

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF SELECTED STUDIES OF EFFECTS OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS AND PROGRAMS ON DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR AND RELATED OUTCOMES

Outcome key: + Favorable effect - Unfavorable effect X No effect or nonsignificant finding DB = Delinquent behavior

MEN = Mentoring program or naturally occurring mentoring relationship

PRIMARY PREVENTION						
Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: Effect of mentoring on delinquent behavior (DB)	Question 2: Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: Intervening processes linking mentoring to lower DB?
Naturally occurring mentoring ⁵²	<p>Goal: N/A</p> <p>Setting: Varies</p> <p>Duration: Varies</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Any adult age 18–24 other than the youths’ parent or stepparent who youth reports has made a positive difference in their lives since age 14</p> <p>Mentees: Adolescents</p>		<p>Design: Observational with four waves of data collection: 2 years (wave 2), 6 years (wave 3), and 14 years following initial assessment (Wave 4)</p> <p>Sample: Adolescents with an average age of 15.8</p> <p>Mentoring: Presence and type of mentor measured with one 1 item at Wave 3</p> <p>Potential Mediators: Youth report 11-item scale of mattering at Waves 1 and 2.</p> <p>Outcomes: Youth-report scale of DB at Wave 1 (15 items) Wave 2 (14 items) and Wave 3 (16 items). Youth report eight-item scale of dangerous DB at Wave 3</p>	<p>X DB</p> <p>+ Dangerous DB</p>		<p>+MEN → (+) Mattering → (-) DB and (-) Dangerousness</p>
Naturally occurring mentoring ³²	<p>Goal: N/A</p> <p>Setting: Varies</p> <p>Duration: Varies</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: An adult 25 years or older identified by teen as a mentor (other than immediate family members)</p> <p>Mentees: Urban adolescents who were in their first year of high school in 1994, and who had eighth grade GPAs of 3.0 and below</p>		<p>Design: Observational, cross-sectional</p> <p>Sample: 770 adolescents</p> <p>Mentoring: Structured face-to-face interviews were used to assess youth report of having a mentor (one item)</p> <p>Outcomes: Single-item measures of Nonviolent DB and Violent DB</p>	<p>+ Nonviolent DB</p> <p>X Violent DB</p>		

PRIMARY PREVENTION

Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: Effect of mentoring on delinquent behavior (DB)	Question 2: Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: Intervening processes linking mentoring to lower DB?
Big Brother Big Sisters ²⁹	<p>Goal: Create and support one-to-one mentoring relationships that ignite the power and promise of youth</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: One-year commitment with potential for longer</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Adult community volunteers</p> <p>Mentees: Youth ages 6–18</p>	<p>Parents submit an application and a team decides if the child qualifies. Parents are involved throughout the process, provide information about their child’s strengths and needs, ask their child about their outings and share their child’s progress with program staff, and participate in training on child safety. Mentors commit for 12 months, meeting one to four times a month for an average of three to five hours. They complete a formal application, reference checks, in-person interviews, orientation, and a training</p>	<p>Design: RCT with measures at baseline (T1) and 15 months after follow-up (T2)</p> <p>Sample: 806 youth ages 10–16</p> <p>Mentoring: Participating in all six thriving promotion activities (“Step it up to Thrive”) versus standard services</p> <p>Potential Mediator: Three-item youth report of enhanced support for thriving from adults</p> <p>Outcome: Twenty-seven-item self-report scale of PB that includes a 22-item DB scale, and a 22-item/ 4 domain scale of youth thriving</p>	<p>✗Thriving condition → Problem Behavior</p>		<p>✚ Positive engagement with the activities → (+) enhanced support for thriving from adults → (+) personal resources for thriving and (-) Problem Behavior</p>
Naturally occurring mentoring ⁵³	<p>Goal: Reduce risk behavior among youth, especially in the context of school</p> <p>Setting: School</p> <p>Duration: N/A</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Teachers or other adults at school who the youth reports cares about them, tells them they do a good job, listens to what they have to say, believes them to be a success, or listens to them when they have something to say</p> <p>Mentees: High school students</p>		<p>Design: Observational (T1 & T2 one year later)</p> <p>Sample: 3,320 students from 65 high schools across 8 states, average age 14.8</p> <p>Mentoring: Five-item youth report of whether they have a mentor at school</p> <p>Potential Mediators: Four-item self-report scale of school attachment (T1)</p> <p>Outcome: Four-item self-report scale of violence perpetration (T2).</p>	<p>✚Violence Perpetration</p>		<p>✚ MEN → (+) School Attachment → (-) Violence Perpetration</p>

