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ABSTRACT

Trends in restorative justice, reintegrative alternatives to traditional programming, and funding limitations in corrections have created the need for community based resources to be developed and used to supplement existing correctional treatment program components. Mentoring is one such resource that has emerged as a realistic community based resource with the potential for broad application. Mentoring is defined as, “a voluntary relationship in which a commitment is made by a mentor to guide a youthful probationer into increased maturity, and, a commitment is made by a youthful probationer to receive this guidance.”

One glaring deficiency in the operations of most criminal justice agencies is the lack of evaluation, for both program implementation and outcomes. There is an immediate need for evaluation procedures that contribute to the monitoring of program operations, with the goal of making the most efficient and effective use of limited resources.

This thesis will evaluate the implementation of a mentor program in a county probation day school setting with youth adjudicated by the juvenile court. A model mentoring program and a strategy for implementation, developed as a result of this evaluation, will be presented for future consideration in similar settings.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, implementation evaluation will be the utilization of a procedure for determining how effectively a new program was implemented into a county probation juvenile day school facility. This thesis does not assess the outcome of projects or activities, nor hypothesize about the success of any particular clients. A single component (The Mentor Program) of a particular kind of social program (providing needed services to adjudicated wards of the court) will be the focus of study (specifically how effectively the mentor program was implemented within the Youth Justice Center). Included in this thesis will be development of the concept of mentoring, and, implementation evaluation as a management tool.

The implementation evaluation will gather data from probation staff, mentors, and mentees, and will measure their perceptions of the mentor program. It is hypothesized that the mentors themselves will report the greatest degree of “implementation frustration” among the three groups, for it are the mentors that have the greatest challenge and role in making the mentor program “work.”

Hopefully, three goals will be achieved: (a) that a feedback mechanism will be provided to aid program revision within the host agency, (b) that a mentoring guide or model will emerge that can be used in other settings, and (c) that the evaluation will serve the host agency to better implement future programs.

Implementation evaluation is a valuable management tool. Because implementation is the process by which we actually carry out policy, Redlinger and
Shanahan (1986) conclude, “it should go without saying that better policies in general, and criminal justice policy in particular, would result if policy-makers would consider whether or not their decisions can be effectively implemented before they choose a course of action.” (p. 76) Because decisions are usually not self-executing within human organizations, there is a need for prescriptive information on how to choose implementation processes so that, “desired impacts are effectively achieved and can be measured, unintended and undesirable impacts can be avoided, and finally personnel can be held accountable” (Redlinger and Shanahan, 1986, p. 77).

Implementation evaluation will be detailed in this section, first conceptually and then as a process. A brief overview is as follows:

**IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION PROCESS OVERVIEW**

I. IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION DESIGN:

Implementation evaluation begins with the development and use of questionnaires, interviews, and other instruments to solicit pertinent information on the factors related to the start up of a program. The two main concepts to be evaluated are: (a) the procedures and instruments of the data gathering and feedback process (is the implementation evaluation able to measure what it was intended to), and (b) the program itself (does the program accomplish its goals). In both of these evaluations the questions of what lessons were learned and what mistakes can be avoided are hopefully answered.
II. IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION APPLICATIONS AND PRODUCTS:

Implementation evaluation is useful for both the host organization and other interested organizations. Once the evaluation is completed, the host organization can make the necessary changes to create a model program. This model program can then continue with consideration given to the lessons learned. Performance of the model program can be monitored, and revisions can be made whenever necessary. The products of an implementation evaluation include the ability to create new programs more effectively, as well as revise existing programs.

Other organizations can benefit from the lessons learned by the host organization, therefore, the model program can be replicated in similar settings.

IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Often ignored in the debate over the effects of rehabilitation has been the behavior of public officials who are responsible for designing and implementing treatment policies. Put another way, “bad implementation” may swamp relatively small treatment effects of rehabilitation, thus supporting the claim that “nothing works” in corrections. (Hamm and Schrink, 1989, p.166)

In any organizational setting, the problems experienced by a new program may be caused by implementation errors. The program itself can be well designed, but the implementation of the program into the existing structure is ineffective. This may be especially true of criminal justice agencies that operate in a complex, open environment with a host of internal and external influences. Lewis and Greene believe that, “the
problem of implementation failure is an important component in the evaluation of criminal justice projects” (Lewis and Greene, 1979, p. 167). They point out that project implementation is neglected by organizational researchers, evaluation specialists, policy makers, and program developers. Their solution is to have those involved with programming accept the premise that, “effective criminal justice programming requires a feedback loop that provides information on whether or not projects are working and why.”

Evaluation research is viewed by its partisans as a way to increase the rationality of policy making. (Weiss, 1972) Evaluation can used to investigate the extent of implementation success so that decisions such as these can be made (Weiss, 1972):

1) To continue or discontinue the program or program component.
2) To improve its practices and procedures.
3) To add or drop specific program strategies and techniques.
4) To begin similar programs elsewhere.
5) To allocate resources among competing programs.
6) To accept or reject a program approach or theory.

It has been noted that, “the more direct the path of implementation to the specific set of behaviors that solve the problem, the higher the probability of successful implementation” (Redlinger and Shanahan, 1986, p. 82). “The framework management cycle model” formulated by Lewis and Greece (1978) divides the association between the time periods and planned innovations into stages. By identifying the stages along the path
of implementation, one can better assess how directly the path unfolds from the concept stage to the implementation stage.

The framework management cycle is divided into three stages:

1) Problem Analysis and Project Initiation.

This is the production stage where existing situations are diagnosed, alternate futures are identified, specific innovations are selected to help achieve desired goals, and, efforts are made to acquire the necessary resources. In corrections, for example, a drug program component may be added to an existing treatment program of a residential setting because the high correlation between drug usage and crime might suggest the necessity to address the problem of drug usage as a separate concentration. Administration would then assess current drug programs being used in similar settings, select one for implementation, and then fund and staff the new drug program component.

2) Attempted Implementation.

This stage is characterized by efforts to put into operation the ideas and activities selected during stage one. In the above example, the drug program component is scheduled into operation. Once funding and staffing are secured, the new component becomes operationalized within the total treatment milieu of the residential setting.
3) Institutionalization or Rejection.

This stage represents the period in which the innovation or some adaptation of it is institutionalized or rejected by the host organization and its environment. In the above example, the drug program component may be rejected because the form of drug counseling utilized (for example, confrontation therapy) has created the unpredicted results of breeding anger and mistrust among those in residence. Thus, the attempt to reduce drug usage has undermined the entire treatment process, is found unsuitable, and is terminated. If the drug component had been successful, it could have been expanded (improved production) or, it could be replaced by a more effective drug program (future framework). It is in this third stage that implementation evaluation takes place for the purpose of providing for improved production and implementation of future frameworks. (Lewis and Greece, 1978, and California State Department of Education, 1971)

If the final outcomes do not satisfy expectations there may be at least three reasons for the apparent lack of project success:

1) Programmic Over Expectation (the expectations for success were greatly exaggerated). Using the drug program example, administration might have been misled regarding the actual success rates of this approach. Expectations influenced the decision to choose this particular approach. Faulty experimental design, the wrong subject pool, or blatant falsification by the private providers might have led to the drug program being “oversold.”
2) Conceptual Failure (the theoretical framework is inaccurate or incomplete). The project fails because it did not produce the anticipated results. In the drug program example, the theory that confrontation therapy would strip away the dysfunctional defense systems of the participants, which would then lead to honest appraisals of personal responsibility, simply did not stand the test of implementation. The confrontation therapy actually resulted in strengthening dysfunctional defense systems, and this led to the projection of more blame on others. As a result, personal responsibility continued to be avoided.

3) Implementation Failure (the project was never operationalized according to the research design). Implementation failure can be the causal factor for a project appearing to fail, because the project developed differently than originally intended. (Lewis and Greene, 1978) If implementation evaluation is not applied, it is probable that project failure will be blamed on the project design. This could lead to unnecessary redesigning, and if implementation remains unchanged, project failure would again occur. Consequently, implementation evaluation should be a regularly prescribed and on-going management function.

IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION PROCESS

Lewis and Greene (1978) have identified four primary process issues that can have an independent effect on project implementation. These will later serve as the basis
for evaluation in this study. They are: (a) project goal and objective clarity, (b) goal consensus, (b) interdependence of vested interests, and (d) local motivations for obtaining and using federal support.

1) Project Goal and Objective Clarity.

There is a need for explicit program description. Often, clear, concise goals and objectives are lacking, which create vagueness for the personnel carrying out the program design. Program goals are often hazy, ambiguous, and hard to pin down. Occasionally, official goals are merely a long list of pious and partly incompatible platitudes.

Examples of vague goals might be, “delinquency prevention,” “building self esteem,” or “resocializing the offender.” In one study reported by Weiss (1972) committee members were asked to specify their programs’ goals. They came up with such things as improving the behavior of the youths, helping them become better citizens, and improving their school work. When the committee members attempted to translate the goals into operational criteria of program success, “behavior” and “citizenship” were too vague to use, and school grades were too likely to be influenced by teachers' stereotyped perceptions of the youth. Because these goals were not operationally defined, operational procedures and their relationship to goal attainment could be ignored.

