

# Mentoring as a Strategy to Support Youth Social Inclusion Processes: Evidence and Challenges

Patricia Jara Males  
Francisco Ochoa  
Rita Sorio

Social Protection and Health  
Division

TECHNICAL  
NOTE N°  
IDB-TN-1265

# Mentoring as a Strategy to Support Youth Social Inclusion Processes: Evidence and Challenges

Patricia Jara Males  
Francisco Ochoa  
Rita Sorio

Mayo 2017



Cataloging-in-Publication data provided by the  
Inter-American Development Bank  
Felipe Herrera Library  
Jara Males, Patricia.

Mentoring as a Strategy to Support Youth Social Inclusion Processes: Evidence and  
Challenges / Patricia Jara Males, Francisco Ochoa, Rita Sorio.

p. cm. — (IDB Technical Note ; 1265)

Includes bibliographic references.

1. Tutors and tutoring-Latin America. 2. Youth development-Latin America. I. Ochoa,  
Francisco. II. Sorio, Rita. III. Inter-American Development Bank. Social Protection and  
Health Division. IV. Title. V. Series.

IDB-TN-1265

Keywords: Mentoring, Youth Social Inclusion, Evidence, Latin America, Brazil, Chile,  
Uruguay

JEL codes: I00, I38, O54, O57

<http://www.iadb.org>

Copyright © 2017 Inter-American Development Bank. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons IGO 3.0 Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC-IGO BY-NC-ND 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/igo/legalcode>) and may be reproduced with attribution to the IDB and for any non-commercial purpose. No derivative work is allowed.

Any dispute related to the use of the works of the IDB that cannot be settled amicably shall be submitted to arbitration pursuant to the UNCITRAL rules. The use of the IDB's name for any purpose other than for attribution, and the use of IDB's logo shall be subject to a separate written license agreement between the IDB and the user and is not authorized as part of this CC-IGO license.

Note that link provided above includes additional terms and conditions of the license.

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Inter-American Development Bank, its Board of Directors, or the countries they represent.



SCL-SPH@iadb.org

[www.iadb.org/SocialProtection](http://www.iadb.org/SocialProtection)

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1 .....	4
Introduction .....	4
The challenge of designing services for youth social inclusion .....	4
Youth mentoring: a promising intervention .....	7
About this document .....	9
Chapter 2 .....	10
What the evidence says .....	10
What we know about the factors that most affect final outcomes .....	10
Areas in which outcomes attributed to mentoring are observed .....	14
Chapter 3 .....	18
Promising regional experiences.....	18
Mentoring to restore youth trajectories in communities with high social unrest: the case of the Caminho Melhor Jovem Program.....	18
Mentoring to reverse functional disengagement and youth inactivity: the case of the Jóvenes en Red Program .....	27
Chapter 4 .....	32
Implementation of mentoring-based programs: lessons learned and challenges for LAC .....	32
Annex.....	35
Recommendations for the design and implementation of mentoring-based programs .....	35
References.....	39

# Mentoring as a Strategy to Support Youth Social Inclusion Processes: Evidence and Challenges

Patricia Jara Males  
Francisco Ochoa  
Rita Sorio

## Summary

The social development gains made by Latin America and the Caribbean have driven the need for differentiated services to enhance the inclusion of specific groups and to respond more effectively to their vulnerabilities. In the case of adolescence—a key stage in life during which skills are accumulated and conditions created for a full and independent adult life—tutoring programs have emerged as a promising alternative to reduce risk behaviors and encourage positive life paths.

Establishing a bond of trust with an unrelated adult peer acts as a protective factor by offering a positive behavioral model at a key moment of the transition into adulthood. The expectation is that the mentoring process will generate impacts on the young person's social-emotional and cognitive development and the formation of his or her identity.

In this study, we propose to analyze some recent evidence on individual mentoring programs. Aspects including mentor profile, length of relationship, and frequency and type of activities, among others, determine the effectiveness of this methodology. Outcomes also vary depending on the objective the program seeks to achieve, such as academic performance, self-esteem enhancement, or reduction of risk behaviors.

In addition, the study presents three promising programs in the region that incorporate professional mentoring into their work with at-risk youth: *Caminho Melhor Jovem*, the state of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; *Abriendo Caminos*, the Security and Opportunities Subsystem of the Social Protection System, Chile; and *Jóvenes en Red*, the national government of Uruguay.

