TABLE 1: CROSS-AGE PEER MENTORING PROGRAMS

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, High School Bigs study (Herrera et al., 2008)	***Goal:*** Provide one-to-one mentoring to children in a school-based context. ***Setting:*** School-based mentoring program (various schools). ***Duration:*** School year. ***Mentors:*** High school student mentors recruited, trained, and supported by local BBBS agencies. Nearly half were high school juniors; a quarter were sophomores. Seventy-nine percent were female. Nearly 40% received class credit for mentoring. Forty seven percent reported having mentored a child informally (and 18% formally) in the past. ***Mentees:*** Youth referred to BBBS program. More than 75% were elementary aged students. Fifty percent matched their mentees' ethnic background.	• Volunteer mentors met with students at their school for approximately one hour per week during or after school (4.8 meetings). • A majority of the teen mentors met with their mentees alongside their teenage peers in a class setting. • "Their interactions typically focus on a range of social and academic activities" (Herrera et al., 2008, p. 2).	• Youth randomly assigned to be matched with a BBBS mentor or serve in wait list control group. • Assessments at start of program in fall of school year (baseline), at end of school year (post-test), and in late fall of subsequent school year (follow-up). • Outcome measures included teacher and youth assessments of academic, behavioral, and socioemotional functioning.	Compared with their non-mentored peers, youth matched with a high school mentor improved only on the measure of teacher-reported social acceptance. In contrast, youth matched with adult mentors showed improvement compared to non-mentored youth on 8 of the 17 teacher-reported outcomes and 4 of the 12 youth-reported outcomes. Several aspects of program support contributed to the benefits of having a teenage mentor, namely training (amount and quality) and staff support (perceived quality and frequency of communication). High school mentors who received two hours or more of training had longer-lasting matches (at the follow-up assessment) and reported having higher-quality and closer relationships with their mentees at both follow-up periods. Their mentees reported greater youth-centeredness, emotional engagement, and closeness in their relationships. High school mentors who reported higher quality support from program staff and more frequent communication with staff reported stronger and closer relationships. In addition, higher quality staff support was associated with longer match length.

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Secondary analysis of data from the U.S. Department of Education's Student Mentoring Program study (Hwang, 2015)	***Goal:*** Goal: Provide school-based mentoring to students identified as being at risk for academic underachievement. ***Setting:*** School-based mentoring programs. ***Duration:*** School year. ***Mentors:*** Volunteer mentors recruited by the program sites. Of the mentors in the present study, 26% were 18 years of age or younger. ***Mentees:*** Students in fourth through eighth grades.	• For the whole sample of youth who were mentored, either by an adult or a teen, the average length of the matches was just under six months and there was an average of 4.4 hours of face-to-face contact a month. • "While specific mentoring activities are not mandated in the legislation, the program purpose description states that supported activities are those designed to: improve interpersonal relationships with peers, teachers, other adults, and family members; increase personal responsibility and community involvement; discourage drug and alcohol use, use of weapons, and other delinquency involvement; reduce dropout rates; and improve academic achievement" (Bernstein, Rappaport, Olsho, Hunt, & Levin, 2009, p. xv).	• Subgroup analysis were conducted comparing mentees who had an adult, teen, or no mentor to the control group using data from a study of the U.S. Department of Education mentoring study (Bernstein, et al., 2009). That study involved 32 programs in which 2,573 children in fourth through eighth grades were randomly assigned to receive a mentor or to serve in a control condition. • Analyses compared the 220 children with a teenage mentor to the 630 children with an adult mentor, the 389 children in the experimental condition but who received no mentor, and the 1,300 children in the control group. • Three outcomes were assessed at pre and post-test: Scholastic efficacy, overall GPA, and problem behaviors. • Outcomes were assessed in the fall of the school year and in the spring of the end of the school year (92% of children completed both assessments).	Students with a teenage mentor reported more scholastic efficacy than students in the control group at post-test. Compared to the control group, students with a teenage mentor reported engaging in fewer problem behaviors, but this relationship did not reach statistical significance, and there was no effect on GPA. No differences were found in the effects of mentoring on mentees when comparing teen and adult mentored students.

