth's best interest. Parents will also be asked to join conversations with the program coordinator and mentor to plan collaborations. Such meetings encourage parental buy-in and provide an opportunity to ensure all parties understand program objectives and goals.

Recruiting: The program coordinator and assistant program coordinator are tasked with recruiting mentors. One targeted recruitment area will be local college campuses. Any student interested and who completes the screening process satisfactorily may participate in the program. Majors that receive training on how to work with at-risk populations, such as social work, sociology, psychology, will be specifically targeted as recruiting pools. Providing course credit for mentoring incentivizes program participation among college students.

College recruiting will entail delivering informational presentations for students, posting flyers in public areas detailing program specifics, and consistent contact with facility members who oversee internships. Mentors can also recruit. Providing bonuses to established mentors for successfully bringing in new recruits would further incentivize this work. Flyers, newspaper ads, and word of mouth may also be used to recruit in the broader community. Collecting a pool of older adult mentors from the general public is recommended for older youth in the program with severe anti-social behavior.

Mentor screening: Screening recruits constitutes a vital practice to ensure mentee safety. It is also important for measuring a potential mentor's commitment to the program. Screening should include a criminal background check and an interview to determine mentor motivation, experience, cultural background, and likelihood of finishing a one-year time commitment. Personal references can also be used as a screening tool. Other vetting procedures may include, but are not limited to:

- Attending an initial mentor orientation/training
- Completion of a written application
- A driving record check and provision of proof of valid automobile insurance coverage
- A criminal history check: state/federal criminal history, child abuse registry, sexual offender registry
- Provision of personal references
- Completion of personal interview
- Information from: Ballasy, Fullop and Garringer 2008

An eligibility policy provides the minimum and preferred criteria necessary for a candidate to become a mentor. Clearly communicating criteria to program staff and mentor candidates better

ensures satisfaction of program expectations. Mentor eligibility will vary among different programs, but it is recommended when working with an at-risk juvenile population that the mentor candidate be at least 18 years old, and have a clean criminal record (certain offenses may not disqualify a candidate, eligibility policies should clearly specify which offenses trigger disqualification). Other eligibility requirements could include, but are not limited to:

- Candidate residency in the community the youth comes from
 - An agreement that the candidate will adhere to mentoring program policies and procedures
 - A commitment to one-year program participation
 - A commitment to spending a minimum of four hours monthly with the mentee
 - A willingness to communicate with the mentee weekly
 - Completion of the screening procedure
 - Not providing falsified information during the screening process
 - Agreement that the candidate will attend mentor training as required
 - A willingness to communicate regularly with the program coordinator and to submit monthly reports detailing meetings and activities the mentor engaged in with the mentee
 - Access to an automobile or reliable transportation
 - A current driver's license, auto insurance, and good driving record
 - Never accused, arrested, charged, or convicted of child abuse or molestation
 - Not a convicted felon
 - Not using alcohol or controlled substances in an excessive, illegal, or inappropriate manner (drug test may be required)
 - Not currently in treatment for substance abuse
 - Not currently in treatment for a mental disorder
- This information comes from: Ballasy, Fullop and Garringer 2008.

If a candidate meets all minimum requirements, a file will be created to hold application material. Once this folder is created, program staff will conduct an in-person interview with the prospective mentor, conduct phone interviews with personal references, and examine driving and criminal histories, in addition to child abuse and sexual offender registries. Based on the information gathered, program staff will complete the assessment and make a determination as to the appropriateness of participant involvement in the program. An acceptance or rejection letter should be sent to the applicant reporting overall assessment results. If the applicant is rejected, the applicant's file should be categorized to reflect that they are ineligible. If the applicant is accepted, the mentor must continue to satisfy foundational requirements prior to being matched with a mentee.