Personnel do not know exactly what is expected, possibly making even robust efforts noneffective and nonefficient. This is particularly true for organizations that are
addressing multiple-solution problems. Values and attitudes can affect decisions. Also, organizational complexity limits consensus that can lead to confusion. This confusion can then lead to unintended innovation in individual behavior that may result in cross purposes to the original program design. One side benefit of evaluation becomes the possibility of focusing attention on the formulation of goals in terms of the specific behaviors that program practitioners aim to achieve.

Lewis and Greene (1978) identify two impacts that such shifts in project orientation have on both the implementation and evaluation efforts: (a) The implementation process itself is modified by the redirection of project objectives, and (b) Consideration of the project's use of resources toward goal attainment requires the identification of the "real" purpose of the program(s). There might not be an absence of resources, but rather a possibility of misdirection in the allocation of resources.

2) Goal Consensus.

In some cases, the issue of goal consensus can be directly related to the previous consideration of goal and objective clarity. However, even if the goals and objectives are clear and understandable there might not be a "buying in" by personnel. An example might be an institutional director instituting a "treatment" priority in programming while the line staff prefer a "control" priority in programming. Even if the director's goals and objectives are clearly understood by line staff, their fear of being attacked or losing control of the inmate population may make them reject the "official" treatment goals and objectives.
Critical actors, both within an organization and critical actors in an external environment, may lack goal consensus due to the perceived negative impact of newly imposed goals and objectives upon their organization. Fears may include a loss of power, control, or ability to predict outcomes. "What is in it for me?" can be the overriding concern of critical actors in the process of change.

Hamm and Schrink (1989) report that public officials must be predisposed toward rehabilitative policies. In the absence of official support for rehabilitation, any further resort to implementation analysis is unwanted. Moreover, if public officials accept the "nothing works" doctrine, then the implementation of rehabilitation programs is excluded by fiat. The bureaucratic structure of the correctional institution must accommodate programs that are premised upon rehabilitative rationales. In the absence of organizational support, treatment programs will not flourish regardless of official mandates for rehabilitative policies. (Hamm and Schrink, 1989)

Within an organization there can be a lack of goal consensus between management and labor, and, or supervisors and line staff. In one study of methods for implementing policy changes in correctional institutions, McShane and Williams (1993) found that the preferred method by wardens was to "circulate preliminary changes and solicit feedback from administrative ranks." In general, "wardens preferred dealing chiefly with their administrative staff when a policy change was in the offing, rather than to communicate directly with line officers." This is an example of soliciting goal consensus among administrative staff while omitting the line staff who will ultimately bear the responsibility for implementing the changes. This could lead to implementation
failure due to a lack of goal consensus. In some cases there will be a lack of goal consensus due to undetected incompatibilities among stated goals.

Weiss (1972) reports that in one program that attempted to increase coordination among private and public agencies serving its "run-down neighborhood, innovation (the contrivance of unusual new approaches) was a stated goal. What was discovered is that coordination among agencies is easier around old, clearly established, accepted patterns of service. It was discovered that innovation is likely to weaken coordination, and weakened coordination is likely to dampen the innovative spirit.

3) Interdependence of Vested Interests.

In a systems approach to organizations, any sub-system that is interactive with another sub-system will find cooperation necessary for the success of their program. Mutual interdependence requires goal consensus. Often implementation failure can be traced to short sightedness regarding the scope of who needs to "buy into" the program. This may range from a police chief not including the patrol division in a decision that will ultimately be implemented by officers on the beat to, that same police chief not including the mayor in a decision that may affect the city as a whole.

The ability to secure goal consensus within an environment can be undermined by inattention to the need for goal consensus by those outside the immediate environment. From the "systems model" notion that systems are composed of elements in constant interaction, that systems interact with constantly changing environments, and that social
systems are complex and adaptive structures that must change in order not only to survive but to pursue goals, emerges a distinctive role for implementation evaluation.

Implementation evaluation can also serve as a coordination mechanism, in that it can provide guidance for adapting parts to the system, provide a tool for controlling dysfunction, and eliminate cross-purposes among parts. (Hudzik and Cordner, 1983)

Individuals and organizations tend to be protective of their self interests. Any perceived threat to vested interests can result in resistance. Therefore, some researchers have even proposed that the “goal model” be replaced in favor of a “system model” to counteract the pitfalls mentioned above. In the system model, there is recognition that organizations pursue other functions besides the achievement of official goals. They have to acquire resources, coordinate subunits, and adapt to the environment. These preoccupations become entangled with, and set limits to, the attainment of program goals. According to system model proponents, an evaluation that ignores them is likely to result in artificial and perhaps misleading goals. (Weiss, 1972)

4) Local Motivations For Obtaining and Using Federal Support.

For many public institutions, grantsmanship is a primary method of soliciting additional funding for programs and projects. According to Lewis and Greene, “the prevailing view is that of the deceiving local jurisdictions attempting to solicit federal resources,” even though “the issue on the grantor-grantee relationships has yet to be fully explored in its appropriate context” (1978, p. 174). In the worse case scenario, the grantee would actually misrepresent their program in a planned deception to garner
funding. A less serious case scenario would have the program posturing itself by using "buzzwords" that create an impression that may or may not accurately represent the programs goals. Lewis and Greene see the possibility of having a "forced marriage" of the grantee entering into a utilitarian relationship with a grantor. If the actual goals of the program are manipulated to garner funding, a lack of goal consensus emerges and implementation could be less than successful.

The four primary issues listed by Lewis and Greene (1978)—project goal and objective clarity, goal consensus, interdependence of vested interests, and local motivations for obtaining and using federal support, will later become evaluation criteria in chapter five.

The mentoring program evaluated here takes place within the juvenile justice system, functioning as a treatment modality for incarcerated youth. It is therefore beneficial to examine the juvenile justice system in order to better appreciate the context in which the mentor program functions. The following chapter provides an overview of the juvenile justice system, concentrating specifically on its' historical development. It will be shown that mentoring, as a form of volunteerism, is a concept with a rich history.
CHAPTER 2 OVERVIEW OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

Youth crime has been an American social problem for almost 150 years. The public's concern in the 1800's that the number of deviant lower class youth was growing led to the specialization of juvenile delinquency as a focus of study and public policy.

Urbanization and industrialization created cities and with them the impression that large numbers of undersocialized youth posed a threat to the norms of middle-class society. The fearful public looked to the local government for social control of this emerging deviance. For the first time in American history, the government began assuming the role that had belonged to the family and the local community--socialization of its youth. Initial citizen responses, as a form of volunteerism, led to the creation of houses of refuge and the society for the reformation of juvenile delinquents in the 1820's in New York City.

In the 1830's the parens patriae doctrine ("the father of his country," which means the state as father) asserted the right of the state to assume the wardship of a child when the natural parents or the testamentary guardians were adjudged unfit to perform their duties (Binder et al., 1988). The juvenile justice system and the use of institutions to remove youth from the community began initially as an alternative, a last resort. This last resort would slowly evolve into being the primary approach of the twentieth century.

Steps to provide specialized correctional treatment to children and youths were initiated by a group of influential social reformers in the late nineteenth century. The Child Savers, as they were called, were convinced that urban slum life exerted a
corrupting influence on idle youths. They were instrumental in shifting the focus away from the criminal nature of delinquency to what was generally considered to be a more humanistic approach built around the medical model and the rehabilitative ideal. (Bynum and Thompson, 1992) Later reforms would ultimately lead to separate juvenile courts, the first of which was established in 1899 in Illinois. (Binder et al., 1988)

Since then, we have witnessed the steady growth of the juvenile justice system. By 1912, twenty-two states had juvenile court laws, and by 1928, only two states lacked some kind of juvenile court system. The last of these, Wyoming, finally fell into line in 1945. (Binder et al., 1988) The “Great Delinquency Scare” of the 1940's led to federal investigations that made juvenile delinquency a household term for the first time. (Binder et al., 1988) In the 1950's, well-publicized hearings using the new medium of television helped create the impression that youth crime was widespread. (Binder et al., 1988)

Studies to examine causation accelerated as society looked toward scientific methods to help with the prediction and control of delinquency. Probation departments built larger juvenile halls and added camps and ranches to “rehabilitate” the offender. Treatment plans were developed using the latest research in psychology, sociology, and criminology. However, the optimism that the criminal justice system could stem the rising tide of crime and delinquency began to fade by the 1970's. Lipton et al. (1974) completed a study to determine what past and current correctional treatment practices were effective.
A summary by Martinson (1984) concluded that, "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far had no appreciable effect on recidivism." Although this conclusion was contradicted by Stuart Adams (1975), Ted Palmer (1975), and even by Martinson himself (1979), public policy decision makers began to conduct themselves as if "nothing works."

Pessimism regarding rehabilitation, a conservative trend toward the recriminalization of juvenile offenses, and a tax revolt by citizens (which decreased the tax base of local governments) all contributed to the current predicament of corrections. (Krisberg, 1988) Most probation departments have cut their budgets, probation officers are supervising larger caseloads, and institutions are overcrowded to the point of requiring court intervention.

Current trends in youth crime are alarming. In the Los Angeles area, youthful offenders are younger, more violent, and less affected by rehabilitative efforts. (Shumacher, 1990) Well-armed gangs appear to terrorize whole communities and drive-by shootings seem commonplace. This has created a public policy quagmire for criminal justice planners and politicians. The great delinquency scare has become the great delinquency terror. No one appears confident regarding what strategy is the most effective to implement.

