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Abstract

Archival national data from a wide range of mentoring programs were examined to determine whether mentee risk status predicted match outcomes. In addition, archival national data from Big Brothers Big Sisters agencies accompanied by program practice self-assessments from a subset of agencies were examined to determine the relationship between program practices and outcomes for mentoring relationships, in general, as well as for mentoring relationships of special populations of youth (i.e., children with an incarcerated parent, youth in foster care).

Mentees who were adolescents when first matched or with exposure to many risk factors such as exhibiting antisocial behavior problems or experiencing many stressful life experiences were less likely to have mentoring relationships that are effective and long lasting; however, mentoring program practices make a difference in match longevity, even with high-risk youth. Specifically, the sum total number of both benchmark program practices and standards described in the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring (EEPM; Third Edition) implemented by mentoring programs were associated with match length and long-term relationships; however, neither predicted premature match closure. These findings were true for matches in general, as well as for matches including youth in foster care. Notably, the Training Standard in the EEPM predicted match length of mentoring relationships, in general. In addition, children of incarcerated parents (COIP) have shorter mentoring relationships, and have lower grades, school attendance, and parental trust after one year of mentoring, compared to youth who are non-COIP.

In addition, providing specialized mentor training on issues associated with mentoring of children of incarcerated parents was associated with longer and stronger matches and mentees having higher educational expectations. Mentees who were children of incarcerated parents (COIP) experienced benefits from mentoring programs that received additional funding specifically for serving COIP. Given the importance of having a set of standards of practice for the field of youth mentoring that define both research- and safety-based program practices, a model for the development of practice guidelines and recommendations for the youth mentoring field was adapted from the health care literature on the development of Clinical Practice Guidelines. This model includes replicable and transparent procedures that can be used to update the EEPM as well as create supplemental guidelines for special populations of mentees or mentors, or special mentoring intervention models or settings.
Background and Brief Review of the Relevant Literature

Mentoring programs have experienced tremendous growth in the past decade, fueled in part by an increased availability of funding for mentoring initiatives (Rhodes & DuBois, 2006; 2008) and an increased federal marketing effort to increase volunteerism. In fact, mentoring is one of the most popular social interventions in American society with over one-third of Americans reporting volunteer involvement in coaching, tutoring, teaching, or mentoring (Corporation for National Service, 2006). Rarely acknowledged in the midst of this expansion and enthusiasm, however, is the actual population of youth who are most likely to benefit from mentoring and the program characteristics necessary to support high quality mentoring matches (Schwartz, Rhodes, Chan, & Herrera, 2011). As mentoring programs continue to expand, it is important to understand the factors associated with positive youth outcomes and to provide mentoring programs with the tools needed to effectively achieve these goals. By evaluating the effects of mentoring on youth and the support services available to volunteers, programs can begin to optimize their selection and training opportunities by incorporating evidence-based practices into the development and evaluation of their practices (Rhodes & DuBois, 2006). The empirical examination of child risk factors and program practice implementation, including mentor training and support mechanisms, form the two main goals of this project. Program practices related to the special populations of children of incarcerated parents, youth in foster care, and juvenile justice-involved youth are of particular interest in this project.

Mentee Risk

The stress and coping literature suggests several causal models that can be applied to understanding how risk may negatively affect outcomes for youth (Johnson, 1988; Lin & Ensel, 1989). One model suggests that a single experience of a specific stressor will lead to a later negative consequence. This individual risk factor model has already been established within the mentoring literature for prediction of premature closure; several studies have established that an array of individual risk factors is a significant predictor of match length.

A second model suggests that the presence of co-occurring risk factors (e.g., behavioral problems, social stressors, family background characteristics) is related to a range of negative behavioral, emotional, and academic outcomes in youth (Appleyard, Egeland, van Dulmen, & Sroufe, 2005; Kupersmidt, Burchinal, & Patterson, 1995). According to this cumulative risk model, as each risk factor accumulates, relationship longevity may become increasingly difficult to sustain. In other words, risk would accumulate additively in a linear fashion such that low risk exposure would be associated with the most positive outcomes and high risk exposure would be associated with the worst outcomes. For example, in a study of 1,310 youth, Herrera, DuBois, and Grossman (2013), noted that mentors who were paired with more risk-exposed youth reported more challenges within the match, such as more frequent cancellations by the youth, difficulty managing youth behavioral problems, and greater needs for program staff support. Qualitative interviews with mentors who ended their relationships prematurely suggested that they felt overwhelmed by the stressful home lives of mentees (Spencer, 2007). Thus, one portion of the current project focused on examining the individual and cumulative risk models in predicting premature closure for youth mentoring relationships.

Program Practice Implementation and Outcomes

Positive youth development programs such as mentoring programs have become increasingly more accountable for reporting on the effectiveness of their interventions, with attention focused not only on outcomes for participating youth, but also on the quality of the programs themselves (Yohalem & Wilson-Ahlstrom, 2010). This emerging interest in program
operations and practices extends beyond a simple audit or process evaluation of whether or not programs are implementing their practices as they were designed. There is also ample reason to examine program design and operations in the form of program practices.

There are few large-scale studies that provide descriptive information on the current use of research-based practices by mentoring programs nationally and even fewer that provide information about the prevalence of usage of these practices in programs serving high-risk youth. For example, despite the fact that mentor training and support practices directly affect mentee-related outcomes (DuBois, et al., 2002), the use of these practices are far from universal. In a survey of a diverse set of over 700 mentoring programs, most (more than 90%) reported providing their volunteers with some orientation or training; however, 14% required an orientation, but no training (Sipe & Roder, 1999). Pre-match mentor training and post-match mentor support are common, but are not universally implemented across practice settings, suggesting substantial room for quality improvement in program practices.

Match duration is an important outcome to study in the context of program practice implementation, because it serves as a moderator of youth outcomes for mentoring relationships and the minimum recommended match duration of one calendar (for community-based mentoring) or school (for site-based mentoring) year is difficult to achieve. Longer-term mentoring relationships have been found to be associated with more benefits to youth than shorter-term relationships (MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership, 2015). As match length increases, positive outcomes for youth also increase with the greatest benefits occurring for matches that last one year or longer (Dubois & Rhodes, 2006; Grossman & Johnson, 1999; Grossman & Rhodes, 2002; Grossman, et al., 2011). Also, match length has been positively associated with match quality, as rated by mentors and mentees (Rhodes, Schwartz, Willis, & Wu, 2014). Unfortunately, matches that terminate prematurely, prior to one year of length, are associated with negative outcomes for youth (Herrera et al., 2007; Rhodes & DuBois, 2008). Because of the need to understand factors that promote match longevity and prevent premature match closure, program practice implementation was examined in this project in relation to these indicators of match effectiveness.

**Program Practice Implementation for Special Population Youth**

**Children of incarcerated parents.** Children of incarcerated parents (COIP) can face a host of co-occurring difficulties that put them at risk for poor developmental outcomes, largely because a parent's incarceration rarely signals the beginning of a child’s challenges (Travis & Waul, 2003). In many cases, the family instability (e.g., disrupted living arrangements; Geller, Garfinkel, Cooper, & Mincy 2009), stigmatization (e.g., feelings of shame and embarrassment; Beckerman, 1997), and stress (e.g., loss of income; Glaze & Maruschak, 2008) associated with parental arrest and imprisonment have already exposed COIP to a multitude of challenges (Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2003).

Dubois and colleagues (2002) conducted a meta-analytic review of the effectiveness of mentoring programs and concluded that youth from disadvantaged backgrounds who experienced environmental risk were most likely to benefit from mentoring. At the same time, such risk factors can contribute to shorter, less satisfying matches with potentially iatrogenic effects on at-risk youth who have pre-existing personal vulnerabilities (Rhodes & Spencer, 2010).

These findings call attention to the need for enhanced program practices designed to serve COIP. Because mentoring is a relationship-based intervention, it can ignite vulnerabilities and elicit behavioral patterns that were established in their bonds with their incarcerated parent.
With appropriate program enhancements, however, staff and volunteer mentors can be better equipped to meet the relational and behavioral challenges posed by youth in special populations such as COIP (Kupersmidt & Rhodes, 2013). A series of analyses were conducted as part of the project to examine the associations between three program enhancements (having specific goals for matches involving COIP, whether program received additional funding to serve COIP, and whether programs provided additional supplemental mentor training for mentors matched with a COIP) and youth and match outcomes.

