

## National BBBS School-Based Mentoring Impact Study

### Public/Private Ventures

Carla Herrera, Jean Grossman, Tina Kauh, Amy Feldman, and Jennifer McMaken with Linda Jucovy

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Questions

- What do these programs look like?
- In what ways does BBBS SBM benefit youth?
- What kind of programs and matches yield the strongest benefits?
- What is the cost of these programs?

1

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Study Design

- Random Assignment Impact Study
- 10 Agencies
- 71 Schools
- 1,139 Youth in Grades 4 through 9
- Surveys Administered to Youth & Teachers
- 3 Waves of Data Collection (15-Month Study)
  - Fall 2004
  - Spring 2005
  - Late Fall 2005

2

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Findings: The Program

- BBBS SBM is not:
  - a tutoring program.
  - a CBM program placed inside a school.
- CBM and SBM costs are very similar.
- Programs are very diverse.
- Youth have many risk factors.
- Volunteers differ from those in CBM.
- Training and support could be strengthened.

3

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Training and Support

Relationship closeness Linked with	Carryover of match Linked with
Individual pre-match training; •Individual post-match training; •Communication with school staff; •BBBS program quality; •BBBS staff support; •Helpfulness of BBBS staff; •Helpfulness of school staff; and •School resources and space.	•Group training; •Individual pre-match training; •Individual post-match training; •BBBS program quality; •BBBS staff support; •Helpfulness of BBBS staff; and •School resources and space.

4

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Findings: Impacts in Year One

- Littles fared significantly better than controls in:
- Overall academic performance
    - Written and oral language
    - Science
  - Quality of class work
  - Number of assignments completed
  - Absence without an excuse/Starting to skip school
  - Engaging in serious school misconduct
  - Scholastic efficacy

5

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Findings: Impacts in Year Two

- Littles were less likely to skip school and were more confident they would attend and complete college.
- Other impacts were not sustained.
- Two reasons for the lack of strong Year 2 impacts:
  - Low participation in Year Two
  - Timing of Year 2 Follow-Up

6

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Findings: Youth Characteristics and Program Impacts

- HINTS that certain groups benefited more than others
  - Girls (both years)
  - Minorities (both years)
  - High academic performers (in year 1; low in year 2)

7

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Findings: Mentoring Experiences and Program Impacts

- Longer matches are linked with stronger impacts.
- Relationship quality may work with match length to determine strength of benefits.
- Summer meetings may lengthen and strengthen relationships.

8

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Recommendations

- Increase Match Length.
- Bridge the Summer Gap.
- Choose Supportive Schools and Foster those Relationships.
- Provide Volunteers with Sufficient Levels of Support and Training.
- Strengthen Relationship Quality.

9

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---