PRIMARY PREVENTION

Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: Effect of mentoring on delinquent behavior (DB)	Question 2: Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: Intervening processes linking mentoring to lower DB?
Mentor Sweden ⁵⁴	<p>Goal: Promote social, emotional, and academic development for the purpose of preventing substance abuse in low-risk youth</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: One year</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Adult volunteers</p> <p>Mentees: All 14-year-olds in program schools with a self-reported need for more adult contacts</p>	<p>Mentor Sweden staff meet with parents and mentors at the program onset, and with mentor-mentee pairs before, during, and after the program.</p> <p>Mentors undergo a criminal records check, take a two-day course on program aims and mentoring principles, and are offered supervision by program director or psychologist.</p> <p>Mentor/mentee pairs are matched on gender interests. They meet for two to five hours at least every two weeks and are free to meet as they see fit, but they are given eight "assignments" as suggestions. They are also given 2000 SEK (~280 USD) to spend during their meetings.</p>	<p>Design: RCT (T1 and T2 12 months later)</p> <p>Sample: 128 14-year olds (65 in treatment group) in Sweden</p> <p>Mentoring: Mentoring versus control condition</p> <p>Potential Moderator: Time measured as length of intervention</p> <p>Outcome: Forty-item scale of youth-report DB (T1 and T2)</p>	×DB		×Time → MEN
The Mentoring Enhancement Demonstration Program (MEDP) ⁴⁵			<p>Design: RCT</p> <p>Sample: 2,165 youth, just over half were female. The average age was 12.4. Thirty programs across 13 states participated.</p> <p>Mentoring: Enhancement versus no enhancement</p> <p>Outcomes: Stopped by police or arrests, onset of person-offenses, onset of property offences, and referral to a juvenile court</p>	<p>×Stopped by police or arrested</p> <p>×Person offenses—onset</p> <p>×Person offenses—frequency</p> <p>×Property offenses—onset</p> <p>×Property offenses—frequency</p> <p>+Referral to juvenile court</p>		

PRIMARY PREVENTION

Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: Effect of mentoring on delinquent behavior (DB)	Question 2: Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: Intervening processes linking mentoring to lower DB?
The Youth Empowerment Solutions (YES) program ³²	<p>Goal: Engage middle school youth to promote positive community change and enhance positive development using an empowerment framework</p> <p>Setting: School</p> <p>Duration: Academic year</p> <p>Format: Group</p> <p>Mentors: Paid after-school teachers</p> <p>Mentees: Middle school youth in two Michigan counties: Flint and Genesee</p>	<p>YES incorporates empowerment theory and helps youth build skills and interpersonal confidence through designing and implementing a community change project using photovoice. The curriculum provides structured lesson plans that are culturally responsive. The curriculum is organized around six units: Youth as Leaders, Learning About Our Community, Improving Our Community, Building Intergenerational Partnerships, Planning for Change, and Action and Reflection</p>	<p>Design: Modified random assignment. Youth were randomly assigned at schools where 12 or more youth consented. Schools with fewer than 12 youth were assigned to program or control. Participants completed a pretest and post-test 1 to 70 days after program completion.</p> <p>Sample: 367 middle school youth across 13 schools (249 YES participants and 118 regular after-school program youth) ages 11–16 (M = 12.71, SD = 0.91) 60% female</p> <p>Mentoring: YES Program versus regular after-school programming</p> <p>Potential Mediators: Dose received measured by mentee reports of activities participated in, and dose delivered measured by mentor reports of activities delivered</p> <p>Outcomes: DB measured using eight items adapted from the Child Behavior Checklist</p>	XDB		<p>⊕ Dose received → (-) DB ⊗ Dose delivered → DB</p>