Youth in foster care. Nationally, over 400,000 children were living in some form of foster care in 2015 and this number has been steadily growing since 2011 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2016). On average, these children spend 19 months in the foster care system and are at heightened risk for a wide range of negative life outcomes both during and after leaving care. Many of the negative outcomes faced by youth in foster care are thought to be associated with their relationship histories with the adults in their lives. A secure attachment relationship with a caring adult is often lacking in children in foster care due to their history of child abuse and neglect (e.g. Carlson, Cicchetti, Barnett, & Bruanwald, 1989).

To date, there have only been a few studies that have investigated the impact of mentoring on outcomes for youth in foster care. The literature on this topic has largely been limited to either evaluations of idiosyncratic program models (e.g. Osterling & Hines, 2006; Taussig & Culhane, 2010) or program descriptions (e.g. Mech, Pryde, & Rycraft, 1995; Utsey, Howard, & Williams, 2003) with a few exceptions. For example, data from a national study of mentoring relationships formed through the Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America (BBBS) program was utilized to evaluate the impact of mentoring on peer relationships for youth in foster care and whether the impact of mentoring was influenced by the type of foster care placement (Rhodes, Haight, & Briggs, 1999).

For the current project, we examined the relationship between program practice implementation and match longevity outcomes for matches involving youth in foster care.

Research Questions and Objectives

At the initiation of this research project, we were given access to two large archival, administrative, national mentoring program data sets, MentorPRO and AIM. The MentorPRO data set was provided by MENTOR/The National Mentoring Partnership and was obtained from an online mentoring management software system that had been used by thousands of mentoring programs to log information about their matches. The AIM (Agency Information Management) data set was provided by Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) of America and included archival match and outcome data from hundreds of thousands of mentoring matches and hundreds of BBBS agencies.

Our overall objective was to leverage existing data that mentoring programs had already captured into answering innovative research questions that could be informative for and instructive to the mentoring, youth development, and delinquency prevention fields, as a whole. Detailed research questions and objectives were developed based on the amount and type of data available in each of these archival data sets.

Objective 1: Use archival data to determine the association between mentee risk and youth and match outcomes.

The MentorPRO data set was utilized by thousands of mentoring programs for different purposes. One piece of information that programs could enter into the system was challenges that mentees experience, such as anxiety, substance use, and delinquency. A rich literature exists highlighting the associations between youth risk factors and poor outcomes, including analyses...
that focus on individual risk factors (Johnson, 1988; Lin & Ensel, 1989), as well as cumulative or additive risk (Appleyard, Egeland, van Dulmen, & Sroufe, 2005). Whereas previous analyses in the mentoring field have involved assessments of some individual risk factors (e.g., COIP, justice-involved) and risk profiles that group youth into categories such as “high risk” and “low risk” (Herrera, DuBois, and Grossman, 2013) and their associations with outcomes, few have explored the effects of levels and types of risk on youth and match outcomes. Exploring the effects of risk at a more granular level could aid mentoring programs in determining how to best serve youth who present with varying levels of risk and how best to train mentors to be prepared to mentor youth who might experience different levels of challenges.

In addition to youth risk factors, programs logged match length and closure information for nearly 9,000 matches but measured youth outcomes at baseline and at a follow-up time point for fewer than 200 matches. Therefore, we focused our analytic efforts on exploring the association between risk variables and match outcomes, particularly a dichotomous variable indicating premature termination of match. We were able to conduct preliminary analyses to estimate the relationship between premature match closure and dozens of individual risk factors. Using those results, we constructed a 7-category cumulative risk index for premature closure that was significantly predictive, even after controlling for the age of mentee, which was the strongest demographic predictor of premature closure, and the multilevel nature of the data. Results are published in the American Journal of Community Psychology (Kupersmidt, Stump, Stelter, & Rhodes, 2017a) and highlight the need for programs to implement effective pre-match training for mentors and provide consistent monitoring and support of the match from program staff.

Objective 2: Use a combination of archival and program practice implementation data to determine the association between practices and match outcomes.

The AIM data set was utilized by hundreds of BBBS agencies to track youth and match data over the life of the relationships. Though all agencies operate under the same basic service delivery model, individual agencies are able to modify or supplement their standard operating procedures based on needs of the agency.

In an effort to capture variability in program practice implementation, we developed a program practices survey and semi-structured telephone interview that were completed by administrative representatives from 45 BBBS agencies. The goal of these sources of information was to explore whether implementation of certain program practices was associated with match outcomes. We organized our program practice data collection to reflect the Benchmarks and Standards described in the Third Edition of the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring (EEPM), which have since been updated in a Fourth Edition.

Though the practices in the EEPM are research-based or research-informed, there have been no studies that have examined how overall implementation of the benchmark practices in the EEPM is associated with match or youth outcomes. Completing these analyses would not only demonstrate the effectiveness of the EEPM guidelines, as a whole, but also aid mentoring programs in understanding the importance of aligning their practices with those program practices that are required as benchmarks in the EEPM. By illustrating the positive associations between practice implementation and outcomes that youth and matches experience, programs could see the potential positive growth that might result in their programs the more they align themselves with the Standards.
We coded survey and interview responses to parallel the benchmark practices of the EEPM and, when respondents reported that they were in compliance with all of the benchmarks that compose a Standard, they were coded as being in compliance with the Standard. We measured overall implementation of each benchmark, and calculated the associations between each Standard with match and youth outcomes, as well as the sum total number of benchmarks and Standards implemented with outcomes, while controlling for demographic background characteristics, cohort, and the multilevel nature of the data.

Results from these analyses are published in the *Journal of Community Psychology* (Kupersmidt, Stump, Stelter, & Rhodes, 2017b), and provide the first empirical snapshot of the impact of the implementation of the EEPM as a whole. Based upon these results, programs are now able to see that overall implementation of the EEPM (sum total benchmarks and sum total Standards) is positively associated with match length. Furthermore, the Training Standard was the only standard that was independently associated with match longevity in these analyses. These published findings can now function as a stimulator for programs to invest in modifying or updating their program practices to be in closer alignment with the EEPM. This groundbreaking study also contributes to the value of not only examining the mentoring relationship on match and youth outcomes, but also demonstrating the importance of examining larger organizational factors.

**Objective 3: Determine whether program practices are more or less effective for special population youth.**

The AIM data set contained information from thousands of COIP and hundreds of youth in foster care and youth involved in the juvenile justice system; thus, we were uniquely positioned to extend our program practice analyses to study whether certain practices were differentially effective when serving youth from specific special populations. Portions of our program practice interview were related to implementing specialized practices when serving special population youth and there were enough respondents and variability in variables to assess effectiveness of specialized practices for COIP, but not for youth in foster care or youth involved in the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, there were too few youth in the juvenile justice system subgroup where we had program implementation data to be able to conduct statistical analyses. In addition, we limited our analyses for youth in foster care to include EEPM benchmark implementation only. These studies are currently under review at peer-reviewed journals (Stelter, Kupersmidt, & Stump, 2017; Stump, Kupersmidt, Stelter, & Rhodes, 2017).

Our analyses of specialized program practices for serving COIP can aid programs in understanding how implementing specialized program practices can affect youth and match outcomes. Results indicated that specialized mentor training and receiving additional funding to serve COIP had the strongest effects on match outcomes. With these findings in hand, mentoring programs may be motivated to implement specialized practices or seek supplemental funding to do so and will have an supporting empirical justification to aid them in the process.

Likewise, program practice analyses involving youth in foster care resulted in significant effects revealing that youth in care from high implementation programs (i.e., mentoring programs that implement many benchmarks and Standards) have significantly longer matches than youth in care whose programs adherence less closely to the EEPM. These results provide additional evidence for the effectiveness of the EEPM and provide mentoring programs with more information about the benefits of investing time and energy into aligning their program practices with the EEPM, even for serving high-risk youth.
Methods and Analytical Techniques of the Study

Developing the Program Practices Survey and Interview

Capturing program practices was accomplished by modifying our comprehensive mentoring program assessment tool, Elements Quality Improvement Process (EQUIP), into a shortened online self-assessment for mentoring program staff to complete regarding their practices. All survey questions were written to mirror practices represented in the Third Edition of the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring (EEPM). After the online self-assessment was complete, we conducted a follow-up telephone interview to clarify responses and gather qualitative information related to core and supplemental program practices, including specialized practices for serving children of incarcerated parents, youth in foster care, and justice-involved youth.