**Keywords:** Mentoring, Youth Social Inclusion, Evidence, Latin America, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay

**JEL codes:** I00, I38, O54, O57

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### *The challenge of designing services for youth social inclusion*

The region of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) has navigated a complex path to social development. Without question, the higher levels of growth seen in the last decade have generated greater margins for investment in social services. Similarly, the stronger performance of several economies in the region has laid the foundation to improve certain income redistribution tools to assist the segment of the population living in extreme poverty. In the last 10 years, a significant portion of the population—some 96 million people—has been lifted from poverty or kept from falling into it. This relative improvement has been accompanied by the recognition of other vulnerabilities that differ from income poverty; that is, the identification of households and individuals who, although not necessarily poor or extremely poor, face adverse conditions or find themselves in a situation in which there is a greater likelihood that their current welfare will decline. These groups are known as at-risk and vulnerable populations, given their increased exposure to factors that predispose them to impoverishment and social exclusion.<sup>1</sup>

An analysis of the population's living conditions throughout the life cycle reveals three crucial periods related to welfare: childhood, adolescence and older adulthood. In the case of more developed countries, their welfare conditions and social protection policies have sought to provide basic security for these groups, particularly at the beginning and end of life, with this expectation underpinning the continuum of social services. In line with this thinking, the Inter-American Development Bank, in its Social Protection and Poverty Sector Framework Document, notes that while it is imperative to develop high-quality, universal social services in those areas essential to people's welfare and security, particularly education and health, it is also necessary to accompany this platform with a set of differentiated services, specially designed to meet the social protection needs of the vulnerable population.

These services play a key role during the most crucial stages of life. Childhood offers the first window of opportunity for the development of the cognitive and social-emotional skills that are of such tremendous importance in later stages, as they will strongly determine individuals' possibilities in terms of autonomy and inclusion. Adolescence and young adulthood bear witness to defining moments that will gradually shape the path to adult social and occupational inclusion and decisions that will impact the likelihood of achieving a productive and fulfilling life. Older adulthood, when aging undermines people's health, brings changes in activity status, and the progressive loss of autonomy during this stage of life makes social and welfare services particularly important.

Each stage has an undeniable intrinsic value. With regard to adolescence, it represents a key period for social inclusion because it is a point in life when individuals acquire a significant range of skills, which will determine the availability of future opportunities. Situations such as youth inactivity (i.e., not in education or employment), teenage pregnancy, and exposure to drugs and violence can have a major impact on people's lives. These situations represent the most common forms of youth vulnerability, with high costs for young people, their families and society. For this reason, there must be differentiated services specifically created to boost the cognitive and social-emotional skills of poor or vulnerable youth, who have difficulty accessing sectoral social services

---

<sup>1</sup> The distinction between internal and external factors of vulnerability was established by Chambers (1989) and has served as a reference for the formulation of several definitions that largely rescue the idea of vulnerability as a two-sided phenomenon. The external aspect relates to the risks, shocks and stresses that may affect an individual, while the internal aspect is linked to the inability to cope with these threats without suffering damage. For further reference, see: [http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication\\_files/WP24\\_Prowse.pdf](http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/WP24_Prowse.pdf)  
[http://www.zef.de/fileadmin/downloads/forum/docprog/Temppapers/2004\\_3a\\_Philip\\_Rayan.pdf](http://www.zef.de/fileadmin/downloads/forum/docprog/Temppapers/2004_3a_Philip_Rayan.pdf)

(education, health, and active labor market policies), staying linked to those services, and achieving good results.

In this paper, we propose to draw upon the available evidence on services and programs that have succeeded at providing the necessary protection and security for at-risk youth, while simultaneously strengthening their potential. For the purposes of this study, we analyzed the results of evaluations performed on these types of programs. The majority are experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations, with participants randomly assigned to a treatment or control group. Much of the evidence on the impacts generated by different youth service models is inconclusive or indicates limited effects, and the main findings documented come from evaluations conducted outside of LAC; however, there are encouraging aspects that may be used as the basis for the design of alternative courses of action for the countries of the region.<sup>2</sup> The following observations about youth programs are noteworthy:

- a) *Interventions that aim to substitute risky behaviors are ineffective if they are based exclusively on providing information to young people.* The evidence indicates that while behavior change communication is critical to relating to young people, prescriptive strategies do not work. Messages such as “education is the key to getting a good job in the future” or “always use protection” are ineffective unless accompanied by strategies that allow young people to assimilate these messages and, most importantly, the necessary resources and opportunities to implement the behaviors being promoted—namely, educational offerings, employment alternatives, and access to contraception. For example, an evaluation conducted by Jensen (2010) in the Dominican Republic showed that providing information to young people about returns to education (in terms of future income) has the potential to be a low-cost intervention to prevent school dropout, as long as there are no other barriers, such as a lack of educational facilities or teachers. Furthermore, interventions that place an emphasis on communicating information should use methodologies that ensure meaningful practical learning, since generic messages do not produce behavioral changes. For instance, an evaluation by Jemmott et al. (2005) in the United States demonstrates the potential of counseling programs focused on developing specific tools and skills in young women to negotiate condom use with their partners. Didactic tools proved more effective than information-based sessions on sexually-transmitted infections, HIV, and sexual and reproductive health.
- b) *Programs for youth at greater risk work best when they combine multiple interventions.* More complex conditions of youth vulnerability call for interventions that include more than one component. Even when a program’s goal is concretely expressed—for example, to ensure that young people stay in high school or to reduce drug use—the path to achieving these results may require more than one intervention. For example, Bandiera et al. (2012) studied the results of a randomized intervention to empower girls in Uganda with life skills.<sup>3</sup> They found that to strengthen the cognitive and non-cognitive abilities of adolescent girls with the aim of improving their sexual health, combined interventions—for example, sexual counseling and vocational education—were more effective than programs providing health counseling alone (Bruce & Hallman, 2008; Duflo et al., 2011). The strategy of combining sex education with improved job skills increased condom use, reduced unwanted sex, and reduced the number of teenage pregnancies. For their part, Cheng et al. (2008) demonstrated that programs for victims of violence, which include interventions such as youth mentoring, family counseling, and referrals to health or social protection services,

---

<sup>2</sup> Division of Social Protection and Health. (2014). Social Protection and Poverty Sector Framework. Inter-American Development Bank. Document GN-2784. Washington, DC

<sup>3</sup> This study is a randomized experiment that followed 4,800 girls who received life skills training to reduce risky behaviors and vocational training for microbusinesses over a two-year period.

significantly reduce crime and aggression among adolescents. A US study by Bloom et al. (1993) showed that a program providing a package of conditional cash transfers, transportation support, child care services, and counseling<sup>4</sup>—one of just a handful of programs that gives cash transfers directly to young people—increased school enrollment, retention and attendance among teenage parents. This study is one of the few that found positive effects on re-enrollment rates among young people who had previously dropped out of school.

- c) *Interventions that incorporate work with families have better outcomes than those that work exclusively with youth.* While it is true that work with youth requires a certain level of expertise, the evidence suggests that this work is more effective when combined with a family intervention, a finding consistent with that of the effectiveness of multidimensional strategies. Sexton and Turner (2010) analyzed the effectiveness of a multisystemic intervention that combined support for juvenile offenders and their families versus an intervention consisting solely of the provision of regular probation services to offenders. Using the experimental method, juveniles were assigned to one of the two treatment models upon their release. The findings showed that the intervention with family involvement achieved a 35% reduction in felonies, a 30% reduction in violent crime, and a 21% reduction in misdemeanors. Similarly, brief interventions aimed at improving family mediation skills may reduce not only the incidence of hostile interactions between parents and young people in the home, but also the incidence of violent or aggressive behavior by young people outside the home, as demonstrated by the Iowa Strengthening Families Program (Spoth et al., 2000). A US study by Terzian et al. (2011) identified effective strategies for reducing risky behaviors, through a meta-analysis of 123 programs designed to prevent or reduce aggressive behavior, with direct impacts determined through experimental evaluations. Consistent with other findings, the study concluded that life-skills-only programs aimed at juvenile offenders—in addition to those aimed solely at improving families' economic situation—did not yield positive impacts in the dimension of aggressiveness, in contrast to those that combine these elements with family therapy and parenting skills training to improve communication, disciplinary practices, limit-setting, and supervision.
- d) *Community-based interventions are more likely to achieve sustainable outcomes.* Programs that exclusively address individual determinants of vulnerability may be less effective than those that also intervene in surrounding environments, where numerous other risk factors are present. In terms of structural, environmental and personal determinants, evidence suggests that actions based solely on the individual characteristics of young people are less successful and achieve less enduring results than those that involve the family and community. This idea of community refers to the importance of local surroundings, as this is where both existing (or potential) opportunity structures and important vulnerabilities are found. A US study by Sikkema et al. (2005) provides evidence of the potential of community interventions. Teenagers who participated in the community intervention were more likely to delay the onset of sexual intercourse and more likely to have used a condom the last time they had sex. These results were observed both in the short and long term, meaning that the effects were lasting. In the same vein, an evaluation by Arthur et al. (2010) of the Communities That Care program in the United States provides evidence that comprehensive programs that empower community leaders to implement prevention initiatives in their communities can significantly reduce risky behaviors among adolescents.