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
The Young Women Leaders Program ⁵⁵	<p>Goal: preventing delinquency and related negative outcomes in adolescent girls identified as at-risk</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: Up to three years, mentees receive a new mentor each year</p> <p>Format: One-to-one and group</p> <p>Mentors: College women who commit five hours a week for the academic year</p> <p>Mentees: Seventh to ninth grade girls at risk for delinquency</p>	<p>Mentoring pairs meets for at least four hours a month one-on-one to do mutually agreed upon activities. Pairs meet two hours a week after school in groups of 8–10 mentees, their mentors, and a facilitator for connection, homework time, introduction of skills, working on service projects, and group discussion of problematic topics. All pairs attend structured activities once a semester on the college campus and most groups have sleepovers or play days.</p>	<p>Design: Quasi-experimental and randomized (true randomization did not occur year one, five-year follow-up)</p> <p>Sample: 165 youth</p> <p>Mentoring: Examined outcome based on dosage</p> <p>Outcomes: Youth report two-item DB subscale</p>			<p>⊕MEN dose → (-) DB</p>
The Buddy System ⁵⁶	<p>Goal: Prevent juvenile offending</p> <p>Setting: Hawaii (urban and rural)</p> <p>Duration: Approximately one year</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Paid adults recruited from the same neighborhoods as mentees. Mentors served three mentees each</p> <p>Mentees: Adolescents ages 11–17 referred for problems such as truancy, aggression, and low academic performance</p>	<p>Clinical psychology students supervised mentors</p> <p>Pairs met every week. Mentors had a small monthly allowance to spend on fun activities. These activities were contingent on good behaviors.</p>	<p>Design: RCT 35 year follow-up</p> <p>Sample: 475 adults; 295 participants (62.1%) in the Buddy System and 180 (37.9%) from the randomly assigned no-treatment control group</p> <p>Mentoring: Study records of mentoring versus control youths</p> <p>Potential Moderators:^{viii,ix} Program records of whether the youth was arrested before referral, and their gender</p> <p>Outcome: Court records of arrests</p>		<p>✗Arrest rate for participants with no arrest before referral</p> <p>✗Arrest rate for participants with arrests before referral</p> <p>✗Arrests for women with no arrests before referral</p> <p>✗Arrests for women with no arrests before referral</p>	

^{viii} Since one-tailed tests were used in these analyses, a significance testing cutoff of $p < .025$ was used.

^{ix} Analyses testing a mentoring program or relationship effect at different levels of the potential moderator were reported without a test of the moderator (i.e., whether the mentoring - outcome association was statistically different across levels of the potential moderator)

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Campus Corps ⁵⁷	<p>Goal: Prevent deeper engagement with the juvenile justice system, school dropouts, and serious behavioral health problems</p> <p>Setting: College campus</p> <p>Duration: Twelve weeks</p> <p>Format: Combination one-to-one and group</p> <p>Mentors: Undergraduate students in a three-semester service-learning course</p> <p>Mentees: High risk youth ages 11–18, mostly recruited from probation and office of the District Attorney. Youth deeply involved in the juvenile justice system are not included</p>	<p>Each mentor is assigned a “mentor family” (groups of four or five other pairs) and supervised by more experienced mentors and graduate students trained in therapeutic interventions and systemic thinking. Each week includes a four-hour meeting where mentors and mentees walk on campus, work on individualized career planning, have family dinners, or engage in other prosocial activities.</p>	<p>Design: QED, pre- and post-test</p> <p>Sample: 382 youth (n = 286 in Campus Corps; n = 136 comparison referred after program was full)</p> <p>Mentoring: Mentoring versus “treatment as usual”</p> <p>Outcome: Single youth-report open-ended truancy item, 13-item youth report scale of DB and substance use</p>	<p>+ DB and Substance use</p> <p>+ Truancy</p>		