There is a simultaneous move by some criminal justice planners to reclaim the original vision of the juvenile court, while others want to see it abandoned as a failed experiment. Currently, some states are lowering the age at which youth may be tried as adults. Status offenses (truancy, runaway, and incorrigibility) have ceased to be a focal
concern of the juvenile court. (Schumacher, 1990) The use of secure state youth institutions is increasing in some jurisdictions as a placement option for frustrated probation departments. Possibly most indicative of the current situation is the fact that public sentiment is becoming increasingly negative toward youthful offenders. People are less convinced that troubled youth are simply wayward youth in need of guidance. Today, troubled youth are routinely seen as gangsters, armed and dangerous, who need to feel the full impact of a nonsympathetic, punishing criminal justice system.

It is within this current political, economic, and attitudinal context that mentoring is gaining acceptance as a developing treatment modality. With an overworked juvenile justice system and depleted governmental resources, there is a critical need for alternatives that are cost effective and community based. For example, in a local study Charles (1988) found that youth who are court-ordered into out-of-county placement can be better served by using vocational, education, and other treatment services within the local community that utilize volunteers. It is ironic that a system that began primarily using ordinary citizens to provide guidance and nurture to troubled youth has rediscovered the value of volunteerism 150 years later.

Mentoring is one form of volunteerism that has been rediscovered in recent times. It is important now to examine more closely the history of mentoring, and, to define mentoring, both in historic terms and as the term is to be used within this thesis.
CHAPTER 3 OVERVIEW OF MENTORING

The term mentor dates back to antiquity, with its origin in Homer’s Odyssey. Before embarking on his ten-year journey, Ulysses asked his trusted friend Mentor to care for and educate his son Telemachus in his absence. As a guardian, teacher, and surrogate father to Telemachus, Mentor defined the concept that characterizes similar relationships today. (Beck, 1983) From the legacy of this famous mentoring relationship comes the sense that mentoring is a powerful emotional interaction between an older and younger person, a relationship where the older member is trusted, loving, and experienced in guiding the younger. In this relationship the mentor helps shape the growth and development of the mentee. (Merrian, 1983)

The term mentor literally means advisor, and within the context of this term, Webster has broadened the definition to be “a wise and loyal advisor” (Webster, 1968). The World Book Dictionary adds the concept of trust and defines mentor as “a wise and trusted advisor” (The World Book Dictionary, 1974).

Merrian (1983) in her literature review of mentors and protégés notes that because mentoring has vastly expanded both in concept and practice in recent years, it has become apparent that a precise definition—at least one that all could agree upon—is not to be found. She concludes that the meaning of the term mentor appears to be defined by the scope of a research investigation or by the particular setting in which it occurs. (Merrian, 1983)
For the purpose of this thesis mentor is defined as, “a caring advocate and a positive role model, whose objective is to maintain a long-term relationship as an encouraging advisor to a youthful probationer.” A mentee is defined as, “a youthful probationer who voluntarily requests and receives a mentor of their own to begin a mentoring relationship.”

The practice of mentoring is as old as human relationships. Throughout time, much as in Ulysses' Odyssey, people farther down the paths of life have reached back to assist a novice in his or her journey. In the workplace, journeymen have mentored apprentices. In school settings, teachers have mentored those students who have generated a special interest. In the family, parents have mentored their children with the goal of maturity and independence for their offspring. At times this process has been called training, child rearing, being a big brother or sister, or in a church setting, being a discipler.

In the literature, mentoring has been defined as simply as, “adult volunteers forming direct relationships with young people” (Search Institute, 1992, p.5), to a more elaborate, “making the mentor's personal strengths, resources, and network (friendships/contacts) available to help a mentee reach his or her goals” (Biehl, 1990, p.3). A mentoring program with troubled youth, the YMCA Community Action Program (Y-CAP), defines mentoring as, “acting as a positive role model and friend to a child who is going through a difficult time in their life; To add worth, acceptance and support to a child's life” (Y-CAP, 1993, p.4).
Mentoring does include religion, and an example would be Prison Fellowship, an evangelical Christian organization founded by the ex-Watergate criminal, Charles Colson. In 1993 Prison Fellowship signed a partnership agreement with the Evangelistic Association of New England to open a Boston pilot site for Matchpoint, a new mentoring ministry to juveniles in trouble with the law. Boston Matchpoint has already established strong relationships between mature Christian mentors and delinquent youth. Prison Fellowship’s decision for entering into ministry with troubled youth resulted from the belief that youths repeatedly in contact with the juvenile justice system—those who seem to be on their way to adult prison—have a common thread of alienation: a lack of connection in long-term, caring relationships.

The emphasis of Matchpoint of a caring person being there for a youth week after week is an element that is entirely new for many youth in the juvenile justice system. Matchpoint’s mission is to restore alienated youths to productive relationships with their families, communities, and Creator, replacing distorted images of self and others with new ones rooted in God. Matchpoint’s approach addresses the physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual aspects of life. The key to this approach lies in dedicated Christian mentors who establish significant relationships with alienated youths, and who model the love of God in these relationships. Each mentor gives 3-5 hours a week to be a friend and model for the youth for one year. The mentor offers concrete expressions of unconditional love and support. The two participate together in activities designed to build friendship, trust, and constructive values. (Strong, 1994)
Mentoring can include a comprehensive community approach, and the Buddy System is one example. The Buddy System, a division of the Minneapolis Youth Trust, is a non-profit organization that promotes, initiates, and develops partnerships to help Minneapolis children and youth K-12 become ready for life and work. As a consortium of agencies that conduct mentoring, tutoring, and friendship programs for children and youth, the Buddy System is an established inter-agency outreach that has provided services for many years.

The Buddy System has conducted a study of mentoring programs with a grant from the McKnight Foundation and the results of this study were presented in a publication entitled “Understanding Mentoring Relationships” published by the Search Institute in 1992. In the typology of mentors outlined by the Buddy System, definitions of mentors vary widely in scope and purpose, depending on the setting and the classification of mentees.

In this thesis, the practice of mentoring will be defined as, “a voluntary relationship in which a commitment is made by a mentor to guide a youthful probationer into increased maturity, and, a commitment is made by a youthful probationer to receive this guidance.” Therefore, mentoring will be more than being a friend or a buddy, a big brother or sister, a visitor or a matched volunteer. While mentoring may include these elements, in this thesis it will describe a more deliberate, intentional goal directedness, in which the mentor serves as a treatment agent in the life of a youthful probationer. Since the mentoring relationship should enhance development, maturing out of delinquency replaces the traditional mentoring goals of mere friendship or mastering a chosen task.
The specific mentoring program that serves as the subject for this thesis was conducted on a single probation site (the Youth Justice Center) as part of a newly conceived strategic plan to target troubled youth more at the beginning of their delinquent career. The history of the Youth Justice Center and The Mentoring Program will be detailed in the following chapter. It is important to note that both the Youth Justice Center and The Mentoring Program were begun as experiments. The San Bernardino County Probation Department had not previously created a day-school setting for adjudicated wards of the court, nor had they successfully implemented a mentoring program (although several serious attempts had been made in the past). It is in the context of an “experiment within an experiment” that the mentoring program was undertaken.
CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH SITE: YOUTH JUSTICE CENTER

HISTORY

Responding to severe budget deficiencies in 1990, newly hired Chief Probation Officer Barbara J. Frank and her staff made the difficult decision to close Verdemont Boys Ranch (VBR) in San Bernardino County. For forty years, VBR served as a placement for adolescent males removed from their homes by the juvenile court, with the goals of changing both the youth and their parent(s), and, reintegrating the youth back into their family. This reintegration was facilitated by having the youth and his parent(s) participate in conjoint family therapy during the youth's six month incarceration and four months of aftercare. However, the practical need for better services at the front of the juvenile justice system and the expense of residential facilities prompted the closing of VBR and the opening of a day treatment center, the Youth Justice Center (YJC). The department felt that services to younger youth were inadequate, warranting a shift in priorities.

The closing of VBR was not without criticism and damage to employee morale. Staff, assigned at VBR for up to thirty years, felt a deep sense of loss. Public concern was also expressed over the rationality of closing an established program that had targeted high risk, recidivist males. However, the new priority of early intervention coupled with budgetary constraints made the opening of YJC the preferred option.
The Youth Justice Center opened on May 29, 1990 in response to the need for an alternative to out-of-home placement, and for a community program for youth recently released from placement. The mission of YJC is to enable positive community readjustment for identified probation-involved youth and their families through participation in an intensive range of short-term services in a day school program.

The program format at YJC was developed through a process of interagency planning. It focuses on bringing together an array of services to enable and strengthen at-risk youth and their families.

The goals of YJC are:

1) To empower youth through improved self concept, academic achievement and acquisition of job-related skills.
2) To develop socialization, interpersonal and communication skills that will interrupt maladaptive thought processes and behavior.
3) To help positive self-development through the mentoring of life skills.
4) To manage and coordinate a range of specialized services and culturally relevant programs that will empower youths and their families to live drug and crime-free lives.

The YJC is unique because of the cooperative effort of five major county departments: the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools and the departments of Mental Health, Public Health, Public Social Services, and Probation. These departments are working with private individuals, private agencies, and community-
based organizations (CBO) to address family problems, gang problems, drug and alcohol addiction, and health problems. The community organizations include Inland Behavioral Services, Inc., Law Auxiliary of San Bernardino County, YMCA of San Bernardino, Hydroscope, San Bernardino Kiwanis Club, Griggs and Associates, Volunteers in Probation, Bilingual Family Counseling, and Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries.