Training: It is recommended for this program that training take place before and during the mentoring process. The program coordinator and the assistant program coordinator will conduct the training, with outside resources (e.g. webinars and seminars) called upon as needed. Six hours of training each year has been found to provide the greatest results. An initial mentor orientation will consist of, but is not limited to:

- Provision of program rules
- A discussion about mentor goals and expectations for the mentor-mentee relationship
- Provision of a clear statement of mentor obligations and appropriate roles

- Training on relationship development and maintenance with a focus on the sage/counseling mentoring role
- Training on ethical issues related to the mentoring relationship that may arise; this should include the mentor's role as a mandatory reporter of abuse related issues
- Training on strategies to facilitate effective closure of the mentoring relationship
- Provision of information on mentor-support resources
- Training regarding best practices when working with criminal justice-involved youth
- Information on specific activities effective for youth involved in the juvenile justice system
- These recommendations come from the National Mentoring Resource Center: (<http://www.nationalmentoringresourcecenter.org>)

Additional mentor training should occur at least once annually after the matching process is completed. Such trainings will provide information on evidence-based strategies for working with criminal justice-involved juveniles. Training topics should include the youth development process; cultural, gender, and economic issues, and opportunities and challenges associated with mentoring specific youth populations. Such training sessions should also provide an opportunity for mentors to meet with program staff to discuss and address techniques for troubleshooting problem areas.

As discussed above, a youth and parent orientation is recommended. The orientation should provide information on program guidelines, mentor obligations and roles, and guidelines for parental/guardian involvement. The orientation is designed to increase parental buy-in and to give mentees a preview of what the program will entail, including what they can expect from mentors. Periodic meetings with youth and parents may be beneficial to keep all stakeholders updated on progress, questions, or concerns that may arise. (<http://www.nationalmentoringresourcecenter.org>).

Program coordinators and case managers can find more information on specific training curriculums recommended by The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) at the National Mentoring Resource center (<http://www.nationalmentoringresourcecenter.org/>).

Matching: A matching policy that itemizes specific criteria for forging successful mentor-mentee relationships is helpful for promoting match longevity. As discussed earlier in this report, mentors are more effective when working with a young person of the same gender. Literature on best practices indicates that mentor-mentee matching should be based on gender, especially for at-risk populations. Matching based on ethnicity may be beneficial, but, depending on mentor demographics, may not be possible. Secondary matching criteria can be based on common interests, similar personalities, and specific mentor qualifications related to the mentee and their goals, such as the mentor's education level or experience working with delinquent youth.

Risk Assessment: The Montana Back on Track (BOT) risk assessment instrument is given to all youth placed on probation in Montana. This instrument has been validated as a predictor of juvenile recidivism (see McKay, Hollist, Bunch, Acton, Tillman, and Harris 2015). The instrument places each youth into one of three categories: (1) low risk; (2) medium risk; and (3) high risk. As discussed above, youth with higher risk benefit the most from mentoring programs. Thus, youth who are medium or high risk on the BOT should be strongly considered. Risk level is only one consideration when making the referral for youth to participate. Low-risk youth may benefit greatly from this program, if certain needs can be addressed (e.g. lack of caring parent figure).

Staff and mentor pay: Program coordinators for the Big Brothers Big Sisters program earn between \$29,941 and \$54,815 annually working full time. To remain competitive, it is recommended that the program coordinator position for this mentoring program receive comparable compensation. If the program coordinator position is part time (20 hours a week), employment costs will total approximately \$16,640 annually (\$16.00 an hour). If the program coordinator becomes a full-time position, the cost would be \$33,280. An assistant program coordinator could be hired on a part-time basis, as well, instead of employing a program coordinator full time. Approximate costs associated with a part-time assistant program coordinator would be an additional \$15,080. As discussed above, it is recommended that mentors also receive compensation. In the successful program, Friends with Children, located in Portland, Oregon, for example, professional mentors make \$15.80 an hour and hold full-time positions. To incentivize mentor time commitments, the newly launched program could pay them approximately \$13.00 an hour. If 10 mentors were to meet one on one with mentees for one hour weekly over the course of one year, it would cost \$6,760 total. It is also recommended that mentors be compensated for training and all mandatory meetings. Such compensation could result in an additional six hours of pay for each mentor annually. Below is an example budget for the program:

Mentoring Budget

Budget Category	#	Cost	Notes
Salaries			
Mentors	10	\$6,760.00	10 mentors paid \$13.00 an hour for meeting with youth one hour a week for one year
Program Coordinator	1	\$16,640.00	1 Program coordinator paid \$16.00 an hour for 20 hours a week for one year
Assistant Coordinator	1	\$15,080.00	1 Assistant Program Coordinator paid \$14.50 an hour for 20 hours a week for a year (optional)
Subtotal		\$38,480.00	
Subtotal W/out Assistant Coordinator		\$23,400.00	
Training			
Coordinator Training	2	\$5,000.00	\$5,000 allowance for continued training for coordinators via conferences or online training seminars
Subtotal		\$5,000.00	
Recruiting			
Flyers		\$100.00	
Mail		\$100.00	
Other		\$100.00	
Subtotal		\$300.00	
Background Checks			
Name-Based Checks	20	\$290.00	20 mentors @ \$14.50 This fee may be waived if mentors qualify as Criminal Justice Employee
Fingerprint Checks	20	\$465.00	20 mentors @ \$23.25 This fee may be waived if mentors qualify as Criminal Justice Employee
Subtotal		\$755.00	
Supplies/Materials			
Computer	1	\$1,000.00	Laptop computer or tablet for Program Coordinator
Software	1	\$500.00	Software for laptop or tablet
Mail		\$100.00	
Paper and Office Supplies		\$100.00	
Subtotal		\$1,700.00	
Grand Total		\$46,235.00	
Grand Total W/out Assistant Coordinator		\$31,155.00	

A mentoring program that has a part-time program coordinator and a part-time assistant coordinator with 10 paid mentors is estimated to cost \$46,235.00 a year. Without an assistant program coordinator, the program is estimated to cost \$31,155.00. This budget should only serve as an example of rough approximate costs. Hourly wages and other miscellaneous expenses could be altered to fit the probation budget. It is important to note that other cost associated with hiring staff (e.g. workers compensation, unemployment, health insurance, etc.) are not included in this example budget.

Program implementation: Mihalic et al. (2004) identified six components involved in the successful implementation of juvenile justice and prevention programs. Mentoring program implementation should include:

- Effective organization
 - Administrative support: Program administrators should actively participate in program implementation, keep informed of implementation progress, listen and respond to problems that arise, and demonstrate commitment to successful program launch.
 - Agency stability: Agency stability includes a low staff turnover rate. Staff should be offered continued training and support designed to prevent turnover and program failure.
 - Shared vision: Administrators, shareholders, and staff must communicate to develop shared goals and to resolve any philosophical differences regarding program targets.
 - Interagency links: Strong communication among agencies is crucial for successfully resolving interagency conflicts.
- Qualified staff
 - Support and motivation: Program staff should be supportive of the program. Such support can be cultivated through training.
 - Skills, experience, and credentials: Staff experience and credentials should align with program requirements.
 - Adequate time: Administrators should take into account staff and stakeholder time constraints and ensure there is adequate time available for program implementation.
- Program champion(s): “The program champion is the motivator behind the innovation, guiding its day-to-day operations, fostering communication, and serving as a base of support for implementing staff. Typically the program director or coordinator, the champion needs to have enough power in the organization to influence decisions and effect change ... but also must have rapport with implementing staff to motivate them to carry out the day-to-day program elements” (Mihalic et al. 2004:7).
- Program integration: A mentoring program should be closely linked to the overall goals of the host organization.
- Training and technical assistance: Initial training and continued support should be utilized to help foster motivation and preparedness for program implementation.
- Implementation fidelity: Although adaptations must sometimes be made to respond to the environment in which the program is delivered, a mentoring program should adhere as closely as possible to the original program design.

Evaluation methods and processes: To ensure the program is working as intended, it is important to collect data on program operations and program effectiveness. The following are recommended program data to collect:

- Demographics of mentor and youth participating
- Reason(s) the youth is in the program
- Program start and end dates
- Number of times mentor and mentees met

- Successful program completion
 - Reasons for program termination, if not successful
- The number of mentors the youth had during the length of the program
 - If more than one mentor worked with a juvenile, an explanation as to why there were multiple mentors
- Youth goals
- Mentor's concluding comments (exit interview)
- Youth post-program outcomes (one year after program completion is recommended)