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
SFUSD’s Mentoring for Success program: Project Arrive initiative ⁵⁸	<p>Goal: Address the needs of youth at risk of dropping out of school</p> <p>Setting: School</p> <p>Duration: Academic Year</p> <p>Format: Group</p> <p>Mentors: Volunteer school staff (counselors, advisers, principals, other staff) or community partners (employees of local nonprofits).</p> <p>Mentees: At risk K–12 students in the San Francisco school district</p>	<p>Two co-mentors met weekly with groups of six to eight students during school hours for 50-minute sessions.</p> <p>A full-time program coordinator conducts a four-hour training for mentors, assists with recruiting and enrolling students, meets monthly with mentoring teams, provides match and logistical support, and serves as a liaison between each school and the district’s student support programs office. Mentors receive a binder with program procedures, contact information, and curricular materials, and access to a website with activities that address common adolescent issues. Mentors select activities or work with their mentees to develop activities and discuss topics in line with overall program goals.</p>	<p>Design: QED with data collected at five time points: pre-intervention plus the end of fall and spring semester for two years</p> <p>Sample: 1,219 68 youth who finished the program (n = 240 Project Arrive, n = 983 comparison)</p> <p>Mentoring: Project arrive compared to demographically similar students.</p> <p>Outcome: Truancy data was collected from school administrative records and arrests records were collected from the juvenile probation department.</p>	<p>×Ninth grade arrests</p> <p>+Eighth grade, 10th grade, or any year</p> <p>+Truancy</p>		
Promoter Pathway Program ⁵⁹	<p>Information about this program and study can be found on CrimeSolutions.gov</p>			<p>–Getting into a fight</p> <p>×Carrying a weapon</p> <p>×Incarceration</p>		
Coaching for Communities ⁶⁰	<p>Information about this program and study can be found on CrimeSolutions.gov</p>			<p>×Volume of offending</p> <p>+Variety of offending</p>		

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Operation Peacekeeper ⁶¹	Information about this program and study can be found on CrimeSolutions.gov			+Gun homicides in Stockton, Calif.		
National Guard Youth Challenge ³⁵	<p>Goal: Improve educational and behavioral outcomes for youth who have dropped out of high school</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: One year or longer</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Youth nominate their own mentor</p> <p>Mentees: Sixteen-to-eighteen-year-old unemployed high school dropouts who are disconnected from meaningful direction in life but not heavily involved in the justice system</p>	The mentoring phase of the National Guard Youth Challenge is the third phase of the 17-month program. Youth nominate mentors in phase two and staff initiate the relationship and check in with youth and mentors monthly. Mentors are meant to help maintain the attitudes and behaviors learned in the earlier phases of the program.	<p>Design: Nonexperimental mixed methods</p> <p>Sample: 722 youth in the treatment group</p> <p>Mentoring: Duration of mentoring relationship at 38-month follow-up, re-estimated using propensity scores based on baseline characteristics of youth</p> <p>Outcome: Self-reported convictions</p>	+Convictions		
Comprehensive Homicide Initiative ⁶²	Information about this program and study can be found on CrimeSolutions.gov			+Number of homicides		
The Girls Circle ⁶³	<p>Goal: Address gender-specific risks, needs, and strengths of girls in the juvenile justice system</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: Eight to ten weeks</p> <p>Format: Group</p> <p>Mentors: Varies</p> <p>Mentees: Girls ages 9–18</p>	<p>Based on the relational-cultural theory of female psychology</p> <p>Uses motivational interviewing</p>	<p>Design: RCT, pre/posttest</p> <p>Sample: 168 youth (112 treatment and 56 control)</p> <p>Mentoring: Potential</p> <p>Moderator: Dosage as number of days attended</p> <p>Outcomes: The Juvenile Probation and Court Services Department provided court records of recidivism, including probation violation, delinquency petition, arrest, and any event (i.e., petition or arrests)</p>	XRecidivism		