Within this working relationship, individual cases receive the collaborative services of the network. Staffs of all departments meet to discuss cases identified as critical and to plan strategies for dealing with the most challenging youth.

The academic program at YJC is designed to be an integral part of a life and employment skill's program. The vast majority of students have met with very little success in regular school, so a program was developed to stimulate interest and success, and to develop proficiency in life and career skills. A leadership Challenge Course, which consists of a ropes challenge course designed to build confidence and trust, complements this curriculum and its' goals.

The Department of Mental Health has on-site clinicians and therapists to work with other agency staff in identifying specific therapeutic needs of youth and their families. Assistance is provided to students on an as-needed basis to ease and improve readjustment to family and community life.

With Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries, staff from the Public Health Department supervise the mentoring program. Also, public health nurses provide urgent care referrals and on-site care.
The community-based organizations offer a variety of programming in collaboration with the five major county departments. These include: Friday Nite Live (music, dancing, plays and other entertainment designed with a “message”), drug and alcohol counseling, victim awareness, community service worksites, skills marketing, self esteem development, fitness and team sports training, and cultural leadership training.

The YJC has no screening criteria. The center is driven by the needs of the referred youth and their families. Development of resources and programming to address each identified need is an ongoing effort. The program is designed to remain flexible for modification and change. Plans include an art therapy program, incorporation of the Alternative to Placement Program (ATP), and the Independent Living Skills Program (ILSP) in partnership with the Public Social Services. Also included in future plans is the revision of the mentor program as a result of the implementation evaluation provided by this thesis.

The Youth Justice Center was recognized as model interagency daycare program (consisting of a multidisciplinary services team) by the legislature of the state of California in 1993, per the approval of Assembly Bill No. 1166, Chapter 970.

THE SETTING AND POPULATION

YJC is located on the grounds of San Bernardino County Juvenile Hall, in San Bernardino, California. School rooms, offices, a dayroom, kitchen, and lobby provide an
adequate and attractive physical environment. On the grounds of YJC are a large patio, a
weight training area, green house and shop, and modular trailers used by mental health
counselors.

Probationers, ages thirteen to eighteen, are referred to YJC by their probation
officer. The average length of stay is approximately four months, with the longest stay to
date being one and a half years. The average probationer has a history of four offenses
and has been on probation for twelve months. On any given day at YJC there will be
approximately forty boys and five girls in daily school attendance. In the afternoon and
evenings, approximately twenty-five non-YJC committed probationers, and their
families, will join in attending the treatment components listed previously.

THE MENTOR PROGRAM

The Mentor Program (TMP), as one treatment component provided by the
Department of Public Health, began its' design phase in December 1991. Public Health
made an initial commitment by allocating the services of one staff person to serve as a
program consultant. Funding for this position came as a grant for the specific purpose of
targeting youth at risk. Research by the program consultant led to the initial design of the
mentor program, including the information and application packet contents.

A community based organization, Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries (PYCM),
directed one staff member to donate five hours per week to carry out, redesign as needed,
and coordinate the mentor program, matching adults with Youth Justice Center students.
Including the PYCM coordinator, the mentor staff team finally consisted of:

- One public health consultant.
- One community based organization coordinator (PYCM).
- Two YJC staff (group counselors, who identified youth who were suitable mentoring candidates and assisted in the screening and training of mentors).
- One supervising public health nurse who aided in the planning process.
- One auxiliary probation officer to serve as a direct supervisor.
- One Volunteer in Probation (who, after becoming a trained mentor, (VIP) wanted to also donate time to the mentoring programs' growth and effectiveness).
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**Figure 4.1**
THE MENTOR PROGRAM-STAFFING DIAGRAM

The initial program design provided by public health was revised so that the final design would meet with existing “Volunteers in Probation” guidelines. These guidelines are used by all volunteers, whether in the field or in an institution, and limit the scope and authority of the volunteers' involvement with probationers. The policies and
procedures of the host agency, San Bernardino County Probation, were reviewed for applicable and transferable information.

The administration of YJC wanted The Mentor Program (TMP) to begin as soon as possible, so recruitment of both, potential mentors and youth, began during the design revision phase (within two months). Public service announcements, radio ads, flyers, verbal presentations, and personal recruitment were all used to recruit the initial pool of mentor candidates. The minority newspapers of the local community and the local Hispanic cable television show were helpful in attracting African American and Hispanic mentors.

A difference of opinion arose regarding the level of stringency required in the screening and training phases of TMP. The probation administration felt that the current “Volunteers in Probation” orientation would be sufficient. The program consultant and the mentor coordinator wanted a more intensive process due to the sensitive nature of a potentially long term mentor-mentee relationship. The Volunteers in Probation orientation did not provide the building of skills in such areas as: modeling appropriate behavior, confronting antisocial attitudes and behavior, setting limits, and holding youth accountable. The program consultant and the mentor coordinator wanted skills building to be a mandatory component of the mentor training, and a compromise was reached.

The final screening and training requirements were as follows:

1) The mentor candidate begins the process by receiving a thirty minute phone orientation from the program consultant, followed by a one hour in person
orientation. These two interactions begin the screening process. During this initial orientation, the potential mentor is familiarized with the goals and objectives of: The probation department, the Volunteers in Probation program, and the Mentor Program. The goal of this phase is to provide the potential mentor with enough information to allow themselves to quickly decide whether or not the mentor program is what they anticipated, and, worth pursuing.

2) The mentor candidate tours the Youth Justice Center to observe both the youth and the setting in which the mentoring relationship will occur, a process usually lasting one and one-half hours.

3) During this tour (which is conducted by one of the YJC mentor staff/probation staff) the mentor candidate is further evaluated for suitability, and, is given the necessary applications to begin both the "Volunteers in Probation" and mentor program processes.

4) The completed forms are routed to the probation department's volunteer coordinator and the formal background check is begun.

5) An in-depth screening interview is conducted by the mentor coordinator to further evaluate suitability, psychological appropriateness, and the motives of the mentor candidate. This interview also continues the orientation process, clarifying expectations.
6) The mentor candidate begins a four-week rotation. Simply observing youth, with no formal performance expectations, creates a comfortable, controlled, and well-supervised initial experience for the mentor. During this rotation phase school and probation staff continue to evaluate the candidates' suitability.

7) The mentor candidate attends and successfully completes eight hours of mentor training. Topics covered at this training include: Understanding the client, drugs and alcohol, self esteem, gang awareness, active listening skills, co-dependency and attachment, role playing, mentor program policies, and evaluation. During this day of training, especially the role playing segment, the candidate undergoes the final screening for suitability. Suitability is decided by assessing the mentor's maturity level, ability to communicate, interpersonal strength and ability to set limits, ability to remain objective, and ability to direct youth in a non-authoritarian and not co-dependent manner.

8) A match is made between the mentor and a youth. It is an assumption that as potential mentors complete the rotation phase of orientation, a natural match with a potential mentee will emerge, not unlike the process in which most friendships are formed. If this does not naturally occur, a match is made using the initial interest applications completed by both the adult and the youth requesting a mentor. It is the goal that steps one through eight are completed within three months.
9) The mentor and mentee complete an activity form after each mentor activity. These forms are reviewed by the mentor staff to aid in further training, support, and accountability.

10) The mentoring relationship can be terminated by either the mentor or the mentee, and a mentor can be terminated by The Mentor Program staff if they feel that the mentor is not suitable for any number of reasons.

The Mentor Program began its' design phase in December 1991, held its' first mentor training in March 1991, and had six minors matched by the following month. Initially, nineteen minors expressed an interest in having a mentor. However, only ten decided to comply with the contract obligations of the mentor relationship. Out of this original mentee pool, six became matched with a mentor. During the entire mentor program's tenure (December 1991-July 1993), sixty-five adults expressed varying interest in The Mentor Program. Of this number, fourteen completed the entire mentor training and six chose to receive a match. During the tenure of The Mentor Program, which was approximately fourteen months, from four to six minors were continuously matched with one of the six mentors.

In July 1992, The Mentor Program hosted a beach trip for the mentors, mentees, and The Mentor Program staff. In June 1993, The Mentor Program hosted an award ceremony to recognize both the mentors and their mentees.
The following chapter will evaluate the implementation of The Mentor Program at the Youth Justice Center, using information gathered from questionnaires, interviews, and the research criteria outline in chapter one. The important research question that chapter five addresses is: "How effectively was The Mentor Program implemented into a unique and experimental day-school setting populated with adjudicated wards of the court?"
CHAPTER 5 ANALYSIS: 
THE MENTOR PROGRAM OF THE YOUTH JUSTICE CENTER

In evaluating the implementation of The Mentor Program at the Youth Justice Center, three sets of questionnaires were created to elicit information from probation staff, the mentors, and the mentees (see Appendices A-C). Five staff, three mentors, and three mentees ultimately provided information. Initially, only three staff returned their questionnaires, so a second set of questionnaires was distributed a month later. After the second distribution, only five staff had responded.

In order to gain the needed information from the mentors and the mentees, and to augment the questionnaire distribution, phone interviews were finally conducted. It is interesting to note that by the time the phone interviews were conducted, one third of the mentors and one half of the mentees had changed their telephone numbers. While it is not surprising that the mentees would be so mobile, it was surprising to the author that within one year of the completion of this implementation evaluation that the mentors themselves would also be so mobile.