As described by Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, and Carver (2010), after data has been collected it is important to evaluate the program to confirm its effectiveness and, if it is found ineffective, to use the evidence to improve or terminate the program. Evaluations should focus on youth goals created by the program coordinator and case managers at the beginning of the program to determine if goals were met and if these goals led to successful future outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Anastasia, Trena T., Rebecca L. Skinner, and Samantha E. Mundehenk. 2012. "Youth Mentoring: Program and mentor Best Practices." *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences* 104(2):38-44,
- Aos, Steve, Roxanne Lieb, Jim Mayfield, Marna Miller, and Annie Pennucci. 2004. "Benefits and Costs of Prevention and Early Intervention Programs for Youth." Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Ballasy, Linda, Mark Fullop, and Michael Garringer. 2007. "Generic Mentoring Program Policy and Procedure Manual." The Hamilton Fish Institute of School and Community Violence & The National Mentoring Center at Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.
- Bath, Howard. 2008. "The Three Pillars of Trauma-Informed Care." *Reclaiming Children and Youth* 17(3):17-21.
- Britner, Preston A., Fabricio E. Balcazar, Elaine A. Blenchman, Lynn Blinn-Pike, and Simon Larose. 2006. "Mentoring Special Youth Population." *Journal of Community Psychology* 34(6):747-763.
- Bruce, Mary, and John Bridgeland. 2014. "Mentoring Effect: young People's Perspectives on the outcomes and Availability of Mentoring." Washington, D.C.: Civic Enterprises with hart Research Associates for MENTOR: The National mentoring Partnership.
- Cannata, Amy, Michael Garringer, Christian Rummell, Elsy Arevalo, and Linda Jucovy. 2007. "Training New Mentors." The Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence and the National Mentoring Center at Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Dierkhising, Carly B., Susan Ko, and Jane H. Goldman. 2013. "Trauma-Informed Juvenile Justice Roundtable: Current Issues and new Directions in Creating Trauma-Informed Juvenile Justice Systems." National Center for Child Traumatic Stress.
- Downey, Geraldine, and Scott I. Feldman. 1996. "Implications of Rejection Sensitivity for Intimate Relationships." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70(6):1327-1343.
- DuBois, David L. 2007. "Effectiveness of Mentoring Program Practices." Research in Action Series. Alexandria, VA: MENTOR/National mentoring Partnership.
- DuBois, David L., Bruce E. Holloway, Jeffrey C. Valentine and Harris Cooper. 2002. "Effectiveness of Mentoring Programs for Youth: A Meta-Analytic Review." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30(2):157-197.
- DuBois, David L., Nelson Portillo, Jean E. Rhodes, Naida Silverthorn and Jeffrey C. Valentine. 2011. "How Effective Are Mentoring Programs for Youth? A Systematic Assessment of the Evidence." *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 12(2):57-91.
- Foster-Bey, John, Nathan Dietz, and Robert Grimm, Jr. 2006. "Volunteers Mentoring Youth: Implications for Closing the Mentoring Gap." Corporation for National and Community Service.