MENTOR’s MentorPRO Database

Cleaning and coding archival data from the MentorPRO database. The MentorPRO data set was delivered as dozens of individual spreadsheets downloaded from an online SQL archive. The data was not transferred with an accompanying codebook but variable names and definitions and response values were nested within the spreadsheets themselves. The spreadsheets were organized such that each datum was contained on a line with a time stamp, ID variable, and other explanatory information. Therefore, significant data merging and restructuring took place to create analyzable data sets.

Youth outcome data were located and restructured into a multivariate data set with outcome data from multiple time points for each mentee. After this data set was created, we realized that that there were only 192 matches with data at baseline and a follow-up time point. These data came from 30 agencies but only 12 agencies provided data from 5 or more matches. We decided that pursuing a program practice data collection from agencies represented in the MentorPRO archive was inappropriate and inefficient because the program practices surveys and interviews were time intensive and so few matches (and even fewer programs) contained the longitudinal data necessary for analyses. Therefore, we decided to focus program practice analyses on data and programs represented in BBBS’s AIM archive.

Though the MentorPRO data set was inappropriate for program practice data collection, there was a bevy of data outside of the youth outcome surveys at intake. During data restructuring, a program-defined dichotomous variable in the match data set that indicated whether the match ended earlier than anticipated (as defined by the mentoring program) was used to define premature match closure. That variable became a central outcome of interest for analyses using the MentorPRO data set.

One of the other data spreadsheets included a list of risk factors that programs could use to identify mentees who presented with various difficulties. However, programs only identified youth who fit the prescribed risk factor; they did not document when youth did not have a risk factor. In other words, data were a list of youth who were a “yes” for risk factors but did not report any youth with “no” as a value. Therefore, to create a dichotomous variable for each risk factor, we identified programs that were using the risk factor documentation feature and coded any youth from those programs who did not appear on the list of mentees with risk factors as “no” on each risk factor. This procedure likely resulted in an underestimation of presence of risk factors and overestimation of absence of risk factors.

Analyses using the MentorPRO database. Each risk factor was coded as a dichotomous variable and its association with premature closure was independently tested via logistic regression (PROC LOGISTIC in SAS). This series of analyses served as preliminary analyses to
identify items to include in a cumulative risk index for predicting premature closure; however, due to limited variability in many of the individual risk indicators, these logistic analyses could not be corrected for nestedness. Risk factors that were significantly associated with premature closure were retained and placed into 7 categories based on content. If youth were reported as having any of the risk factors in the category, then they were a “yes” in that risk factor category. Categories included criminality, family background stressors, school functioning difficulties, risky health behaviors, internalizing problems, behavior regulation problems, and externalizing problems. Once the categorization and coding was complete, the categories were summed into a cumulative risk index. Program-level characteristics such as program location (e.g., school-based) and program format (e.g., one-to-one), mentor demographic variables, and mentee demographic variables were also tested as predictors of premature match termination via multilevel logistic regression. Logistic analyses related to the CRI and program-, mentor-, and mentee-level variables were corrected for nestedness (PROC GLIMMIX in SAS).

BBBS AIM Database

Cleaning the BBBS AIM database. Youth outcome data and youth and mentor strength of relationship data were contained in separate stacked spreadsheets. The first step in cleaning the data sets was to identify youth who had been matched with multiple mentors as a result of rematching. To maintain the independence of the outcome data (i.e., to ensure that youth appeared in the data set only once), data were retained from matches with mentees’ first mentor only. The second step in cleaning the data sets was to calculate new Match ID numbers and to recode match length. In the original data sets, when match relationships switched from school-based matches to community-based matches, the original match was closed and a new match was created during the transition; each portion of the match was given its own match start date and match end date. We wanted to define the match as the full life of the relationship, so part of the cleaning process involved calculating new Match ID numbers to represent the entire relationship (regardless of whether the match type changed during the life of the match). After the new Match ID was created, we wrote an R macro to scan through each Match ID and select the earliest start date and latest match end date. Match length was calculated based on the new values. Matches that were still open had a match length equal to the time between the match start date and the date that the data were pulled for the project. A dichotomous variable was created to identify whether matches were open or closed. Data sets were unstacked and restructured into multivariate data sets containing data from baseline surveys as well as one-year follow-up data.

Three special populations of interest (children of incarcerated parents, youth in foster care, and juvenile justice-involved youth) were identified in the data sets through a combination of methods. A dichotomous variable already existed to identify youth who had an incarcerated parent and foster care was a response option for a youth living situation variable. There was no predefined variable for identifying justice-involved youth, but there were two sources of information that served as a proxy for the variable. One question in the youth outcome survey asked whether the youth had been arrested in the last 12 months. If the youth ever responded with anything other than “Never,” then that youth was considered “justice-involved.” The second piece of information used to identify justice-involved youth was a separate spreadsheet from BBBS from a previous project that had completed for juvenile justice-involved youth. If a mentee’s ID number appeared in the separate spreadsheet as part of the previous justice-involved youth project, then they were identified as justice-involved.
Once the data sets were structured and special populations were defined, we tallied the number of total youth, children of incarcerated parents, foster youth, and juvenile justice-involved youth for each agency. We selected programs that had at least 10 youth represented in the overall data set and randomly selected 125 programs to participate in our program practices survey and interview. Those programs were contacted by BBBS and given a link to information about the project as well as a consent form. Due to low consent rates, we extended our invitation to participate to all programs with at least 10 youth represented in the AIM archive.

Programs that consented to participate completed our online program practices survey as well as our follow-up program practices interview about program practices, especially those practices related to serving special populations of youth. Survey responses regarding general program practices were coded in concordance with benchmarks and standards outlined in the third edition of the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring (EEPM). Each benchmark was coded as a dichotomous variable indicating whether a program implemented a benchmark or not. Standard implementation was coded based on benchmarks. When programs implemented each benchmark required for a standard, then they were coded as having met that standard.

The follow-up qualitative interview data was coded by a research assistant to determine whether programs were implementing specialized practices for special population youth. Data were coded to identify whether programs received any additional funding to serve special populations, whether they identified specific goals in serving special population youth, and whether they required specialized training for staff and mentors serving special population youth. The project director coded 20% of the interviews to check the coding reliability; the percent agreement on the coding was 85.3% and the kappa coefficient was 0.704, which falls in the moderate range.

Analyses using the AIM database and program practice data.

Program practices and match longevity. The first set of analyses using AIM data and program practice data focused on the relationship between the implementation of safety- and research-based program practices and match longevity in community-based matches. Preliminary frequency analyses were completed to determine the prevalence of program practice implementation. Programs varied in their implementation of EEPM benchmarks and standards; programs implemented between 13 and 21 benchmarks and between 0 and 5 standards. Multilevel linear regressions were estimated to determine the relationships between individual EEPM standards and match length, as well as relationships between sum total benchmark and sum total standard implementation and match length. The multilevel models were followed up with survival analyses to determine whether programs who implemented high or low levels of benchmarks and standards differed in their match length outcomes.

Additional multilevel logistic regressions were estimated to determine the relationship between program practice implementation and two dichotomous variables related to match length. The first set of analyses, like those completed with the MentorPRO data, focused on premature closure. For community-based matches, BBBS requests a 12-month commitment from their mentors. Therefore, we coded community-based matches that lasted less than 12 months as prematurely ending and those that lasted 12 months or longer as not prematurely ending. A second set of multilevel logistic regressions were estimated using a “long-term match” dichotomous outcome. In consultation with BBBS, we defined a long-term match as one lasting 24 months or longer.