---

<sup>4</sup> The studies of both Bandiera and Bloom analyzed programs that offer a combination of interventions that aims to enhance the desired effects on their target populations. In both cases, the results achieved in the treatment group were compared to those obtained in a control group, precisely to observe the added value of multiple interventions. The limitation of this evidence is that it does not test specific combinations of interventions.

*One-on-one mentoring programs have high potential for modifying youth risk behaviors.* Several experiences show that when adequately prepared mentors meet with youth on a regular, ongoing basis under proper supervision, these adult figures can become important protective factors for the most vulnerable young people or those who have no positive adult influences at home. Some assessments show that high-quality bonds made through US mentoring programs were able to generate additional effects, such as improved relationships with peers and family, increased self-esteem, and better perception of social support<sup>5</sup> (Karcher, 2005). These results have also been observed in other areas. A study by Tierney and Baldwin (2000) evaluated the impact of Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS), a program providing mentoring between adult volunteers and youth that seeks to promote the comprehensive development of at-risk children and adolescents. The results very clearly highlight the potential of highly qualified mentoring programs with systematic, regular meetings and strong supervision, especially to prevent or delay drug use among young men.<sup>6</sup>

### ***Youth mentoring: a promising intervention***

Since the first decade of the 2000s, mentoring has proliferated as a promising intervention aimed at solving the problems and meeting the needs of young people, with strategies based on the guidance of adult role models or older peers. In the United States alone, it is estimated that there are over 5,000 mentoring programs, serving nearly 3,000,000 young people nationwide (DuBois et al., 2011).

Undoubtedly, the widespread popularity achieved by this type of program results from the theoretical and conceptual developments that have been made in different disciplines, particularly in psychology, which emphasizes the importance of establishing positive relationships with children, adolescents and young adults as a strategy for behavior modeling and positive socialization. In fact, the presence of a close adult in a position to serve as a role model and to support the young person is considered a protective factor. When it comes to an unrelated adult or older peer who acts with the intention to support the young person—using a format and structure that turns that bond into the motivational trigger for behavioral change—this kind of intervention can play a key role in the dismantling of a negative self-concept and the restructuring or rectification of personality traits. This is particularly relevant in contexts where the young person does not have a protective family or community environment from which to draw on examples of positive behaviors.

The *raison d'être* of mentoring has much to do with the vulnerabilities and risks that young people face today—fragile social and family ties, fragmented communities, and violence—as it is a useful tool for mediating and strengthening relationships. Yet the single greatest factor of consequence when explaining the relevance of mentoring is the existence of a positive relationship with a protective adult, due to this factor's strong influence on the development of adolescents and young adults. Just as secure attachment in early childhood is crucial to children's cognitive and emotional development, the presence of adults who can serve as positive role models for behavior is vital for adolescents. For this reason, young people who do not have an adult caregiver and role model are more vulnerable to multiple difficulties.

As a means of support during a defining moment of transition in a young person's development, the establishment of a meaningful relationship with an unrelated adult helps adolescents feel more confident that they can successfully transition to adulthood. It offers them the possibility to develop

---

<sup>5</sup> This program, called Developmental Mentoring, invested heavily in the strengthening of mentors' skills and commitment, as well as the involvement of families. Each mentor received ongoing training and met with mentees on an individual basis two times per week.