- Garringer, Michael, Janis Kupersmidt, Jean Rhodes, Rebecca Stelter, and Tammy Tai. 2015. *Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring: Research-Informed and Practitioner Approved Best Practices for Creating and Sustaining Impactful Mentoring Relationships and Strong Program Services*. 4th edition. Boston, MA: MENTOR: The National Mentoring Partnership.
- Grossman, Jean B., and Jean E. Rhodes. 2002. "The Test of Time: Predictors and Effects of Duration in Young Mentoring Relationships." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30(2):199-219.
- Hall John C., 2003. "Mentoring and Young People: A Literature Review." *The SCRE Centre Research in Education University of Glasgow* Layerthorpe UK. Pp.1-45.
- Herrera, Carla, Cynthia L. Sipe, Wendy S. McClanahan, Amy J. Arbreton, and Sarah K. Pepper. 2000. "Mentoring School-Age Children: Relationship Development in Community-Based and School based Programs." U.S Department of Education and Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Herrera, Carla, Jean B. Grossman, Tina J. Kauh, Amy F. Feldman, and Jennifer McMaken. 2007. "Making a Difference in Schools: The Big Brother Big Sister School-Based Mentoring Impact Study." *Public/Private Ventures* New York, NY.
- Herrera, Carla, Zoua Vang, and Lisa Y. Gale. 2002. "Group Mentoring: A Study of Mentoring Groups in Three Programs." *Office of Educational Research and Improvement* 1-73.
- Holsinger, Kristi, and Penny Ayers. 2006. "Mentoring Girls in Juvenile Facilities: Connecting College Students with Incarcerated Girls." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 15(2):351-372.
- James, Chrissy, Geert J. Stams, Jessica J. Asscher, Anne Katrien De Roo, and Peter H. van der Laan. 2013. "Aftercare Programs for Reducing Recidivism Among Juvenile and Young Adult Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Clinical Psychology Review* 33:263-274.
- Jekielek, Susan, Kristin A. Moore, and Elizabeth C. Hair. 2002. "Mentoring Programs and Youth Development: A Synthesis." *Child Trends* 1-80.
- Johnson, Sharon. 2014. "Project Research to Action in Mentoring." U.S Department of Justice.
- Karcher, Michael J. 2008. "The Study of Mentoring in the Learning Environment (SMILE): A Randomized Evaluation of the Effectiveness of School-Based Mentoring." *Prevention Science* 9:99-113.
- Karcher, Michael J. and Michael J. Nakkula. 2010. "Youth Mentoring with a Balanced Focus, Shared Purpose, and Collaborative Interactions." *New Directions for Youth Development* 126:51-69.
- Keating, Lisa M., Michelle A. Tomishima, Sharon Foster, and Michael Alessandri. 2002. *Adolescence* 37:717-734.
- Keller, Thomas E. 2005. "The Stages and Development of Mentoring Relationships." In D. L. DuBois and M. J. Karcher, *Handbook of Youth Mentoring* (pp. 82-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Keller, Thomas E. 2005. "A Systemic Model of the Youth Mentoring Intervention." *The Journal of Primary Prevention* 26(2):169-188.

- Keller, Thomas, E. and Julia M. Pryce. 2010. "Mutual but Unequal: Mentoring as a Hybrid of Familiar Relationship Roles." *New Directions for Youth Development* 126:33-50.
- Keller, Thomas, E. and Julia M. Pryce. 2012. "Different Roles and Different Results: How Activity Orientations Correspond to Relationship Quality and Student Outcomes in School-Based Mentoring." *Journal of Primary Prevention* 33:47-64.
- Lakind, Davielle, J. Mark Eddy, and Adrienne Zell. 2014. "Mentoring Youth at High Risk: The Perspectives of Professional Mentors." *Child Youth Care Forum* 43:705-727.
- Langhout, Regina D., Jean E. Rhodes, and Lori N. Osborne. 2004. "An Exploratory Study of Youth Mentoring in an Urban Context: Adolescents' Perceptions of Relationships Styles." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 33(4):293-306.
- Lerner, Richard M. 2007. "The Good Teen: Rescuing Adolescence from the Myths of the Storm and Stress Years." New York, NY: *Stonesong Press*.
- Lipsey, Mark W. 2010. "The Primary Factors that Characterize Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Overview." *Cictim & Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy and Practice* 4(2):124-147.
- Lipsey, Mark W., James, C. Howell, Marion R. Kelly, Gabrielle Chapman, and Darin Carver. 2010. "Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs." *Center for Juvenile Justice Reform*.
- Lipsey, Mark W., and Francis. T. Cullen. 2007. "The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews." *Law and Social Science* 3:297-320.
- Lipsey, Mark W., and David B. Wilson. 1998. "Effective Intervention for serious Juvenile Offenders: A Synthesis of Research." In Loeber, Rolf and David Farrington "Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Intervention Pp. 313-345. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- McBride, Amanda M., Ernest Gonzales, Nancy, Morrow-Howell, and Stacey McCrary. 2011. "Stipends in Volunteer Civic Service: Inclusion, Retention, and Volunteer Benefits." *Public Administration Review* 71(6):850-858.
- McKay, Patrick, Dusten Hollist, Jackson Bunch, Daniel Acton, Taylor Tillman, Chuck Harris. 2015. "The Montana Back on Track Risk Assessment Instrument: An Assessment and Validation Study."
- Mihalic, Sharon, Katherine Irwin, Abigail Fagan, Diane Ballard, and Delbert Elliot. 2004. "Successful Program Implementations: lessons From Blueprints." U.S. Department of Justice; Office of Justice Programs; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Miller, Mitchel J., Holly V. Miller, J. C. Barnes, Pamela A. Clark, Michael A. Jones, Ronald J. Quiros, and Scott B. Peterson. "Referring Youth in Juvenile Justice Settings to Mentoring Programs." Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Morrow, K. V., and M. B. Styles. 1995. "Building Relationships with Youth in Program Settings." *Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures*.