Specialized program practices and match and youth outcomes for COIP. The second set of analyses using AIM data and program practice data focused on the relationship between
specialized program practices (receiving additional funding, having specialized goals, and having specialized mentor training) and match length, strength of relationship, and youth outcomes for children who had a parent who was incarcerated. The first step in the analyses was to employ inverse propensity weighting (IPW) to calculate estimators of average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) for use in analyses on the entire BBBSA archival dataset. Employing the propensity score method allowed us to adjust the dataset to correct for the relative rarity of having a parent who had been incarcerated (approximately 19% of the dataset) and to balance the populations (COIP vs non-COIP) on a set of covariates to increase the likelihood that differences between the populations are due to the COIP status of the child and not due to demographic or other background factors. The procedure for calculating IPW began by identifying background covariates available in the archival dataset that could potentially vary between COIP and non-COIP, and conducting preliminary analyses ($\chi^2$ or t-test) to test whether differences existed. Once covariates of interest were identified, logistic regressions were estimated that included 20 covariates used to predict the probability of a child having an incarcerated parent. Covariates included youth and volunteer gender, race, ethnicity, and age; youth living situation (e.g., foster care, living with a single mother), family income, and subsidized lunch status; volunteer education, marital status, and profession (helping profession vs. not); and match type (community-based vs. site-based). If the outcome of interest included a baseline measure, the baseline value was included in the logistic regression estimation procedure to further ensure that differences in outcome were due to COIP status and not potential differential baseline values. Probabilities of being a COIP were calculated for all youth with complete data on all covariates. Probabilities were output and the dataset was balanced using ATT equations, resulting in a sample of non-COIP that was similar to the sample of COIP in every available aspect except COIP status. The ATT weights were then included in regression analyses to determine whether mentoring outcomes differed based upon the COIP status of the youth using the full AIM archival data set. All covariates that were in the IPW calculation models remained in the regression models to control for effects that may have remained, even after balancing.

To explore whether employing enhanced program practices yields better outcomes for COIP, the balancing and estimation procedures were repeated for a subset of BBBS programs that participated in the program practices telephone interview. An Enhancement*COIP status interaction was included in regression models to determine whether COIP specifically benefitted from mentoring program enhancements. When the interaction was significant, follow-up simple slopes analyses were conducted to probe the effects within the COIP and non-COIP populations. Analyses were conducted on matches that had complete data on all covariates, outcomes, and program practices.

Program practices and match longevity for youth in foster care. Though programs were asked about specialized program practices for youth in foster care, few programs implemented different or supplemental practices for their foster care youth population. Therefore, we completed program practice analyses for youth in foster care using the general benchmark and standards variables. We opted not to employ IPW analyses that paralleled those completed for COIP analyses because IPW analyses included 20 covariates in the estimation model and data were retained only for youth who had complete data on all covariates. There were far fewer youth in foster care from programs that we surveyed and interviewed (N=208) and the complete data requirement would have reduced the sample size too much to produce an analyzable data set. Therefore, all analyses were completed using the foster care sample only. Match longevity outcomes (match length and premature closure) were the outcomes of interest for foster care.
analyses because the outcomes were non-missing for all youth. Preliminary logistic and survival analyses using the entire AIM archive were estimated to determine whether foster care status was associated with poorer match longevity outcomes, including premature closure and match length.

Follow-up logistic regressions and survival analyses were estimated to determine whether foster youth who come from programs that employ more evidence-informed practices have a lower likelihood of premature closure or longer matches than foster youth who come from programs that employ fewer EEPM benchmark practices.

**Findings and Conclusions**

**Risk and Premature Closure**

Preliminary multilevel logistic regressions were estimated to determine the relationships between program-, mentor-, and mentee-level factors and premature closure. Program factors, including format (e.g., one-to-one vs. group-based) and location (e.g., school-based vs. community-based) were unrelated to premature closure. Mentors who were female and younger (18-24 years old) more likely to be part of a relationship that ended prematurely. Likewise, mentees who were older when the match started (over the age of 11) were more likely to be part of a match that ended prematurely. Because mentee age was such a strong predictor of premature closure, the variable was retained and included in the final multilevel logistic regression along with the cumulative risk index. The cumulative risk index was a significant predictor of premature closure (OR=1.07). Compared to mentees who were in elementary school at the start of their match (6-10.0 years old), those in middle school (11-14 years old) and those in high school (14.1-19 years old) were more likely to experience premature ends to their relationships (ORs=1.24 and 1.35, respectively).

**Program Practices and Match Longevity**

Multilevel linear regressions were estimated to determine the relationships between individual EEPM standards and match length, as well as relationships between sum total benchmarks and sum total standards implementation and match length. The training standard was the only EEPM standard that independently predicted match length. Both sum total benchmarks and sum total standards were associated with match length. The multilevel models were followed up with survival analyses to determine whether programs that implemented high or low levels of benchmarks and standards differed in their match length outcomes. Both survival analyses were significant, suggesting that programs that implemented 19 or more benchmarks and programs that implemented 4 or more standards had survival probabilities that were significantly higher than programs that implemented fewer standards or benchmarks.

Additional multilevel logistic regressions were estimated to determine the relationship between program practice implementation and premature closure and being in a long-term (24 months or longer) match. Results from multilevel logistic regression analyses suggested that neither sum total number of benchmarks nor sum total number of standards implemented was significantly associated with likelihood of premature closure. However, both sum total number of benchmarks (OR=1.10) and sum total number of standards (OR=1.13) significantly predicted the likelihood of being in a long-term match.

**Specialized Program Practices and Match and Youth Outcomes for COIP**

The second set of analyses using AIM data and program practice data focused on the relationship between specialized program practices and match length, strength of relationship, and youth outcomes for children who had a parent who was incarcerated. All analyses were conducted using ATT weights to balance the COIP and non-COIP samples. With ATT weights included in the models, regression analyses illustrated that COIP youth had significantly shorter
matches (b=-0.31, p<.05), lower grades (b=-0.04, p<.05), lower parental trust (b=-0.03, p<.05),
and lower school attendance (b=-0.04, p<.05) than COIP. COIP and non-COIP did not differ in
their strength of relationship, social acceptance, scholastic competence, or educational
expectations.

To explore whether employing enhanced program practices yields better outcomes for
COIP, an Enhancement*COIP status interaction was included in regression models. When the
interaction was significant, follow-up simple slopes analyses were conducted to probe the effects
within the COIP and non-COIP populations.

Results indicated that having specific goals for the COIP youth population was not
associated with any outcomes, but that having specialized mentor training and additional funding
did affect some outcomes. The relationship between COIP status and match length was
moderated by specialized mentor training. Follow-up simple slopes analyses revealed that COIP
who come from programs that have specialized training have longer matches than COIP whose
programs do not have specialized mentor training (simple slope=1.39, p<.0001). Likewise,
specialized mentor training also moderated the relationship between child COIP status and
mentor-reported strength of relationship. Follow-up simple slopes analyses revealed that COIP
who come from programs that have specialized mentor training have stronger relationships than
COIP whose programs do not have specialized mentor training (simple slope=0.08, p<.001).
Specialized mentor training moderated the relationship between child COIP status and
educational expectations. Follow-up simple slopes analyses revealed that COIP whose programs
provided specialized mentor training had higher educational expectations than youth whose
programs did not offer such training (simple slope=0.11, p<.0001).

Having additional funding for COIPs resulted in a significant main effect for match
length. Having more funding was associated with longer matches overall (b=0.75, p <.05). The
interaction term was trending significant and was probed for exploratory purposes. Follow-up
simple slopes revealed that COIP from programs that received additional funding for COIP
services experienced longer matches than COIP whose programs did not receive such funding
(simple slope=1.57, p<.0001). The relationship between COIP status and strength of relationship
was also moderated by funding. Simple slopes analyses revealed that COIP from programs that
received additional funding had stronger relationships than COIP from programs that did not
receive additional funding (simple slope=0.11, p<.0001).

**Program Practices and Match Longevity for Youth in Foster Care**

A preliminary logistic regression was estimated with foster care predicting the likelihood
of premature closure and results indicated that foster care status was a significant predictor of
premature closure (OR=1.39). Likewise, a preliminary survival analysis was estimated to
determine whether foster care youth and non-foster care youth have survival trajectories in their
match relationships that are significantly different from one another. The survivor curve for
youth in foster care was consistently lower than the survivor curve for youth who were not in
foster care and the survival analysis indicated that the two strata were significantly different from
one another, Log-Rank χ²(1) = 7.21, p <.01. Follow-up logistic regressions and survival analyses
were estimated to determine whether foster youth who come from programs that employ more
evidence-informed practices have a lower likelihood of premature or longer matches than foster
youth who come from programs that employ fewer benchmark practices. Results indicated that
neither total Benchmarks (OR=0.99) nor total standards (OR=1.04) were predictive of premature
closure among youth in foster care. However, foster youth whose programs employ more
benchmarks (18 or more) and more standards (3 or more) have match survival trajectories that
are significantly higher than foster youth from programs that employ fewer benchmarks (Log-Rank $\chi^2(1) = 7.56, p < .01$) and standards (Log-Rank $\chi^2(1) = 7.04, p < .01$).