Therefore, it is recommended in chapter six that exit surveys be completed within thirty days of the termination of any mentor/mentee relationship to insure that evaluation data may be secured. It is also noted in chapter six that, considering the mobility of southern Californians, long-term mentoring relationships may be the exception and not the norm.
In conjunction with these questionnaires, informal interviews were conducted during the entire term of The Mentor Program to gain additional information on how those involved perceived The Mentor Program's implementation. **It is the conclusion of this research project that The Mentor Program was not implemented to the satisfaction of most of the participants involved.** By this it is meant that The Mentor Program did not become a treatment component that the Youth Justice Center staff readily referred their caseload youth to, nor one that the youth actively sought out, nor one in which most mentors were willing to make personal long-term commitments. This does not mean that both the mentors and the mentees did not have positive experiences, or that the mentees did not receive help. It does mean, however, that The Mentor Program did not become the program of impact that was initially anticipated.

As noted in chapter one, if outcomes do not satisfy expectations there may be at least three reasons for an apparent lack of project success: (a) programmic over-expectation, (b) conceptual failure, and (c) implementation failure. These three reasons for project failure will be examined in terms of the four primary process issues used by Lewis and Greene (1978) in the evaluation model presented in chapter one:

1) Project Goal and Objective Clarity.

The initial administrative meeting to discuss a mentoring concept was held on November 12, 1991. The San Bernardino County Probation Department was interested in finding alternatives to placement as a means of saving money and was seeking a grant that included a mentoring component for adults. Therefore, the initial mentoring concept
revolved around the needs of adults and the Probation Department’s desire to secure a grant. This discussion generated the idea that a mentoring program could be created that would satisfy the adult program need, and also be transferable to youth. By November 19, 1991, the adult program need was no longer addressed, and the focus became the youth attending the experimental day school (Youth Justice Center) created as an alternative to placement. At this meeting officials decided to have a mentoring program, with the only stated goals being that 20-30 mentors be involved with a racial target of 40% Hispanic, 30% White, and 30% African American mentors.

The Mentor Program suffered from a lack of goal and objective clarity at the onset. As an experimental program within an experimental probation setting, the initial planning began simply with an acknowledged need for a mentor program to augment the other treatment components. “Having a mentor program” was the initial goal without clarification of what exactly that meant. As Lewis and Greene point out, when clear, concise goals and objective are lacking, vagueness is created for the personnel carrying out the program design.

2) Goal Consensus.

While The Mentor Program suffered from a lack of goal and objective clarity, it also suffered from having multiple competing goals from the various persons and agencies represented. The Public Health Department of San Bernardino County volunteered to help create The Mentor Program. This department already had a specific drug and alcohol program design that they wished to simply transfer to the Youth Justice Center. The Public Health Department undertook to provide this mentoring program as
part of a grant received for a variety of community services. With the grant came expectations of quantifiable results (such as having 25 mentors trained, 10 mentors matched, an outreach activity with mentors and mentees, and an award ceremony that included local politicians and press coverage) to fulfill the obligations of the grant.

The Public Health staff member who was placed in charge of fulfilling this grant was self-designated as a “consultant” to the project. In reality, the Public Health Department was expecting this person to create and implement a mentor program and to perform at a level acceptable to satisfy the grant. The Public Health Department was expecting “their” person to make The Mentor Program “happen.”

At the same time that the Public Health Department was assigning their person to this responsibility, the Probation Department was assigning the responsibility of coordinating The Mentor Program to a staff member of a community based organization (CBO), Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries. The title “coordinator” was given to the CBO staff member with the expectation that The Mentor Program would be coordinated by this person. It was later discovered that the Department of Education was also expecting the principal at Youth Justice Center to facilitate The Mentor Program as the school’s representative. The principal, completing an evaluation questionnaire for this study, answered the question, “How did you find out about the mentor program?” by stating: “I was the program facilitator for three years at YJC.” The principal assumed the title of facilitator without the knowledge of any of the other participants. At the onset of The Mentor Program, no less than three people was assigned some form of leadership of the project. Because all of the programming at YJC was designed to be inter-
departmental/agency, no one entity assumed leadership for designating who would ultimately be responsible for The Mentor Program.

A lack of consensus resulted regarding the means to implement the goal. While everyone agreed that a mentoring program was needed, what constituted a mentoring program, proper program design, implementation strategies, and ultimate responsibilities for carrying out this program varied.

As noted by Greene and Lewis (1978), "in a systems approach to organization, any sub-system which is interactive with another sub-system will find cooperation necessary for the success of their program. Mutual interdependence requires goal consensus." The Public Health Department, which was under pressure to justify grant funding, had the goal of a fully functioning program operating immediately. An example of the haste on the part of the Public Health Department was their sending out press releases for mentor recruitment the same month (December 1991) that the mentor committee initially met to begin designing The Mentor Program.

Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries, which had designated their staff member to limit involvement to five hours per week, wanted a mentoring program that would unfold at a slower and more deliberate pace. Initially, the entire five hour commitment by PYCM was solely to coordinate The Mentor Program. However, once the Spiritual Concerns Committee (who is designated by the Probation Department to give oversight to all religious programming) understood that religious mentors would be included, they insisted that the mentor coordinator become an active member of the Spiritual Concerns Committee. Membership in the committee became part of the five hour commitment.
The founding YJC Director also requested that the mentor coordinator become part of the newly formed Citizen's Advisory Council, acting as its first Chairperson. While both of these committee involvements were positive in nature, they came at the expense of the five allotted hours designated to coordinating The Mentor Program.

The principal at YJC, due to his very commendable intense personal involvement with students and acute awareness of their crisis needs, strongly requested that a mentor be assigned to a youth in crisis the very same week that program design planning began. This also created pressure to put something in place immediately. The Probation Department expressed a similar expectation, due to the fact that they had previously attempted implementing three mentoring programs that had failed. A Big Brother program, a local YWCA program, and an expensive Partners in Colorado mentoring program failed to produce a mentoring program that remained ongoing and effective.

According to one probation director, a lack of commitment with leadership and unsuccessful recruitment among minority mentor candidates contributed, in part, to the failure of these programs. Even though the Probation Department had not completed an implementation evaluation to determine exactly why these three attempts failed, they anticipated having a fourth and successful mentoring program up and running quickly. Therefore, each of the sub-systems detailed above had agendas and expectations of their own, creating confusion and possibly some degree of competition.

An example of this confusion would be the time allotted to program design. Due to a lack of consensus regarding the importance of allotting time to program design, the time that was actually taken was viewed by several participants as "foot dragging" and
bureaucratic "red tape." On one occasion this led to the complaint that, "nothing was being done." As mentioned earlier, mentors were being recruited through press releases subsequent to The Mentor Program even being designed, creating immediate pressure.

Therefore, both programmatic over-expectation and conceptual failure contributed to The Mentor Program being unsatisfactorily implemented. The optimism of what a mentor program could provide created a desire to have it immediately in place and meeting needs. Too much was expected too quickly, which resulted in the growing disappointment that once again an attempt at mentoring had failed. The mentoring concept being implemented by the assigned mentor coordinator simply unfolded too slowly to meet the expectations of others.

3) Interdependence of Vested Interests.

In chapter four, the program design of the Youth Justice Center and The Mentor Program was explained in some detail. It should be noted that as an experimental design, the Youth Justice Center was an attempt to have several county departments and outside agencies become a team in the design and operation of the program. While the Probation Department was the host agency for YJC, it was not the "leader." The departments of Public Health, Mental Health, and Education all felt a sense of ownership in YJC. However, even though there remained a consensus regarding the team concept, each department had a unique mission that propelled it in the direction of self interest. This interdependence of vested interests, and the realities of self interest, impacted The Mentor Program. Each department and agency needed each other for the success of the program and for the success of their own agendas.
If a strategy was needed that best served the program, but this strategy came at the expense of a particular entity, self interest occasionally emerged as a priority. For example, The Mentor Program needed the school staff to willingly facilitate a mentor’s initial exposure to the youth by allowing the mentor to sit in on classes and serve as tutors. This segment of training was included for the purpose of acclimating the mentor to the youth, the institutional setting, becoming familiar with the needs of troubled youth, and having this acclimation take place in a less non-threatening environment.

Occasionally, the school teachers would not cooperate by refusing to allow a mentor to join their class because they felt that this created a “class disturbance.”

Another example involves the probation counselors supervising the youth during the day. Because the mentors were not allowed evening participation, as most youth left at 2:30 p.m., this necessitated the mentors being at YJC during the school-day shift. Incoming mentors needed the probation staff to let them in, initially direct them to the school principal’s office and later to the classrooms. Often, the mentor would not be attended to by busy probation staff, and if they did attend to the mentor, the staff would not facilitate the visit according to mentor program guidelines. Mentors often complained of being ignored by probation staff, and this complaint was echoed in the questionnaires completed by the mentors. Also, the first group orientation and recruitment among the YJC youth (a scheduled assembly to be held April 1992) proved to be unsuccessful because the probation staff failed to cooperate in facilitating the assembly.

In these two cases, both the school and the Probation Department failed to provide the service that was necessary for The Mentor Program to function properly,
choosing rather to concentrate on their own particular agendas. Memos and complaints by the mentor coordinator never resulted in having these problems satisfactorily solved. The interdependence of vested interests requires a certain level of cooperation. Consequently, a lack of cooperation contributed to the lack of success of The Mentor Program.