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Cross-Age Mentoring Program (CAMP) Cross-Campus Model (Karcher, 2005)	***Goal:*** Provide supportive relationship with older youth mentor. ***Setting:*** Rural school. ***Duration:*** Weekly for one academic year plus a two-week summer enrichment program. ***Mentors:*** Volunteer high school students. ***Mentees:*** Middle school students (fourth and fifth grades).	• Typically, meetings take place weekly for two hours after school; for three hours at monthly Saturday events with parents; and for an all-day, two-week summer day camp at the school campus. • In this study (Karcher, 2005), the mentoring meetings took place twice weekly (48 total meetings) and one Saturday a month (6 SuperSaturday events) with parents, for a total of 144 contact hours. • Program also includes an intensive two-week summer enrichment program. • **Meetings include four parts:** 1. A whole-group icebreaker activity; 2. One-to-one informal conversation and discussion time; 3. A structured dyadic activity from a Connectedness Curriculum; and 4. Short unstructured time to interact in the larger group with others. • **The Connectedness Curriculum includes 35 activities that focus on:** o Promoting connectedness to self, school, teachers, parents, and the future; o Reading skills; and o Interpersonal negotiation skills. • Mentors receive training prior to being matched with mentees and receive ongoing training on curricular activities and mentoring skills twice monthly over lunch.	• Pre-post randomized experimental design with small sample (n = 33 assigned to mentoring group, n = 40 to control). • Youth were surveyed at baseline and six months after the start of the mentoring program (post-test) but before participation in the summer program. • Assessments at pre- and post-test included student self-reported connectedness, self-esteem, and social skills. • Attendance of mentors and mentees at after-school meetings was recorded. • Intent-to-treat analyses included all students who had complete pre- and post-test surveys (n = 24 mentoring group, n = 30 control group). • Post-test mean score differences on outcome measures (holding constant starting scores on outcome measures and child characteristics) were compared across intervention and comparison groups. • Additional analyses examined changes on intermediate outcomes of self-esteem and social skills, as well as program attendance rates of mentees and mentors to explain changes in connectedness to school.	Findings indicated that mentored youth reported higher scores on connectedness to school and parents at post-test than the control group. Mentor attendance, but not mentee attendance, was positively associated with pre-to-post changes in mentees' self-reported rule compliance, social skills, and self-esteem, suggesting exposure to the curriculum (i.e., mentee attendance) was less predictive of program changes than was the mentor's presence.

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Cross-Age Mentoring Program (CAMP) Outreach Model (Karcher, 2008; Karcher, Davis, & Powell, 2002)	***Goal:*** Provide supportive relationship with older youth mentor. ***Setting:*** Boarding school outside a major metropolitan area. ***Duration:*** Monthly Saturday events for a full academic year plus summer enrichment program. ***Mentors:*** Volunteer high school students. ***Mentees:*** Elementary and middle school students.	• Mentors and mentees from different school districts met at the boarding school campus one Saturday per month for the full day with parent participation encouraged at events. • Program also includes an intensive two-week summer enrichment program on the boarding school campus. • Meetings are structured with a variety of activities of the following types: o Academic skills development activities; o Connectedness activities; and o Unstructured time to interact with others. • Mentors received two days of training prior to being matched with mentees and then monthly one-hour group supervision and training.	• Thirty fifth-grade students from an inner city public school were randomly assigned to the intervention group and control group. Two students from each group left the study before the post-test resulting in a sample of 26 participants in the treatment (n = 13) and control groups (n = 13). • Youth were surveyed in the spring of the school year prior to group assignment (pre-test) and again the following spring, one year later (post-test). • Assessments at pre- and post-test included student ratings of connectedness (Hemingway: Measure of Pre-Adolescent Connectedness) and a small group assessment of math and spelling achievement (Wide Range Achievement Test). • Due to group differences at baseline on two measures and the small sample, outcome analyses included only spelling achievement scores and connectedness to school, future, and parents.	At one year (post-test) the mentored youth reported higher scores on connectedness to parents and spelling achievement. Gains in school and future connectedness were greater for the mentored youth but did not reach statistical significance ($p < .10$). To understand how the program effected achievement gains, mediator analyses were conducted. Analyses revealed that improvements in spelling achievement were fully explained by gains in connectedness to parents, suggesting that academic benefits from program participation were largely due to gains in connectedness to parents that resulted from program participation.

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Untitled (Sar & Sterrett, 2014)	***Goals:*** Reduce negative behaviors associated with delinquency risk and improve school performance among at-risk middle school students. ***Setting:*** Three middle schools. ***Duration:*** There were two cohorts: One semester (four months) in first school year, two semesters (eight months) in following school year. ***Mentors:*** High school students (juniors and seniors) who volunteered and met program criteria (e.g., good academic standing) and had been screened by school personnel and deemed as having leadership skills and mentoring potential. ***Mentees:*** Middle school students (sixth grade) identified as having at least one risk factor for delinquency.	• Mentoring program at each participating school was intended to create one of three types of mentoring approaches reported to be effective in the youth mentoring literature: o ***Relational approach***, in which mentoring focused first on relationship development through activities on topics of self, friends, reading, peers, teacher, and culture, with more goal-directed interactions later in the match. o ***Instrumental approach***, in which the mentoring started with a goal-directed focus and then moved to more relational topics over time. o ***Risk reduction approach***, which involved programming and curricular activities designed specifically to address and thereby lesson risk factors for delinquency.	• Longitudinal quasi-experimental design with data collected at baseline, at the end of the program (after four months in the first participation duration; after eight months in the other), and then again at a six-month follow-up. • Mentees completed measures of school performance, behavior problems, family functioning, connectedness, self-esteem, and engagement in delinquency behaviors as well as ratings of their experience with their mentor and the mentoring program. • Mentees' family members rated satisfaction with the mentoring relationship and mentoring program. • Mentors rated their satisfaction with training, the mentoring experience, and the mentoring program. • Teachers rated the mentees' behavior problems and connectedness.	Youth and teachers reported reductions in problem behavior from pre-test to post-test, but this change was only significant for the relational mentoring condition. At the six-month follow-up period, youth in the relational mentoring program reported higher family well-being/functioning scores, greater family life satisfaction, and greater satisfaction in their relationships with their mothers.