**Discussion and Research Limitations/Qualifications**

Our independent explorations of risk and program practices highlight some of the challenges associated with mentoring as well as steps that programs can take to strengthen their service delivery and enhance outcomes. In our study of risk, we identified a wide range of program, mentor, and mentee risk factors that predict premature match closure, becoming the first study to establish that premature closure is significantly impacted by cumulative mentee risk factors in an additive way. Replicating Grossman and Rhodes (2002), we determined that the age of mentees when matched is one of the strongest predictors of premature match closure, even in the context of other mentee risk factors. Additionally, youth who experience vulnerability in multiple domains are even more at risk for early termination of their relationships than mentees with vulnerabilities in fewer domains. Mentors may feel overwhelmed by mentoring a youth who experiences vulnerabilities in multiple domains. Youth with behavioral or emotional problems or other vulnerabilities may be more likely to challenge the boundaries in a mentoring relationship, resulting in mentors feeling burned out or violated, or mentees may not want to be a part of prosocial relationships with helping adults. Mentors may quit prematurely, if they feel unprepared to address challenges involved in mentoring high-risk youth.

Indeed, in our analyses of overall program practices, the training standard was the only standard that independently predicted match length, highlighting its important role in sustaining and maintaining healthy mentoring relationships. Our study of evidence-informed program practices in mentoring was the first to examine the relationship between the comprehensive set of standards and benchmark practices for the mentoring field published in the EEPM with measures of match longevity. Overall, the results revealed that the sum total number of benchmarks and standards implemented by mentoring programs was significantly associated with match length, particularly for matches surviving for 2 years or longer. Results suggest that greater adherence to and fidelity of implementation with the EEPM (MENTOR, 2009) can enhance program effectiveness and that the level of adherence to practice guidelines matters. Higher implementation agencies were more effective in developing and sustaining longer term matches, with supporting evidence stemming from the survival analysis of long-term matches.

The pattern of higher implementation programs having longer matches than programs that implement fewer benchmark practices was repeated in analyses including only foster youth. Foster youth who come from programs that implement high levels of EEPM benchmarks and standards have longer matches than foster youth from programs with lower levels of EEPM practice implementation, again highlighting the importance of considering the role of research- and safety-based practices in achieving positive outcomes in youth, particularly those at very high-risk levels.

Our study pertaining to program practices for mentoring children of incarcerated parents focuses on the role of specialized or enhanced program practices. Having specific goals for matches involving COIP was not associated with any differential outcomes in mentees, but receiving supplemental funding and implementing specialized mentor training appeared to be particularly helpful for programs serving COIP youth. COIP from programs that received additional funding to serve COIP or that offered specialized mentor training had longer and stronger matches than COIP from programs that did not implement those enhancements. Taken together, results suggest that targeted mentor training may be a critical investment for mentoring programs desiring work with special populations of youth such as COIP. Obtaining
additional funding to serve COIP may aid programs in implementing specialized mentor training or may allow programs to strengthen their match support by reducing caseloads.

These groundbreaking findings about the overall efficacy of the EEPM are important in suggesting that implementation of a single program practice or even a single standard is not sufficient for achieving positive outcomes for mentoring relationships. Through the implementation of a broad set of practices, mentoring programs have the potential to have maximal impact. More research is needed to address the relevance of the EEPM for mentoring programs utilizing other models of intervention besides one-to-one or community-based approaches. In addition, with databases where outcome data are collected in a more intentional way with fewer missing data, there is the potential to truly examine the impact of program practices on youth outcomes. This provided to be challenging in these studies that utilized archival data from the field. Furthermore, increasing adherence to the EEPM in an intervention study using an experimental design would allow for drawing more causal conclusions about the relationship between program practices and match and youth outcomes.

Furthermore, challenges were identified in these studies related to initiating mentoring relationships with high-risk samples of youth such as adolescents, youth with an incarcerated parent, or youth in foster care. In order to serve these youth best, programs need to be of the highest quality, potentially be able to access specialized pots of supplemental funding, and offer specialized additional training to mentors.

Limitations

The limited amount of longitudinal youth outcome data in the MentorPRO archive precluded our collecting program practice data from programs represented in that archive. Whereas we were able to employ the MentorPRO data set for analytical purposes, we were unable to use those data for program practice analyses. Therefore, all program practice data were collected from BBBS programs that operate under the same service delivery model. There was still variance in benchmark and standard implementation but the findings are less generalizable, considering the uniformity of service delivery.

As described previously, the risk data in the MentorPRO archive was organized as a list of “yes” values and the concordant “no” values had to be coded according to a set of assumptions. Not all programs reported any risk among their youth. Youth from programs that did not appear to use the risk documentation tool were assigned missing values on all risk variables. Youth who came from programs that appeared to use the functionality, but were not listed in the risk table, were coded as not having risk. This coding system likely resulted in an underestimation of risk and future data collection and analyses should allow for capturing both risk and lack of risk.

We experienced difficulties recruiting programs for our program practices survey and interview. We planned to interview 100 mentoring programs about their practices and our final sample included 45 programs. However, because they were operating under the same program model, increasing the sample size likely would not have resulted in increased variability in program practice implementation or aided in generalizability of results.

Data collection related to specialized practices did not allow for much detail and specifics related to the practices. The program practice survey and interview was focused primarily on general practices (benchmarks and standards) outlined in the third edition of the EEPM. Much of the coding for the specialized practices portions of analyses relied on spontaneous utterances from program staff regarding practices. This procedure likely resulted in an underestimation of
specialized program practices. The qualitative data and coding system we did collect employ, however, resulted in usable and predictive data and a coding system that retained an adequate level of agreement between coders.

Multilevel models were estimated when there was enough data and Level 1 and Level 2 variance to allow for it. However, the survival analysis statistical procedure (SAS proc lifetest) does not allow for corrections for nestedness or inclusion of continuous covariates. Likewise, there is little guidance available for estimating or calculating effect sizes between strata in survival analyses as effect size would vary depending on placement in time.

We were unable to successfully estimate a latent model of relationship risk profiles. Previous work involving relationship risk profiles in mentoring (Schwartz, Rhodes, Chan, & Herrera, 2011) included data concerning relationship quality between mentored youth and three different targets: peers, parents, and teachers. We had archival data from BBBS involving relationship quality with peers and parents, but we did not have any data related to quality of relationship with teachers. In preliminary estimation models, quality of relationship with peers was not aiding in creating differentiated profile groups. Instead, relationship quality with the parent was the driving force behind the differentiation process. However, the exported predicted probabilities of being in each profile included hundreds of barrier estimates (i.e., perfect 1.0 estimates of being in a group), which is an indication of severe model misfit. Because the underlying differentiating variable (relationship quality with parent) was itself skewed and lacking in variance, we decided that pursuing estimation of relationship risk profiles would not result in a model with adequate fit and interpretable profiles.

We experienced difficulty identifying and analyzing outcomes for the juvenile justice-involved population. Most justice-involved youth were identified by their responses on a question in the BBBS youth outcome survey related to whether they have ever been arrested. The response to that question, however, was missing for more than 50% of the entire archival BBBS data set, suggesting that the question was added at a later time or that the question was not asked regularly. Among programs that participated in the program practices survey and interview, 362 of the youth served were justice-involved. Preliminary analyses related to match longevity and youth outcomes did not yield any differential effects of overall program practice implementation; however, many justice-involved youth are missing youth outcome data and few justice-involved youth are from high functioning programs. Programs that reported presence or absence of specialized practices for justice-involved youth served only 35 justice-involved youth. Therefore, lack of data and variance impeded our ability to assess the effects of program practice implementation on outcomes for justice-involved youth.

**Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research**

Although the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring (EEPM), Third Edition and now the Fourth Edition, provide individual guidelines for mentoring programs practices that are informed by research and safety considerations, the efficacy of the EEPM, in its entirety, had never been empirically examined. These studies represent the first empirical studies in the literature to examine the validity of the EEPM as a whole, by testing whether mentoring programs’ alignment of their program practices to the EEPM predicts match outcomes. Findings needs to be interpreted cautiously because these hypotheses were only tested for mentoring programs providing one-to-one mentoring in Big Brothers Big Sisters affiliate programs. Also, the studies that were conducted capitalized on a large national database using a correlational (not
experimental) design; however, the EEPM captures so many program practices that it would never be feasible to conduct a randomized controlled trial of the EEPM as a whole. Despite these limitations, the policy and practice implications of this body of work suggest that importance of mentoring programs being carefully trained to track their implementation of benchmark practices in the EEPM on an ongoing basis, and develop or modify their practices to align closely with the EEPM Standards.
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Modified EQUIP Mentoring Program Self-Assessment


Demographic Characteristics

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
2. What is your age in years?
3. What is your race?
   a. African American
   b. American Indian/Native American
   c. Asian/Pacific Islander
   d. Caucasian/White
   e. Multi-racial
   f. Other: ____________________________
4. Are you of Hispanic, Latino/Latina, or of Spanish origin?
   a. Yes
   b. No
5. Educational and Vocational Background Characteristics
6. How many years of education have you completed (e.g., completion of high school would be 12 years)?
7. What is your highest completed degree?
   a. No degree
   b. High school diploma or equivalent (GED)
   c. Some college
   d. Associates degree
   e. Bachelors degree
   f. Masters degree
   g. Terminal degree (PhD, JD, MD, etc)
   h. Other: ____________________________
8. Are you a volunteer or paid staff person at your mentoring organization?
   a. Paid
   b. Volunteer
9. What is your job title?
10. How many years have you worked for your current organization?
11. How many years have you been working in the field of youth mentoring?
Program or Agency Description

1. What is the name of your mentoring program? (Note. The name of your program may be the same name as your mentoring organization or agency.)
2. What is the name of your organization or agency that hosts your mentoring program?
3. How many years has your mentoring program been in operation?
4. Which of the following best describes your mentoring organization or agency? (Check all that apply)
   a. Faith-based organization
   b. Afterschool programming
   c. Business or corporation
   d. Higher education institution
   e. Nonprofit-National
   f. Nonprofit-Regional
   g. Nonprofit-State
   h. Nonprofit-Local
   i. Federal Government
   j. State Government
   k. Local government
   l. School or school system
   m. Residential/treatment facility
   n. Other:

Interview Question: Is your program solely a mentoring program or do you do other things?

5. Which of the following best describes the location(s) where mentoring takes place in your mentoring program? (Select all that apply.)
   a. Community-based (mentor and mentee meet at places in the community)
   b. Community-organization-based (mentor and mentee meet at community organizations such as Boys and Girls Club, YMCA, YWCA)
   c. School-based (mentor and mentee meet at the mentor’s or mentee’s school)
   d. Workplace (mentor and mentee spend time together at mentor’s workplace)
   e. Faith-based (mentor and mentee spend time together at a religious institution)
   f. E-mentoring (mentor and mentee communicate primarily through the internet or email)
   g. Other: ____________________________________

6. Which of the following best describes your mentoring program? (Select all that apply.)
   a. One-to-one mentoring (one mentor is matched with one mentee)
   b. Group mentoring (one mentor works with a group of mentees)
   c. Team group mentoring (at least two mentor work with a group of mentees)
   d. Other: ____________________________________

7. Which of the following best describes the amount of structure in relationships in your mentoring program? (Select all that apply.)
   a. Not structured, mentors and mentees plan their activities on their own without input from the program staff
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b. Somewhat structured, some of the activities are planned by mentors and mentee and some are planned by the program staff

b. Very structured, most of the mentor and mentee’s activities are planned by the program staff

d. Other: ______________________________________

Interview Question: Is the administrative part of the program manualized? Can we view the manual?

8. Is there a main youth outcome(s) of your mentoring program? (Check all that apply.)
   a. Academic Achievement
   b. Truancy and drop-out prevention
   c. Delinquency prevention
   d. Gang prevention
   e. Substance use prevention
   f. Obesity prevention
   g. Healthy living
   h. Self- Esteem
   i. Cultural enrichment
   j. Having fun
   k. Other: ______________________________________

9. Does your mentoring program specifically target any of the following specific populations of youth?
   a. No
   b. Children of prisoners (MCP/Amachi)
   c. Children of immigrants
   d. Children in foster care
   e. Juvenile delinquent youth (youth involved in the juvenile justice system)
   f. Children with a learning disability
   g. LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender) youth
   h. Other

Interview Question: What is your program doing specifically to address problems or challenges faced by your special populations? Follow-up: Why do you think that these practices will work in producing positive outcomes?

10. Does your mentoring program pay mentors?
    a. Yes
    b. No

11. How many employees work at your mentoring program?

12. Which of the following best describes the distribution of labor at your organization for those who are responsible for mentoring-related projects?
    a. All staff are involved in all aspects of the mentoring relationship
    b. Staff are primarily responsible for only one aspect of mentoring (e.g., recruitment)

Agency Process Evaluation

1. Interview Question: Have you conducted any process evaluations of your mentoring program?
a. Follow-up: If yes, can you tell me about the methods used and the main findings?
b. Follow-up: Is there a copy of the process evaluation reports that I can read?

2. Interview Question: [If there has been a process evaluation] How have you used your process evaluation results in revising or designing your agency’s practices?

Youth Outcome Evaluation

1. Interview Question: Have you conducted a youth outcome evaluation of your mentoring program?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, can you tell me about the methods used and the main findings?
   b. Follow-up: Is there a copy of the evaluation report or reports that I can read?

2. Interview Question: [If there has been a youth outcome evaluation] How have you used your evaluation results in revising or designing your agency’s practices?

Quality Improvement/Enhancement Evaluation

1. Interview Question: Have you conducted a quality improvement or enhancement evaluation of your mentoring program?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, can you tell me about the methods used and the main findings?
   b. Follow-up: Is there a copy of the quality improvement report or plan reports that I can read?

2. Interview Question: [If there has been a quality improvement evaluation]: How have you used your evaluation results in revising or designing your agency’s practices?

Staff Training

1. Do program staff receive job training when newly hired?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. If yes, which of the following best describes the training. (Check all that apply.)
   a. Training in the current research in the field of mentoring
   b. Training about program requirements, policies, and practices
   c. Ethics training for working with mentored youth
   d. Cultural sensitivity training
   e. Training in documentation and monitoring of matches
   f. Training in how to make effective matches
   g. Training in how to assess match quality
   h. Training in how to recruit mentors and mentees
      Training in how to provide ongoing support to mentors, mentees, and their caregivers

3. Are there any training opportunities or support resources (e.g., tested training curricula, mechanisms for ongoing supervision and consultation) available to those implementing the program?
   a. No materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available that support training or coaching.
b. Limited materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available that could facilitate but not directly support training and coaching.

c. Limited materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available to directly support training and coaching.

d. Adequate materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available that directly support training and coaching.

e. Adequate materials, resources, and technical assistance are available that directly support training and coaching, and they are of high quality and appropriate for the intended audience(s).

4. What types of materials (e.g., manuals, brochures, information for administrators) are available and/or utilized for implementation of your program? Please describe.
   a. No materials or resources are available that could assist with program implementation.
   b. Limited materials and resources are available that could facilitate but not directly assist with program implementation.
   c. Limited materials and resources are available that directly assist with program implementation.
   d. Adequate materials and resources are available that directly assist with program implementation.
   e. Adequate materials and resources are available that directly assist with program implementation, and they are of high quality and appropriate for the intended audience(s).

5. Interview Question: Do program staff receive periodic ongoing training?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, what type of training?

Mentor Recruitment

1. Do you have a target population for mentors?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   Interview Question: Who is your target population for mentors (e.g., ages, sex, race, ethnicity, special characteristics)?

2. Approximately, how many mentors did you recruit and train in 2012?

3. Interview Question: How do you recruit mentors for your program?

4. Interview Question: Do you think that the prospective mentors have a good idea of what it means to be a mentor in your program?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, why?
   b. Follow-up: If no, why not?

Mentee Recruitment

1. Do you have a target population for mentees?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   Interview Question: Who is your target population for mentees (e.g., ages, sex, race, ethnicity, special characteristics)?
2. Approximately, how many mentees did you serve in 2012?
3. Interview Question: How many mentees are being served in your program this year to date?
4. Interview Question: Do you think that mentees have a good idea of what it means to be mentored in your program?
   a. If yes, why?
   b. If no, why not?