One of the main factors contributing to the implementation failure of The Mentor Program was the instability caused by the complete turnover of probation staff. The first Director of the YJC was prematurely replaced in the beginning of his tenure as a result of an opening in the higher ranks of the Probation Department, that created other openings for promotions throughout the department. This Director was only able to help provide leadership for The Mentor Program from January to June 1992. Another person at the same Director level was scheduled to be transferred to a desert office. This person refused to go, threatened to sue the county if they were made to go, and as a result, the department placed this person in the Directors position at YJC. While this decision may have been expeditious in foregoing litigation, having the founding Director leave early had a significant negative impact on staff. Several staff refused to work for the incoming Director and chose to be immediately transferred elsewhere in the department. The new incoming Director did not respect several of the staff who remained and sought to initiate their transfers. The vision and the encouragement provided by the founding Director became dissipated by the personality conflicts associated with the incoming Director. Instead of the probation staff remaining focused on the tasks associated with an exciting and experimental program, the staff began clustering in a defensive mode, anticipating the worst. Quality staff who had supported the vision of The Mentor Program were now
either transferred or anticipating possible transfer. During the second Director’s tenure (July 1992-July 1993) the momentum of the entire YJC program was slowed dramatically.

While the momentum at YJC was slowed, it was not extinguished. However, another decision by the Probation Department did have the impact of counteracting an entire year of program building at YJC. The department, in an attempt to consolidate juvenile probation services, decided to replace all of the group counselors at YJC with juvenile probation officers by the end of June 1993. The new goal was to continue the Youth Justice Center, and at the same time, have all caseload supervision of juvenile probation conducted at this site. All of the group counselors who had begun the program at YJC were to be replaced with probation officers, who were initially very negative about moving to YJC and being expected to supervise youth at a day school. Staff morale suffered tremendously. The outgoing group counselors performed as “lame ducks” for the remaining two months until they were replaced. They no longer actively referred youth to The Mentor Program or the other components. They expressed feelings of betrayal, non-appreciation, and anger at being transferred to new assignments in less attractive work sites, such as juvenile hall. The probability that they would be again required to work evenings and the weekends contributed to their disappointment.

The incoming probation officers petitioned the department to stop their transfer. They could not imagine continuing to do all of their casework and taking on the additional task of daily supervision in the role of group counselors. They expressed feelings that the department was insensitive, unrealistic, and simply out of touch with the
needs of staff. Added to the obvious sentiment of an unwanted change, several of the incoming probation officers expressed a refusal to work for the second Director. During this period of time, the program at YJC lost zeal and momentum. The Mentor Program ceased to function as it had due to all the changes being made in its host environment.

In July 1993, the Probation Department replaced the second Director in an attempt to stem the tide of dissatisfaction. The third Director had the tremendously difficult job of bringing in a completely new staff to YJC and beginning over again. There was initially a massive problem with lack of alignment regarding goals and methods. The probation officers were used to being more authoritative and less treatment oriented, and they wanted YJC to reflect these values. The Probation Department had the almost impossible task of training a new set of staff while the program simultaneously continued to function on a daily basis.

It was during this transition from July 1993 to the present that The Mentor Program ceased to exist in operative form. Several mentors have since continued to come to YJC and meet with youth, but The Mentor Program as a proactive component was discontinued until all the staff changes were finalized, the YJC program again became stabilized, and an implementation evaluation was conducted. During this time, there has been no mentor recruitment, mentor training, or mentor-mentee matches. This is a clear example of the interdependence of vested interests. The Mentor Program was dependent on the stability of its host environment and powerless to bring about this necessary stability.
4) Local Motivations For Obtaining and Using Federal Support

Every department and agency requires funding to exist. It was initially important to the Probation Department that the experimental Youth Justice Center program be successful, and as noted in chapter four, save the department money. It also later became important to the Probation Department that the YJC help fulfill the requirements for a state awarded Healthy Start grant. The Public Health Department, needing state and federal governmental funding to augment local county funding, relied on grants to fulfill this need. It is noteworthy that when the Public Health Department’s grant was fulfilled in June 1993, they discontinued participating in The Mentoring Program which had been serving as a focal point for their funding. Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries, as a religious non-profit organization, is completely dependent on charitable contributions to fund every aspect of operations. The Mentor Program needed to generate enough funding to compensate for the five hours of PYCM staff involvement and the expenses associated with conducting The Mentor Program.

The Department of Education completely relies on funding associated with daily attendance of the students. It was initially anticipated that The Mentor Program would benefit the students and lend to a higher number of students in daily attendance, thus augmenting funding for the day school at YJC. Each department and agency had a different reason for The Mentor Program to succeed from a financial point of view and it is possible that a competition for funding could have contributed to the lack of congruence in planning and implementation.
When there was pressure to fit the program at YJC into pre-established requirements for grant proposals, competition between several grant sources created the possibility for departure from previously accepted goals and guidelines for the sake of the new goal; “winning the grant.” Bending the program to fit a grant proposal can have the effect of confusing program clarity, and, if there are several participants bending the program to fit their particular grant needs, confusion can only multiply. As noted in chapter one, Lewis and Greene (1978) see the possibility of a “forced marriage” if the grantee enters into a utilitarian relationship with the grantor. If the actual goals of the program are manipulated to garner funding, a lack of goal consensus will occur and implementation can be impacted.

As noted in the introduction, three goals were targeted as a result of this implementation evaluation: (a) that a feedback mechanism will be provided to aid program revision within the host agency, (b) that a mentoring guide or model will emerge that can be used in other settings, and (c) that the evaluation will serve the host agency to better implement future programs. In the summary and conclusions' chapter that follows these three goals will be addressed, with the emphasis on goal number two—implications for a model program.
In chapter one, Weiss (1972) notes that evaluation research is viewed by its partisans as a way to increase the rationality of policy making. Evaluation can be used to investigate the extent of implementation success. Weiss outlines six questions that evaluation should answer and these questions are addressed in the first section of this chapter, summarizing and concluding the implementation evaluation of The Mentor Program. Using data gained from completed questionnaires by mentors, mentees, and YJC staff, the following questions outlined by Weiss are answered:

1) To Continue or Discontinue The Program or Program Component.

**Finding**-The Mentor Program should be continued as a treatment component of the Youth Justice Center. The value of mentoring and the need for mentors among troubled youth have been documented. The Youth Justice Center has continued to express the desire to have mentoring as a component. Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries is willing to continue to allocate human resources to implement a re-designed mentor program. All of the mentors and mentees surveyed during this evaluation expressed the value of continuing The Mentor Program.
2) To Improve Its Practices and Procedures.

**Finding** - A re-designed mentor program will require the following improvements:

a) A single person needs to be responsible for the coordination of The Mentor Program. During the evaluative re-design phase of The Mentor Program, each department and agency that impacts the mentor component need to agree to a single designation of leadership. While additional help and guidance will be necessary and welcomed, it is essential that the problem of multi-leadership that plagued the pilot mentor program be addressed. It is assumed that The Mentor Program, because it is a component of the Youth Justice Center, will continue to serve under the supervision of the YJC Director. However, the carrying out of mutually agreed upon policies and procedure needs to be the responsibility of a single designated mentor coordinator.

b) The re-design of The Mentor Program needs to incorporate the findings of the implementation evaluation. The research findings of this thesis should provide the groundwork for improvements. It is assumed that a re-designed mentor program will require additional dialogue and suggestions, but the findings of the implementation evaluation should not be minimized.

c) The probation staff at YJC should be trained and prepared to facilitate the orientation of mentors as they arrive at the site. Since they will most often represent a mentors initial contact with the day school, it is imperative that the mentor be made to feel welcome and wanted. Mentors noted in their questionnaires that they often felt, “in the way” when they arrived at YJC. One mentor stated that he was made to feel, “who are you and why are you here?” by more than one probation staff.
The school staff should be trained and prepared to facilitate a mentor’s orientation in the classroom. This may mean nothing more than a warm welcome, an introduction to the students, and an invitation to join the class and observe. It would be ideal if the teacher assigned the mentor-in-training to a student who could make the best use of the tutor capabilities of the mentor. Since the classroom experience represents a potential for awkwardness and anxiety, school staff can alleviate these feelings quickly by their courtesy and willingness to allow a temporary distraction to occur. Mentors expressed in their questionnaires that perceived rejection from school staff contributed to their dissatisfaction in TMP.

The mentor coordinator must initiate contacts with the mentors to provide support, encouragement, and additional skills. Mentors must be made to feel that they are important and that their involvement matters. In the pilot mentor program the mentor coordinator failed to provide the technical and emotional support that was needed, and this was reflected in the comments made by mentors in their questionnaires. While mentors were trained and encouraged to contact the mentor coordinator if they had a question, one mentor expressed that it would have been, “tremendously helpful” if he had received monthly calls from the mentor coordinator. Another mentor expressed the feeling that they had been “abandoned” after receiving their assignment. Every mentor suggested that the supervision aspect of The Mentor Program needed to be improved.
3) To Add or Drop Specific Program Strategies and Techniques.