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Reading for Life ⁶⁴	<p>Goal: Provide an alternative to court prosecution for first- and second-time juvenile offenders; reduce recidivism through moral development and character education</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: Ten weeks</p> <p>Format: Group</p> <p>Mentors: Adult volunteer mentors</p> <p>Mentees: Nonviolent, often first-time offenders</p>	<p>Youth are placed in groups of up to five based on reading ability with two mentors. Volunteers undergo an initial practical and theoretical training, with ongoing training and supervision quarterly, and spend twelve weeks shadowing experience mentors before leading groups. Groups select a novel from a list and 60-minute sessions involve oral readings, journaling, and discussion. Through this they learn about Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas's seven virtues. Groups also choose a one-day community service project that coincides with themes from their novel. The program ends with a final presentation for youths' parents, mentors, and staff.</p>	<p>Design: RCT, measured yearly for four years</p> <p>Sample: Nonviolent offenders ages 11–18 (n = 194 treatment; n = 214 controls)</p> <p>Mentoring: Randomly assigned to mentoring or 25 hours community service</p> <p>Outcome: Counts for arrests, misdemeanors, and felonies</p>	<p>✦ Arrests</p> <p>✦ Misdemeanor offenses</p> <p>✦ Felony offenses</p>		
Campus Connections ⁶⁵	<p>Goal: Reduce the depth of a youth's entry into the juvenile justice system by providing opportunities to expunge charges and avoid adjudication</p> <p>Setting: College campuses</p> <p>Duration: Twelve weeks</p> <p>Format: One-to-one and group</p> <p>Mentors: College students</p> <p>Mentees: Youth at risk for future delinquency, 10–18 years old, and residing in Larimer County, Colorado</p>	<p>Pairs meet one day a week, for four hours, for 12 weeks on the university campus. They participate in a community of about 25 other pairs and for activities such as exploring campus during 30-minute weekly walks, getting homework help for an hour each week, eating dinner together, and participating in two hours of prosocial activities like sports or cooking.</p>	<p>Design: Qualitative</p> <p>Sample: 87 first-time offending youth age 11–18 (M = 15)</p> <p>Mentoring: All youth participated in Campus Connections</p> <p>Outcome: Youth described changes they experienced through their involvement with the program in 16 to 32-minute interviews</p>			<p>76% of youth felt they had gained a positive influence in avoiding delinquency</p> <p>Many youths reported staying out of trouble out of concern that they would disappoint their mentor</p>

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
The Arches Transformative Mentoring program (Arches) ⁶⁶	<p>Goal: Reduce recidivism</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Program: Unnamed</p> <p>Duration: Forty-eight lessons over 6–12 months</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Paid adult “credible messengers,” meaning those with backgrounds and characteristics similar to the populations they serve</p> <p>Mentees: Youth on juvenile probation in NYC</p>	Intensive group mentoring sessions using an Interactive Journaling curriculum based on cognitive behavioral therapy principles. Groups meet in two one-hour sessions a week. A full-time program coordinator organizes activities. Sites employ one lead mentor and two to three part-time mentors. Participants receive stipend of up to \$800 for participating in sessions. Sites also provide group meals.	<p>Design: QED, 12(T1) and 24(T2) months following probation</p> <p>Sample: n = 279 arches participants, n = 682 control youth on probation and not enrolled in Arches</p> <p>Mentoring: Arches participants versus matched controls</p> <p>Outcome: Arrests, Felony Arrests, Reconvictions, and Felony Reconvictions were collected from Department of Probation records</p>	<p>✦ Arrests T1</p> <p>✦ Arrests T2</p> <p>✗ Felony arrests T1</p> <p>✦ Felony arrests T2</p> <p>✦ Reconvictions T1</p> <p>✦ Reconvictions T2</p> <p>✦ Felony reconvictions T1</p> <p>✦ Felony reconvictions T2</p>		
Six separate mentoring programs across the state of Ohio: David’s Challenge, Inc; Community for New Direction; Sunlight Village Network, Inc.; Youth Advocate Program; Catholic Charities Community Services of Summit County; I Dream Academy ⁶⁷			<p>Design: QED, youth matched on risk, gender, and age</p> <p>Sample: Two samples; parole youth who participated in mentoring services (n = 190) versus parole youth who did not (n = 234), and probation youth who participated in mentoring services (n = 100) versus probation youth who did not (n = 1,121). Age of the probation sample ranged from 12 to 19 (m = 15.41, SD = 1.47) and was 80.7% male. For the parole sample, ages ranged from 13 to 21 (m = 17.64, SD = 1.31), with 94.8% of the sample male</p> <p>Mentoring: Youth who participated in mentoring versus those who did not.</p> <p>Potential Mediators: Relationship quality was measured with the Dual Role Relationship Inventory-Revised (DRI-R) the Youth Mentoring Survey (YMS), and program satisfaction was measured with the Perceived Program Effectiveness (PPE) scale</p> <p>Outcome: Recidivism was measured as a new offence or revocation of parole/probation</p>	✗ MEN → Recidivism (Parole and Probation)	✗ MEN X Risk Level → No impact recidivism	✗ Relationship Quality → Recidivism (Parole and Probation) — Youth satisfaction with mentor → Recidivism