**Mentor Screening**

1. Does your program require mentors to complete an application?
   a. Yes
   b. No
2. Interview Question: Does your agency have a stated expectation for the length of commitment for matches in your program?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, what is the expected length of time expected for matches to be together (in months)?
   b. Follow-up: If less than a school or calendar year, why?
3. Interview Question: Does your agency have stated expectations for the number of face-to-face meetings that mentors and mentees in your program should spend together each month?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, how many face-to-face meetings per month are expected?
   b. Follow-up: If less than one time per week, why?
   c. Follow-up: If there is a mix of in-person, phone, and email communication, what are the expectations for those modes of communication?
   d. Follow-up: If there are no stated expectations, why not?
4. Interview Question: Does your agency have stated expectations for the number of hours that mentors and mentees in your program should spend together each month?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, how many hours are matches expected to spend together each month, at a minimum?
   b. Follow-up: If less than 1 hour per meeting, why?
   c. Follow-up: If there are no stated expectations, why not?
5. Does your program conduct an in-person pre-match interview with mentors?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Phone interview only
   Interview Follow-up: If yes, but a phone interview, why by phone and not in-person?
   Can we see the interview protocol?
   Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? Are there barriers or challenges to conducting an interview with the mentor? What resources are needed to conduct the interviews?
6. Does your program conduct a reference check (personal and/or professional) with mentors?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   Interview Follow-up: If yes, what are the procedures that take place to check references?
   Is there a specific form or set of questions used for the references?
Interview Follow-up: If not, why not? What are the barriers that exist to conducting a reference check and what resources are needed?

7. Does your program conduct a comprehensive criminal background check on all mentors?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Interview Follow-up: If yes, what are the procedures that take place to conduct a criminal background check? What databases are searched?

Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers prevent your agency from conducting the background check and what resources are needed?

8. If your program is an academic year program, does your program assess mentors' interests in maintaining contact with their mentees during the summer months?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Not applicable

Mentee Screening

1. Do parents/guardians of the mentee provide permission for their child to participate in your program?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Does your agency require each mentee to agree to the minimum expectations of your program?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. Does your agency require each mentee's caregiver to agree to the minimum expectations of your program?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Mentor Training

1. How many hours of pre-match, in person orientation/training does your program provide to mentors?

   Interview Follow-up: If less than two hours or no training at all, why? What barriers might prevent two hours of pre-match, in person training? What types of resources might be needed to establish this length of training?

2. Which of the following describes your program's procedures for in person pre-match volunteer orientation and training (Check all that apply)
   a. We use the updated BBBSA volunteer orientation materials
   b. We provide pre-match volunteer orientation/training on an individual basis
   c. We provide pre-match volunteer orientation/training on a group basis
   d. We include role-playing scenarios
   e. We include small and large group discussion in our training
   f. We include group activities in our training
g. We use orientation materials that we have created specifically for our organization
h. We use materials provided by MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership
i. We include web-based training for pre-match mentors
j. We do not provide in person pre-match orientation or training
k. Other: __________________________________________

Interview Question: Why has your program selected these particular training procedures?

3. Which of the following training methods are included in your orientation/training program? (Check all that apply)
   a. video
   b. group discussion
   c. formal presentation
   d. handouts
   e. role-play scenarios
   f. goal setting
   g. question and answer session

4. Which of the following topics are included in your orientation/training program? (Check all that apply)
   a. program rules
   b. goals for the mentor/mentee relationship
   c. expectations for the mentoring relationship
   d. mentors' obligations and roles
   e. relationship development and maintenance
   f. ethical issues
   g. effective relationship closure
   h. sources of assistance to support mentors
   i. cultural, gender, and economic issues
   j. serving as an advocate for your mentee
   k. youth development process
   l. youth goal setting
   m. parental engagement
   n. information about specific populations (children of prisoners, youth in juvenile justice system, youth in foster care)
   o. Other: ________________________________

5. Do you use a manual for conducting the training for mentors?
   Interview Follow-up: If yes, describe the training manual and materials (e.g., name of the training program, who created the manual and materials).
   Interview Follow-up: If no formal manuals, why not? Are there barriers to using a formal training manual and are there resources needed to obtain formal training materials?

6. Interview Question: Is the rationale for each training activity provided with clear goals and objectives?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, can you explain a little about how you design your training?

Mentee Training

1. Does your program provide a pre-match orientation/training for each mentee?
Matching Procedures

1. Approximately how many matches did you make in 2012?
   Interview Question: Please describe your procedures for matching mentors and mentees. Follow-up: Is there any kind of documentation or computer program utilized to create the matches? Follow-up: If yes, can we view it?
2. Which of the following characteristics do you consider when making the final match decision? (Check all that apply)
   a. Age
   b. Gender
   c. Race
   d. Ethnicity
   e. Personality
   f. Interests
g. Geographic proximity
h. Mentee preferences
i. Mentor preferences
j. Caregiver preferences

Interview Question: Can you discuss the process you use in making a match between a new mentor and mentee?

3. Are there any other qualities that you consider when making matches?
4. Does your program arrange and document the first meeting between the mentor and mentee?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Interview Follow-up: If yes, describe how the first meeting is arranged and documented.
Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers prevent your program from arranging and documenting the first meeting between mentor and mentee? What types are resources might be needed to facilitate the arrangement of this first meeting?

5. Is a program staff member present during the initial meeting of the mentor and mentee?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe the staff member’s role at the initial meeting.
Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? Are there barriers to staffing that first meeting and what resources might be needed to have a program staff member attend the first meeting?

**Match Growth and Development**

1. Does your agency engage families in your agency’s practices?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Interview Question: How does your mentoring program engage families?

2. Does your agency engage families in the match relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Interview Question: How does your mentoring program engage families in the match relationship?
Follow-up: How do you engage families in the match while having the mentor primarily focus on his or her mentee?

3. Who is involved in determining goals for each match?
   a. Mentor
   b. Mentee
   c. Parent/Caregiver
   d. Agency staff

4. Interview Question: Is there a formal process associated with setting goals for each match?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, Please describe the process. Do you:
      1. Focus on relationship development and set goals later
      2. Encourage mentor to set goals immediately while developing the relationship
      3. Leave the match alone and don't encourage goal-setting
4. Provide structured activities that reflect agency goals
5. Other process

5. Interview Question: Is there a protocol or procedure for revisiting goals throughout the match?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, Please describe the process.

6. Interview Question: When do you encourage goal-setting in the life of a match?

7. Do you have expectations for mentors to serve in an advocacy role for their mentee?
   a. Follow-up: If yes, what does this mean to you in the context of your mentoring program?
   b. Follow-up: If yes, describe what you do to provide support to mentors in performing this role.

Monitoring and Support

1. Does your agency/program track mentor-mentee meetings?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   Interview Follow-up: If yes, describe how your agency/program tracks the mentor/mentee matches.

2. How often does your program contact mentors individually during the first month of the match?
   a. Not at all
   b. 1 time
   c. 2 times
   d. 3 times
   e. 4 times
   f. 5 or more times

3. How do you contact mentors during the first month of the match? (Check all that apply)
   a. Phone
   b. E-Mail
   c. In-person
   d. Other: __________________

4. What information is documented during the mentor contact(s) in the first month of the match? (Check all that apply)
   a. Dates of all mentor-mentee contacts
   b. Date of last mentor-mentee contact
   c. Duration of all mentor-mentee contacts
   d. Duration of last mentor-mentee contact
   e. Nature (activities) of all mentor-mentee contacts
   f. Nature (activities) of last mentor-mentee contact
   g. Perceptions of relationship quality
   h. Other: __________________________

5. How successful is your program in reaching mentors during the first month of the match?
   a. Not at all successful
   b. Somewhat successful
   c. Moderately successful
d. Usually successful  
e. Always successful  

6. How difficult is it to make contact with your mentors during the first month of the match?  
a. Not at all difficult  
b. Somewhat difficult  
c. Moderately difficult  
d. Very difficult  

Interview Question: What strategies do you use to contact mentors who are out-of-touch with your agency?  
Follow-up: Describe what happens if you are unable to reach a mentor during the first month of the match.  