Finding. A re-designed mentor program will require the adding or dropping of the following:

a) Drop the concept that mentors will be self starters and will need very little supervision. As noted above, the pilot mentors expressed a strong need for continual support and encouragement.

b) Drop the concept that minimal orientation of probation and educational staff will be sufficient for the necessary alignment of goals and objectives. All staff will need enhanced orientation and training, and continual supervision of their performance. In all three sets of questionnaires, it was noted that probation staff either failed to catch the vision of The Mentor Program or they failed to support it. Probation staff expressed confusion over the goals and timing of TMP, mentors expressed frustration with the lack of support by probation staff, and the mentees stated that they received “mixed signals” by probation staff in terms of what the mentoring program would do for them.

c) Add the concept that mentors be allowed to participate in a more limited role at YJC, especially if they are not comfortable in continuing in the mentor role with a released youth. The ideal concept of a mentor forming a long-term relationship with a delinquent is not realistic with some mentor candidates, who prefer to meet on site at YJC and simply spend time with various youth in a relatively safe environment. In the pilot mentor program, most of the willing mentor candidates were discouraged from involvement if they could not make the complete commitment of the ideal mentor, namely that of forming long-term relationships. As noted in chapter four, sixty five
adults expressed an initial interest in TMP, but only fourteen completed the training. Of
the fourteen who were scheduled to receive a match, only six chose to do so. It is
anticipated that by allowing mentors to meet informally at YJC, a larger number of
potential mentors will choose to complete their training and become actively involved.
As further noted in chapter five, considering the mobility of southern Californians, it is
possible that long-term mentor relationships might be the exception and not the rule.
This fact alone would warrant allowing mentors to make a more limited commitment.

4) To Begin Similar Programs Elsewhere.

**Finding**- A re-designed mentor program could easily be implemented at two
additional probation sites that are close in proximity to the Youth Justice Center. Kuiper
Youth Center and the Regional Youth Educational Facility have expressed a willingness
to incorporate mentor programs within their institutions. Both of these facilities are
closed residential settings and offer opportunities for mentors to participate during the
evenings and weekends. Many of the sixty five adults who initially expressed an interest
in TMP felt that they could not serve during the school hours available at YJC. It is
anticipated that the expanded opportunities of two additional facilities would result a
greater number of adults choosing to become mentors.
5) To Allocate Resources Among Competing Programs.

**Finding**- Pacific Youth Correctional Ministries, as part of their overall strategic plan to the year 2000, desires to be a ministry of influence. Therefore, if any of the mentor information that PYCM accumulates can be of help to another agency that is considering creating mentor programs, PYCM is willing to share this information. The need for mentors nationally is great enough that PYCM welcomes others to begin mentor programs. Because of this tremendous need, other mentor programs would not be considered, “competing programs.”

6) To Accept or Reject a Program Approach or Theory.

**Finding**- The re-designed mentor program will continue the basic approach that was accepted during the pilot program. In addition, the re-designed mentor program will incorporate ideas from the program design of the “Buddy System” as a supplement to the existing approach. The “Buddy System” was cited in chapter three as an example of a successful mentoring program with troubled youth. The re-designed mentor program will also continue the theory that the ideal mentor is someone who will continue a long-term relationship with a youth for the purpose of aiding that youth into increased maturity. However, as noted above, the re-designed mentor program will also allow mentors to serve in a more limited capacity.

The “Buddy System” has created a typology of mentors and mentor programs to describe the programs of those currently in use in most mentoring programs. The second
section of this chapter will present these typologies, both in summarized and detailed form, and will present a model for mentoring incorporating the typologies presented.

It should be noted that the model mentoring model detailed in the second section of this chapter will be the synthesis of several of the typologies outlined in the Buddy System and the research that has been completed for this thesis. (See Figures 6.1 and 6.2) The model mentoring program is designed for use with youth at risk in the community, adjudicated youth in day-school settings, and incarcerated youth in juvenile institutions. Mentoring can serve diverse purposes, such as delinquency prevention and offender rehabilitation.
| TRADITIONAL                        | 1 Adult to 1 Child  
 |                                  | Long-Term (more than 6 months)  
 |                                  | Frequent Contact (about once per week)  
 |                                  | Unspecified Nature and Location of Activity  
 |                                  | Unsupervised  
 | LONG-TERM, FOCUSED ACTIVITIES     | 1 Adult to 1 Child  
 | (E.g., tutoring, career-oriented programs) | Long-Term  
 |                                  | Frequent Contact  
 |                                  | Specified Nature and Location of Activities  
 |                                  | Supervised  
 | SHORT-TERM, FOCUSED ACTIVITIES    | 1 Adult to 1 Child  
 | (E.g., summer internship, brief-tutoring, programs) | Short-Term (between 2 to 5 months)  
 |                                  | Frequent Contact  
 |                                  | Specified Nature and Location of Activities  
 |                                  | Supervised  
 | TEAM MENTORING                    | Team, Couple or Family (more than 1) to Child  
 |                                  | Long-Term  
 |                                  | Frequent Contact  
 |                                  | Unspecified Nature and Location of Activity  
 |                                  | Unsupervised  
 | GROUP MENTORING                   | 1 Adult to Group of Children  
 |                                  | Long-Term  
 |                                  | Frequent Contact  
 |                                  | Specified Nature and Location of Activity  
 |                                  | Supervised  

Figure 6.1
SUMMARIZED MENTORING TYPOLOGY DESCRIPTION *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL LONG-TERM SHORT-TERM TEAM GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM PROCESSES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMITMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT ON MENTEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT ON MENTOR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.2**

**DETAILED MENTORING TYPOLOGY DESCRIPTION**

Using concepts from the traditional, long-term focused activity, and short-term focused activity delineations of the Buddy System typology, the model mentoring program for incarcerated youth is described as follows:

1) Description.

One adult and one youth form a friendship. The adult is a caring advocate and a positive role model for the youth. The mentoring relationship is primarily designed to achieve a particular goal, namely that of maintaining a long-term relationship in which a commitment is made by a mentor to guide a youthful probationer into increased maturity, and, a commitment is made by a youthful probationer to receive this guidance. As noted earlier, the re-designed mentor program will allow mentors to serve in a limited and more informal manner on site at YJC.

2) Examples.

Similar to a Big Brother/Big Sister program, but more goal directed in intensity. Life skills training, tutoring, career counseling, emotional support, and accountability form the basis for the mentoring relationship.

3) Program Processes.

The application, screening, and matching are extensive and comprehensive. The training process is also extensive, due to the nature of the relationship and the possibility that the mentoring relationship will be both long term and not directly supervised.
4) Commitment.

Long term commitments are considered optimal, and may last several years. However, whether the commitment is long term or more informal, mentors and mentees meet weekly for at least three hours.

5) Nature Of Relationship.

Mentors are both friends who are fun, and caring adults who guide the mentee into increased maturity. The mentor is not expected to buy the mentee gifts, not take the mentee to expensive places as a primary function of the relationship. Mentors offer guidance and support, and in doing so, relationships are expected to grow.

6) Activities.

Activities will vary. The pair will do everyday things, “just hang out together,” as well as involve themselves in goal directed projects that increase maturity. The mentor who chooses to only remain on site at YJC will participate in normal YJC school and extra-curricular activities, serving as mentors and adult role models.

7) Impact On Mentee.

Mentees will find the relationship meaningful, important, and substantial. Their mentor will become a significant other who is more than a friend. The relationship will change the mentee’s attitudes towards school, career options, crime, decision making, planning, and relationships in general. In the questionnaires, mentees expressed appreciation for their mentors helping them find employment, learn to play a musical instrument, and tutoring in difficult subjects.
8) Impact On Mentor.

Mentors will feel satisfied in doing something worthwhile and building a good friendship. Mentors will also feel satisfaction about making a real difference. The mentor will come to understand the needs of troubled youth and will have previously held misconceptions re-shaped during actual interactions with "juvenile delinquents." However, not every relationship will result in a changed life. One mentor stated that his mentee had pulled a gun on a policeman and had been sent to the California Youth Authority. Another mentor lamented that the young man he had mentored, and occasionally employed for odd jobs, had been murdered in a gang shooting. In this mentor-mentee match, a genuine bond had been formed that made the brutal slaying of the mentee very painful for the mentor.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A MODEL MENTORING PROGRAM

Any correctional program (including mentoring), no matter how well designed, will find its success or failure impacted by how well the program is implemented into the existing organizational structure. An important part of the above design of the model mentoring program must include a strategy of implementation that is rational and plausible. Hamm and Schrink (1989) have studied how correctional change takes place in organizations and facilities that are designed for the rehabilitation of particular populations. They have noted the development of a system model for generating rehabilitation programs for youthful offenders. This system is outlined as follows:
Figure 6.3
SYSTEM MODEL FOR GENERATING CORRECTIONAL CHANGE*

Using the system model of Hamm and Schrink, and the information presented in chapter one of this thesis regarding implementation, the following outline describes how a model mentoring program might be implemented into a juvenile correctional setting, whether private or public, and whether operated by a county probation department or a State young offender’s department.
1) Mobilization System.

A) **Actors** (those who influence constituents).

A mentoring program might be initiated by either the correctional agency itself or by an outside community based organization that desires to provide a mentoring program as a service to a correctional agency. Because there are more correctional agencies existing than community based organizations initiating mentor programs, it can be assumed that the critical actors in the mobilization system will be correctional administrators who value mentoring as a treatment modality and proactively seek to begin such a program in their setting. It is possible that mobilization could come from a directive of a juvenile court judge, or a suggestion from a civic leader, local politician, or some person of influence, but it is more likely that correctional agencies facing limited budgets and desiring cost-effective services will generate the mobilization.