SECONDARY PREVENTION

SECONDARY PREVENTION						
Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Youth Advocacy Programs ⁶⁸	<p>Goal: Reduce misconduct and recidivism and increase engagement in school or employment</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Program: Unnamed</p> <p>Duration: Four to six months</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Paid adults</p> <p>Mentees: Youth referred by the courts as diversion from incarceration</p>	<p>YAP referrals come from juvenile justice, child welfare, and behavioral health agencies under a “no reject – no eject” referral policy.</p> <p>YAP provides wraparound services in a process that begins with a strength-based family assessment. Staff meets with the family to introduce the program, learn about the family, complete four assessment tools, and address any immediate safety concerns. A team of formal service and informal supports (e.g., family members, pastors) is gathered to identify the family’s needs and strengths, to develop a plan to meet these needs, and to develop a thorough safety plan. Advocate mentors and youth ideally meet for at least 7.5 hours per week, and sometimes meet up to 30 hours per week. They implement Individual Treatment Plans that are developed with each family.</p>	<p>Design: Recurrent institutional cycle (RIC) design for pre-post-test and cross-cohort comparisons; within-group 12-month follow-up.</p> <p>Sample: 163 youth</p> <p>Mentoring: 15–20 hours a week for three to four months.</p> <p>Outcome: Self-reported criminal disposition (truancies, misdemeanors and felonies) at 12-month follow-up</p>	<p>†Serious disposition at one-year follow-up</p>		

SECONDARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Mentoring Toward College Enhancement for Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta ⁶⁹	<p>Goal: Improve social, emotional, and cognitive development, through a focus on improved attitudes about the self, others, and academic achievement</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: One-year minimum commitment</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: College students</p> <p>Mentees: A focus on youth from high-risk backgrounds</p>	An additional layer to community mentoring that involves structured activities based on a specialized curriculum delivered through activity guides, workshops, and seminars.	<p>Design: RCT</p> <p>Sample: 450 matches, youth were from high risk backgrounds, 9 to 15 years old (mean = 11.5 years), and 48% male, 52% female</p> <p>Mentoring: Mentoring towards college versus regular mentoring program</p> <p>Potential Moderator: Gender</p> <p>Outcome: Aggressive behavior measured with a four-item self-report scale (e.g., got into a serious physical fight); school DB was measured with a three-item self-report scale; Variety of DB was measured with a score indexing 11 self-report DBs</p>	<p>✗ No difference between regular mentoring and enhancements for any outcome (i.e., Aggressive Behavior, School DB, Variety of DB)</p>	<p>✚ Enhancement Condition X Gender -> (-) Aggressive Behavior and Variety of DB, but not school DB</p>	

TERTIARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Communities in Schools (2019) ⁷⁰	<p>Goal: Promote academic skills and socioemotional development</p> <p>Setting: Nineteen public schools in Texas</p> <p>Duration: One school-year program, and 10-year follow-up.</p> <p>Format: One-on-one</p> <p>Mentors: Adult volunteers</p> <p>Mentees: Youth grades 5–12, with more girls (67%) and divided across high school (44%), middle school (31%), and elementary school (25%).</p>	All students participated in CIS support services (including tutoring, small group counseling, etc.) and but half were randomly assigned to meet with a mentor in addition. The number of mentoring meetings ranged from 0 to 31, with an average of 8.	<p>Design: RCT, relative efficacy study comparing standard of care (Communities in Schools services) to standard of care plus assignment to mentoring program.</p> <p>Sample: 463 mostly Latinx</p> <p>Mentoring: Individual, hour-long meetings, range of academic activities, play, and conversation.</p> <p>Potential Moderator: Problem-focused conversations and mattering reported by the mentee</p> <p>Outcome: Record of arrest from San Antonio court records, codes as any or no arrest by age 21</p>	+Arrest	<p>×Problem-focused conversations</p> <p>× Low mattering reported by mentee</p> <p>+Time spent getting to know the mentee</p>	
My Life Mentoring, ⁷¹	<p>Goal: Enhance the understanding and application of self-determination skills to improve transition outcomes for youth in foster care</p> <p>Setting: School or community</p> <p>Duration: [[TK?]]</p> <p>Format: One-to-one and group</p> <p>Mentors: Adults with training to work with youth, occasionally MSW students</p> <p>Mentees: 293 foster youth averaged 17 years of age, approximately half were female, and half were Caucasian, and all were in the custody of the Oregon DHS. The average length of placement in foster care was six years, with 42% enrolled in independent living programs and nearly 60% having a special education disability.</p>	<p>Youth meet weekly with mentors for 60–90 minutes, typically during unscheduled class periods, or out of school time.</p> <p>Youth learn to apply skills in the domains of achievement, partnership development, and self-regulation by following a small number of systematic steps. Mentors help youth learn skills by rehearsing strategies, practicing activities necessary for goal achievement, cheering youth progress, and occasionally challenging the youth to take action.</p> <p>Mentors introduce skills as problems arise.</p>	<p>Design: A blocked, randomized design relative efficacy RCT comparing “community as usual” (CUA) to CUA plus mentoring.</p> <p>Sample: Treatment ($n = 144$) and control group ($n = 149$)</p> <p>Mentoring: My Life participants versus youth with traditional transition services</p> <p>Potential Moderators: Gender, developmental disability, youth receives special education services, baseline delinquency (one year before treatment)</p> <p>Outcome: Criminal justice involvement (CJI), defined as past year trouble with the law, and/or self-reported arrests or convictions and/or self-reported days incarcerated or on probation</p>	×Criminal Justice Involvement	<p>+ MEN X Gender → (-) CJI for males in intervention group, no effect for females</p> <p>×MEN X Special education → no impact on CJI</p> <p>+ MEN X Developmental Disability (DD) → (-) criminal justice involvement for youth without a DD no effect for youth with a DD</p> <p>×MEN X Baseline delinquency → no impact on CJI</p>	