- National Center for Mental health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention. 2009. "Recruiting and Retaining mentors." *Education Development Center*. Online: <http://www.promoteprevent.org/sites/www.promoteprevent.org/files/resources/Recruiting%20and%20Retaining%20Mentors.pdf>.
- Petrosino, Anthony, Carolyn Turpin-Petrosino, and Sarah Guckenbug. 2010. "Formal System Processing of Juveniles: Effects on Delinquency." *Campbell Systematic Reviews*.
- Portwood, Sharon G., Penny M. Ayers, Kelly E. Kinnison, Robert G. Waris, and Daniel L. Wise. 2005. "Youth Friends: Outcomes from a School-Based Mentoring Program." *The Journal of Primary Prevention* 26(2):129-145.
- Rhodes, Jean E. "Stand by Me: The Risk and Rewards of Mentoring Today's Youth." 2002. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rhodes, Jean E. "Fostering Close and Effective Relationships in youth Mentoring Programs." 2007. Research in Action Series. Alexandria, VA: MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership.
- Rhodes, Jean E. "Improving Youth Mentoring Intervention Through Research-Based Practice." 2008. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 41:35-42.
- Rhodes, Jean E., G. Anne Bogat, Jennifer Roffman, Peter Edelman, and Lisa Galasso. "Youth Mentoring in Perspective: Introduction to Special Issue." 2002. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30(2):691-707.
- Rhodes, Jean E., Jean B. Grossman, and Nancy L. Resch. "Agents of Change: Pathways through Which Mentoring Relationships Influence Adolescents' Academic Adjustment." 2000. *Child Development* 71(6):1662-1671.
- Rhodes, Jean E., Renee Spencer, Thomas E. Keller, Belle Liang, and Gil Noam. 2006. "A Model for the Influence of Mentoring Relationships on Youth Development." *Journal of Community Psychology* 34(6):691-707.
- Smith, T. 2004. "Guides for the Journey: Supporting High-Risk Youth with Paid Mentors and Counselors." Philadelphia, PA: *Public/Private Ventures*, P/PV Briefs. <http://www.ppv.org/>.
- Spencer, R. 2007. "Why Youth Mentoring Relationships End." Research in Action Series. Alexandria, VA: MENTOR/National mentoring Partnership.
- Thomas, D. 2014. "7 (Easy) Steps to Measuring Performance of Juvenile Drug Courts. In B.E. Ortego, J.M Pearce, W.L. Schiller, and D. Thomas, 7 series: 7 articles with 7 easy steps to improving your juvenile drug court. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
- Thompson, Lynn A., and Lisa Kelly-Vance. 2001. "The Impact of Mentoring on Academic Achievement of At-Risk Youth." *Children and Youth Services Review* 23(3):227-242.
- Tolan, Patrick H., David B. Henry, Michael S. Schoeny, Peter Lovegrove, and Emily Nichols. 2014. "Mentoring Programs to Affect Delinquency and Associated Outcomes of Youth at Risk: A Comprehensive Meta-Analytic Review." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 10(2):179-206.

- Trepanier-Street, Mary, Martha A. Adler, and Julie Taylor. 2007. "Impact of a Mentoring Experience on College Students' Beliefs About Early Childhood Development." *Early Childhood Education Journal* 34(5):337-343.
- VanderVen, Karen. 2004. "Adults are Still Needed! Intergenerational and Mentoring Activities." *Reclaiming Children and Youth* 13(2):94-102.
- Wilson, David B., Denise C. Gottfredson, and Stacy S. Najaka. 2001. "School Based Prevention of Problem Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 17(3):247-272.
- Yelderman, Logan A., and Douglas Thomas. 2015. "Mentoring in Juvenile Treatment Drug Courts: Strategies and Tips from On-Site Technical Assistance Visits and a Focus Group Report." The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the National Center for Juvenile Justice.