B) **Actions** (mobilizing constituents to act in corrections arena).

Constituents will come from the community. It is assumed that correctional agencies will not foster mentors from their own correctional staff. In both San Bernardino and Orange counties of southern California, it is official probation policy for both juvenile facility staff and probation officers not to have the type of relationship with a ward of the court that a mentoring program would demand. Volunteers as mentors will be citizens
at large, and as such, will need to be recruited. An intentional strategy of recruitment will mean that a cross-section of the community will be targeted to insure the racial, cultural, and gender diversity of the mentor pool, and, that there will remain a sensitivity to changes in juvenile profiles and treatment needs.

2) Policy System.

A) Actors (constituents and partisans making group).

It will be assumed that if the correctional administrators initiate a mentoring program, they will first conduct an in-house policy meeting to determine what they intend a mentoring program to provide. The correctional administrator’s goals and expectations, as well as minimal policy guidelines will guide the search for mentors. Either the correctional administrators will assign a correctional employee the task of developing the mentor program or an outside person/organization will be given the task. It is critical everyone involved in the mentor program be aligned in terms of goals, procedures, and policies. A misalignment between actors (as indicated in chapter one) will surely inhibit the successful implementation of a new program.
B) **Actions** (influencing politicians to implement policies reflecting dominant ideologies).

The policy system will be more under the ultimate control of a correctional department than the local political structure, unless the juvenile court judge mobilizes the mentor program. The ideologies of being proactive with programming, being pro-treatment with troubled youth, the use of volunteerism in a treatment modality, and using or allowing community-based organizations to partner with the correctional department are progressive ideologies that will require the highest level of organizational support, and implementation at a policy level.

3) Control System.

A) **Actors** (politicians and formal decision agencies).

Any rehabilitation program must include in its design the feedback mechanism necessary to chart the continued goal and values alignment of all actors involved. Both the design itself, and the strategy for implementing the design require continual monitoring. People must be delegated the task of supervising the progress of the program and be given the authority to control the actors involved. The actors given the task of controlling must be clearly identified from the beginning of the program so that conflicts of interests and power struggles are minimized.
B) Actions (developing policies to guide correctional system).

The overarching ideologies that formed the program will continue to drive the design after implementation. Specific criteria for charting progress and compliance with program design must be determined as part of the program design. It is critical that all actors involved be fully aware of these criteria at the onset, with the further understanding that failure to comply with these criteria will result in a controlling response by those actors assigned that responsibility.

4) Behavior Generating System.

A) Actors (correctional staff and related agencies).

The primary actors in generating behavior that meets the mentoring goal of maturing out of delinquency will be the mentors themselves. In this sense, the mentor provides a role in the control system in that the mentor directly monitors the mentee's progress towards pre-established goals.

B) Actions (influencing youth through controls and opportunities to be law abiding).

The action section of the behavior generating system represents the mentoring program as a whole. The entire mentor program exists primarily to influence youth into a life of increased maturity, with the goal that this maturity will lead to non-delinquent behavior.
5) Behavior System.

A) **Actors** (correctional clients).

The mentoring program targets youth at risk as the population receiving the treatment. By their adjudication as wards of the court, or by their pre-delinquent behavior, these youth are designated as persons with serious problems requiring immediate intervention.

B) **Actions** (living in the community).

Most incarcerated youth return to the community by age eighteen, with the exceptions being youth remanded to youth prisons, or youth tried as adults (who are remanded to adult prisons for life sentences or the death penalty). It is the goal of all rehabilitation programs (and certainly the goal of this mentoring program) that those youth returning to the community mature into law abiding citizens.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the following five issues: (a) implementation evaluation as an organizational tool, (b) the juvenile justice system and the history of volunteerism, (c) mentoring as a treatment modality, (d) the Youth Justice Center as a model day-school facility with wards of the court, and as the site for The Mentor Program, and (e) the implementation evaluation of The Mentor Program, which includes a design for a model mentoring program and a strategy for the implementation of this program.

The finding of this thesis is: The Mentor Program was not implemented to the satisfaction of most of the participants involved. By this it is meant that The Mentor Program did not become a treatment component that YJC staff readily referred their caseload youth to, nor one that the youth actively sought out, nor one in which most mentors were willing to make personal long-term commitments.

The primary suggestions generated by this thesis are: (a) The Mentor Program should be re-designed, taking into consideration the findings of this implementation evaluation and the information on mentoring provided by the thorough search of the literature, (b) The Mentor Program should be re-implemented according to the lessons learned, both positive and negative, (c) The Youth Justice Center should evaluate each of their various treatment components using the format provided by this implementation evaluation, and (d) The Mentor Program should be implemented in both
the Kuiper Youth Center and the Regional Youth Educational Facility of the San Bernardino County Probation Department.

It is finally suggested that once the re-designed mentor program is operational, another implementation evaluation should be conducted after six months to determine what corrective implementation measures need to be taken. After one year has been completed, an outcomes' evaluation should be conducted to determine if the mentoring programs are accomplishing their goals and objectives. An outcomes' evaluation will need to be designed and tested, as this implementation evaluation did not focus on program effectiveness, nor was it a goal of this thesis. If possible, it would be ideal that a continual data collection procedure be operationalized in order to facilitate a long-term evaluation of the mentoring programs and the other components. As noted in chapter five, exit surveys of terminating mentors/mentees should be completed within thirty days of their termination to insure data collection from the participants.

If the San Bernardino County Probation Department has the vision and the commitment to implement the suggestions of this evaluation, it is possible that a significant contribution regarding the treatment of troubled or incarcerated youth could be made. A successful model of mentoring might mean, that in an age of skepticism regarding rehabilitation, there is something to encourage the treatment agent. As noted in chapter two, there is a pressing need for “something that works.” A model mentoring program, properly implemented and continuously evaluated to insure effectiveness, would meet this pressing need.
APPENDIX A:
MENTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
STAFF

1) How did you find out about the mentor program?

2) What did you understand the mentor program to be/do?

3) Does the mentor program do what you thought it would do? If not, explain:

4) YJC has many program components. Does the mentor program "fit in" at YJC?

5) What problems or difficulties have you encountered with the mentor program as a YJC staff?
6) How do the goals of the mentor program differ from the goals of YJC?

7) As a YJC staff, how much time do you give to the mentor program?

8) Did the mentor program begin when you thought it would?

9) Do the mentors know what is expected of them? If yes, what are those things? If not, why not?

10) Do the mentees know what is expected of them? If yes, what are those things? If not, why not?
11) What are three important ways that the mentees benefit from the mentor relationship?

12) How much support does administration provide for the mentor program? Check one—High (a lot) ___ Medium (some) ___ Low (a little) ___

13) Do all the youth at YJC support the mentor program? Check one—High ___ Medium ___ Low ___

14) Do all the staff at YJC support the mentor program? Check one—High ___ Medium ___ Low ___

15) How would you rate the level of coordination between the YJC and the mentor program? Very high _____ High _____ Ok _____ Low _____ Very low _____
APPENDIX B:
MENTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

MENTOR

1) How did you find out about the mentor program?

2) What did you understand the mentor program to be/do?

3) Does the mentor program do what you thought it would do? If not, explain.

4) YJC has many program components. Does the mentor program "fit in" at YJC?

5) What problems or difficulties have you encountered as a mentor?
6) How do the goals of the mentor program differ from the goals of YJC?

7) As a mentor, how much time do you allocate to the mentor program?

8) Did the mentor program begin when you thought it would?

9) Has your mentor training been lacking in any particular areas?

10) Has your supervision as a mentor been lacking in any particular areas?

11) How have you been treated as a volunteer by YJC staff?
12) Do the **mentees** know what is expected of them? If yes, what are those things? If not, why not?

13) What are three of the most important ways the **mentees** are benefitting from the mentor relationship?

14) How much support does **administration** provide for the mentor program? Check one—High (a lot) ___ Medium (some) ___ Low (a little) ___

15) Do all the **youth** at YJC support the mentor program? Check one—High ___ Medium ___ Low ___

16) Do all the **staff** at YJC support the mentor program? Check one—High ___ Medium ___ Low ___

17) How would you rate the level of coordination between the YJC and the mentor program? Very high _____ High_____ Ok_____ Low_____ Very low_____
APPENDIX C:
MENTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
MENTEE

1) How did you find out about the mentor program?

2) What did you understand the mentor program to be/do?

3) Does the mentor program do what you thought it would do? If not, explain.

4) YJC has many program components. Does the mentor program "fit in" at YJC?

5) What are three of the most difficult problems you have had as a mentee?

6) How do the goals of the mentor program differ from the goals of YJC?
7) As a mentee how many hours do you spend with your mentor each week?

8) Did the mentor program begin when you thought it would?

9) Do the mentors know what is expected of them? If yes, what are those things? If not, why not?

10) Give three ways the mentor program has helped you the most?

11) How much help do the YJC director and the senior counselors give to the mentor program? Check one--

   YJC Director:          High (a lot)___ Medium (some)___ Low (a little)___
   Senior Counselors:    High (a lot)___ Medium (some)___ Low (a little)___

12) Do all the youth at YJC support the mentor program? Check one-- High___ Medium___ Low___

13) What proportion of YJC staff do you feel support the mentor program? Check one:  
    All ______
    3/4 ______  
    Half ______  
    Less than half______
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