TERTIARY PREVENTION

TERTIARY PREVENTION						
Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
YES Mentoring Program ⁷²	<p>Goal: Increase positive outcomes and reduce negative outcomes for court-referred adolescent male Persons in Need of Supervision (PINS); provide an adult for guidance and stability during a high-crisis time</p> <p>Setting: Community- based</p> <p>Duration: One month to three years or more</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Adults matched on demographics</p> <p>Mentees: PINS referred from the Brooklyn County Family Court. Youth are required to attend but face no real consequences for nonattendance.</p>	<p>Mentors often reach out to the youth, visit their home, and provide a bridge between their home life and the community. Some PINS received additional services in times of crisis, such as home visits, counseling, family meetings, phone consultations, and educational consultations.</p>	<p>Design: Observational, measures at six months, twelve months, two years, three years, and four years after the start of the intervention</p> <p>Sample: Seventy-nine court-referred adolescent boys (mean age = 14.28; SD = 1.37)</p> <p>Mentoring: Number of times met with mentor tallied by mentee and mentor</p> <p>Outcome: Dropping out of the program or being arrested measured at each interval</p>	<p>✗Arrests or dropping out of the program</p>		

TERTIARY PREVENTION

Program			Evaluation			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: What is the effect of mentoring on DB?	Question 2: What factors condition or shape the effects of mentoring on DB?	Question 3: What intervening processes are important for linking mentoring to lower DB?
Spotlight Serious Offender Services ⁷³	<p>Goal: Provide support-based services and deter gang involvement and justice-system re-involvement through probation supervision and surveillance checks</p> <p>Setting: Community</p> <p>Duration: Varies; average time just over two years</p> <p>Format: One-to-one</p> <p>Mentors: Mentors are paid community corrections employees, who have training in cognitive behavioral assessment and intervention techniques. Mentors have university degrees or some post-secondary training and are usually from a racial minority group.</p> <p>Mentees: High-risk gang-involved young male offenders</p>	<p>Spotlight provides support-based services, which include mentorship activities and probation counselling, coupled with client-specific programming and some family-based rehabilitation services. The program consists of an area director, four supervising probation officers, four street mentors, an intensive support and supervision worker, administrative support staff, and one part-time contract family therapist. The probation officers and street mentors carry caseloads of 15 youth each. Mentors have some latitude as to whether they report such things as minor curfew violations. Activities included sporting and recreational outings, going to Winnipeg Harvest and a sweat lodge, and camping.</p>	<p>Design: QED</p> <p>Sample: Twelve-to-nineteen-year olds with an average age of 16, about 2/3 were aboriginal offenders</p> <p>Mentoring: Mentor youth versus control youth matched with PSM undergoing different treatment or released without supervision requirement</p> <p>Outcome: Time to re-offense, court convictions and crime severity (medium, low, high) from official records</p>	<p>+</p> Time to re-offense <p>+</p> New conviction <p>+</p> High severity offence		



This project was supported 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.