7. How often does your program contact mentees individually during the first month of the match?  
a. Not at all  
b. 1 time  
c. 2 times  
d. 3 times  
e. 4 times  
f. 5 or more times  

8. How do you contact mentees during the first month of the match? (Check all that apply)  
a. Phone  
b. E-Mail  
c. In-person  
d. Other: ___________________  

9. What information is documented during the mentee contact(s) in the first month of the match? (Check all that apply)  
a. Dates of all mentor-mentee contacts  
b. Date of last mentor-mentee contact  
c. Duration of all mentor-mentee contacts  
d. Duration of last mentor-mentee contact  
e. Nature (activities) of all mentor-mentee contacts  
f. Nature (activities) of last mentor-mentee contact  
g. Perceptions of relationship quality  
h. Other: _______________________________  

10. How successful is your program in reaching mentees during the first month of the match?  
a. Not at all successful  
b. Somewhat successful  
c. Moderately successful  
d. Usually successful  
e. Always successful  

11. How difficult is it to make contact with your mentees during the first month of the match?  
a. Not at all difficult  
b. Somewhat difficult  
c. Moderately difficult  
d. Very difficult  
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Interview Question: Describe what happens if you are unable to reach a mentee during the first month of the match.

12. How often does your program contact mentors individually during the duration of the match?

13. How do you contact mentors during the duration of the match? (Check all that apply)
   a. Phone
   b. E-Mail
   c. In-person
   d. Other: ___________________

14. What information is documented during the mentor contact(s) during the duration of the match? (Check all that apply)
   a. Dates of all mentor-mentee contacts
   b. Date of last mentor-mentee contact
   c. Duration of all mentor-mentee contacts
   d. Duration of last mentor-mentee contact
   e. Nature (activities) of all mentor-mentee contacts
   f. Nature (activities) of last mentor-mentee contact
   g. Perceptions of relationship quality
   h. Other: __________________________

15. How successful is your program in reaching mentors during the duration of the match?
   a. Not at all successful
   b. Somewhat successful
   c. Moderately successful
   d. Usually successful
   e. Always successful

16. How difficult is it to make contact with your mentors during the duration of the match?
   a. Not at all difficult
   b. Somewhat difficult
   c. Moderately difficult
   d. Very difficult

Interview Question: Describe what happens if you are unable to reach a mentor.

17. How often does your program contact mentees individually during the duration of the match?

18. How do you contact mentees during the duration of the match? (Check all that apply)
   a. Phone
   b. E-Mail
   c. In-person
   d. Other: _______________________

19. What information is documented during the mentee contact(s) during the duration of the match? (Check all that apply)
   a. Dates of all mentor-mentee contacts
   b. Date of last mentor-mentee contact
   c. Duration of all mentor-mentee contacts
   d. Duration of last mentor-mentee contact
   e. Nature (activities) of all mentor-mentee contacts
   f. Nature (activities) of last mentor-mentee contact
g. Perceptions of relationship quality
h. Other: _______________________________

20. How successful is your program in reaching mentees during the duration of the match?
   a. Not at all successful
   b. Somewhat successful
   c. Moderately successful
   d. Usually successful
   e. Always successful

21. How difficult is it to make contact with your mentees during the duration of the match?
   a. Not at all difficult
   b. Somewhat difficult
   c. Moderately difficult
   d. Very difficult

   Interview Question: Describe what happens if you are unable to reach a **mentee**.

22. Does your program make quarterly contact with a key person in the mentee's life (e.g., caregiver/parent, teacher) for the duration of the match?
   a. Yes
   b. No

23. How do you contact the key person? (Check all that apply)
   a. Phone
   b. E-Mail
   c. In-person
   d. Other: ___________________

24. How successful is your program in reaching a key person?
   a. Not at all successful
   b. Somewhat successful
   c. Moderately successful
   d. Usually successful
   e. Always successful

25. How difficult is it to make contact with a key person?
   a. Not at all difficult
   b. Somewhat difficult
   c. Moderately difficult
   d. Very difficult

   Interview Question: Describe what happens if you are unable to reach a key person.

26. Which of the following resources are provided to mentors in your program? (Check all that apply)
   a. Opportunity to ask advice from program staff person (e.g., Match support specialist)
   b. Opportunity to ask advice from an expert (e.g., Match support specialist arranges for mentor to have phone call with social worker)
   c. Publications (e.g., brochures, handouts, tip sheets)
   d. Web-based resources (e.g., online forum for mentors, website)
   e. Contact information for experienced mentors in the program
   f. Social services referrals
g. Information for contacting community resources in the area of positive youth development or mentoring
h. Information about activities that mentors and mentees can do together
i. Other: ______________________________________

27. Does your program use a standardized protocol for assessing the mentor-mentee relationship from the mentor's perspective?
   a. Yes
   b. No

   Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe the protocol. Who are the informants? What is the format of the assessment? What assessments are used? Are the assessments evidence-based? What is done with the information gained during the protocol?

28. Does your program use a standardized protocol for assessing the mentor-mentee relationship from the mentee's perspective?
   a. Yes
   b. No

   Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe the protocol. Who are the informants? What is the format of the assessment? What assessments are used? Are the assessments evidence-based? What is done with the information gained during the protocol?

29. Are program staff trained on how to administer or collect data from mentors?
   a. Yes
   b. No

   Interview Follow-up: If yes, how are they trained?

30-37. Indicate whether the following mentor post-match training and support activities are optional and encouraged or required:

30. Individualized match support
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

31. Group match support
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

32. Online training
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

33. Group in-person training
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

34. Mutual support (mentor support/discussion groups)
   a. Required
b. Optional and encouraged

35. Web-based two-way communication with staff (e.g., Facebook, Yahoo!, Group, etc.)
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

36. Web-based forum for communication among mentors
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

37. Other: _________________________________
   a. Required
   b. Optional and encouraged
   c. Not provided

38. Which of the following topics are covered in post-match training? (Check all that apply).
   a. Cultural competency
   b. Mentoring youth in a particular age group (e.g., adolescents)
   c. Mentoring special populations (e.g., children of prisoners, youth in juvenile justice system)
   d. Sexual health information
   e. Boundaries
   f. Substance Use
   g. Puberty
   h. Building relationships with parents
   i. Bullying
   j. College prep
   k. Other: ________________________

39. Does your program host group activities for mentors and their mentees?
   a. Yes
   b. No

40. If yes, which of the following statements describe your program's sponsored activities?
   (Check all that apply)
   a. Activities are sponsored less than once a month
   b. Activities are sponsored once or more a month
   c. Some level of participation in sponsored activities is required (i.e. part of expectations communicated to matches or stated in program rules)
   d. Activities are sponsored for specific age groups
   e. Activities are sponsored for specific gender groups
   f. Participation in sponsored activities is formally recognized or rewarded
   g. Activities are sponsored for specific ethnic groups
   h. Activities are sponsored for other type of specific groups
   i. Activities are sponsored that include specific relationship-building exercise
   j. Activities are sponsored that include specific youth asset or skill-building exercises
   k. Attendance at sponsored activities is tracked

41. Does your program formally recognize mentors' contributions?
a. Yes
b. No

Interview Follow-up: If yes, how do you recognize mentors' contributions?

**Match Closure**

1. Does your program have a procedure in place to manage anticipated closures?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe this procedure (and provide documentation if possible)?
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers exist that prevent the program from establishing a procedure for managing these types of closures? What resources might be needed to overcome these barriers?

2. Does your program have a procedure to manage unanticipated match closures?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe this procedure (and provide documentation if possible)?
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers exist that prevent the program from establishing a procedure for managing these types of closures? What resources might be needed to overcome these barriers?

3. Does your program have a system for mentor or mentee rematch following match closure?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe this procedure for rematching (and provide documentation if possible)?
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers exist that prevent the program from establishing a system for rematching? What resources might be needed to overcome these barriers?

4. Does your program conduct an exit interview with each mentor?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe the interview protocol (and provide protocol documentation if available).
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers exist that prevent the program staff from conducting an exit interview with mentors? What resources are needed to ensure an exit interview takes place?

5. Does your program conduct an exit interview with each mentee?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe the interview protocol (and provide protocol documentation if available).
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers exist that prevent the program staff from conducting an exit interview with mentees? What resources are needed to ensure an exit interview takes place?

6. Does your program inquire about continuing the mentor-mentee relationship beyond the first year?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, how does your program make this inquiry?
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not?

7. Does your program have a written statement outlining the terms and policies for the continuation of the mentor-mentee relationship after the match ends?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe those terms and policies (and provide documentation if available).
b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not? What barriers exist that prevent your program from creating a document outlining policies following match closure? What resources might be needed to overcome those barriers?

8. Does your program host a final celebration meeting or event for the mentor-mentee pairs?
   a. Interview Follow-up: If yes, please describe the celebration.
   b. Interview Follow-up: If no, why not?