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada, Edmonton agency study (Cavell et al., 2017)	***Goals:*** Varying by the program types, the goals were either to: • Provide a supportive relationship; • Promote peer relationships; or • Help mentees academically. ***Setting:*** School. ***Duration:*** Within one academic year (approximately six months). ***Mentors:*** 253 high school student mentors (52% in tenth grade; 65% female). ***Mentees:*** 253 elementary school student mentees (66% in fifth or sixth grade; 61% female).	• Mentoring programs were grouped into three types: o One approach used voluntary mentors paired with children referred individually by teachers. This approach had limited goals beyond providing supportive relationships. o A second approach paired voluntary teenage mentors with students from a class in which all students received mentoring. This approach had an explicit goal of promoting peer relationships. o A third approach involved teenagers whose mentoring fulfilled their community service commitment for a class and mentees who were referred as part of an entire of students class being mentored, and which focused on academics.	• Secondary analysis of data from an evaluation of multiple high school mentoring programs operated by a single BBBS agency in Canada; focused on comparing the three approaches to on-to-one cross-age peer mentoring in six programs. • Pre-post, no control group design, assessing changes for individuals from pre-test to post-test on outcomes. • Both teachers and youth reported on outcome measures of academic and socioemotional functioning. • Differences from pre- to post-test outcomes were compared across the three recruitment approaches.	As a whole, mentees self-reported significantly higher ratings of self-worth and social competence at post-test than at pre-test. Overall, teacher ratings of mentees' academic performance were significantly higher at post-test than at pre-test. The largest benefits were for mentees who were individually selected for the mentoring program, were matched with volunteer teen mentors, and whose mentoring focused largely on relationship development. Both mentees from whole-class mentee referrals, and those with teens who mentored to fulfill course requirements fared least well. No differences emerged across the three recruitment configurations in ratings made by mentors of their perceived impact on mentees.

Program			Evaluation	
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/Activities**	**Methodology**	**Findings**
Children Teaching Children (CTC) Program (Sheehan et al., 1999)	***Goals:*** Develop a cross-age mentoring relationship, structured by violence prevention activities, to modify violence attitudes and behaviors among preadolescents. ***Setting:*** Community. ***Duration:*** Eighteen months. ***Mentors:*** Adolescents (aged 14 to 21) participating in the Cabrini Green Youth Program (CGYP). ***Mentees:*** Preadolescents (aged 7 to 13) from the community in which the larger CGYP program was embedded. ***Comparison group:*** Children from the Cabrini Green community who were selected to match the mentees by age and sex.	• The teenage mentors in the CTC program designed and presented lessons to teach younger children about violence prevention. • Program activities included skits, games, and rap music; a total of 12 lessons were produced over the 18-month study period.	• Quasi-experimental design, comparing differences in average score for each outcome measure at three points in time (pre, 9-months, and post, 18-months) between the mentee and comparison groups. • Post-test treatment and comparison samples included only children who were available at the post-test, which was less than half of the original sample. • Outcome measures obtained from youth (two measures of attitudes about violence) and teachers (problem behaviors).	On the first measure assessing "exposure to violence and/or acceptance of violence," the intervention and comparison groups did not differ at baseline or midway through the study; but at the end of the study, the intervention group reported lower scores. The mentee scores decreased from 4.4 to 4.1 at 9-months and 3.3 at 18 months; whereas the comparison group's attitudes toward and exposure to violence increased from 4.0 to 4.4 and 5.5 across the same time points. On a second measure of acceptance of violence, differences between the intervention and comparison group emerged at both 9 and 18 months, favoring mentees. Although post-test teacher ratings of conduct disorder problems were lower for the intervention group (n = 17 of original 50), teachers reported on only 6 of the original 75 comparison students, largely invalidating these comparisons.

This project was supported by Grant 2013-JU-FX-K001 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Justice.