<sup>6</sup> In addition, the young people who participated in the program for 18 months were less disposed to violence, improved their school participation and results, and enriched their relationships with family and peers.

different social skills, to better express their emotions, to more effectively communicate with adults, and to receive guidance that they probably would not be open to getting from parents or caregivers (Rhodes, 2006). Several investigations point to mentoring as a promising type of social intervention in that it reduces the likelihood of young people developing antisocial behavior and low self-esteem and, by extension, improves their academic and social performance.

The arguments in favor of mentoring are especially strong when aiming to achieve multiple youth development outcomes. The literature credits this type of strategy with the ability to generate effects at three levels: the *social-emotional* dimension, the *cognitive* dimension, and the *formation of identity*. In terms of emotional development, mentoring appears promising because it can transform into a positive experience for young people. It prepares them to better relate to the adult world, helps them to practice self-control and to regulate their emotions, and facilitates the development of communication skills. With regard to cognitive development, the belief is that interactions with mentors help youth develop analytical abilities and acquire new skills to facilitate learning, resulting in better academic and future vocational outcomes. With respect to the development of identity, the mentoring relationship offers the possibility of facilitating the recognition of preferences that serve to guide behavior and define expectations for future development. More importantly, these three dimensions appear to always work together as a whole. What this literature suggests is that when relationships with unrelated adults are positive, meaningful and supportive experiences, they can serve to catalyze development processes that help young people to avoid engaging in risky behavior and to discover their own potential.

Despite the expansion of these programs and the diversification of their fields of application, there are still important unanswered questions regarding their actual effectiveness and how to optimize the benefits for the young people who participate in them. The abundant literature produced around mentoring-based programs omits several issues of interest for which there is limited evidence, especially because the evaluation of programs differs in terms of the assessment approach and in what is considered evidence of effectiveness. In particular, this assessment becomes even more complex due to the difficulty of isolating the effect of intervening variables, such as the quality of the relationship established—which is not always easy to determine—and young people's personal, family and contextual circumstances (Scrine et al., 2012).

Another problem that affects the analysis of mentoring effectiveness is the nature of the results that are usually attributed to this intervention and the possibility of measuring those factors. There are variables that more readily lend themselves to evaluation, such as student retention or recovery, while other variables, such as self-esteem, perceived self-efficacy, decision-making abilities, and life skills, are more complex to measure. Furthermore, these variables are transformed into observable results at different points in time, which makes it difficult to identify moments of evaluation corresponding to the times at which these results can be seen.

Finally, when taken as a whole, the evaluations in this area reveal additional limitations: (i) experimental studies have been conducted mostly on very small-scale interventions that are not generalizable to large populations; (ii) there are very few evaluations that have follow-up studies to observe long-term results; (iii) different programs have used varying outcome measurements, making it difficult to compare their effects; (iv) the available knowledge is unclear when it comes to determining the appropriate moment to provide mentoring (unfortunately, very few studies disaggregate the features of an intervention and expected outcomes by age group, nor do they suggest the minimum duration and intensity required for support when a breakdown by age is given); and (v) the evidence is too limited to suggest the desirability of one model over another when considering different intervention settings (e.g., school, community, virtual interaction environments) or strategies (individual mentoring versus group mentoring). The latter indicates a knowledge gap that must be closed, and it establishes a list of important topics for future research.

## ***About this document***

Despite the limitations on the quantity and quality of the available evidence on the effectiveness of interventions with at-risk youth (as mentioned in the previous section), there is a significant accumulation of learning from evaluations conducted on mentoring programs.

In line with the IDB's policy to promote the performance of policy-making, program design, and service implementation in accordance with the best available evidence for each case, this paper has conducted a review of the most relevant literature in the field of mentoring, in an attempt to identify the most important characteristics of the programs that use this model, the components with the greatest impact on final results, and their implications for the design of similar strategies in LAC, where, unfortunately, there is no information available from experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations, such as those developed or systematized by the authors cited in this paper.

Chapter two presents the main findings and conclusions from a series of studies, experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations, and meta-analyses conducted by various authors who have explored the subject. Chapter three analyzes three cases of youth mentoring programs being implemented in Brazil, Chile and Uruguay, in order to illustrate in a practical way the potential applications of the basic components of this type of intervention. The fourth and final chapter reflects on the possibility of implementing these strategies in the region, and it also presents a set of recommendations regarding essential considerations to ensure that the interventions have a greater chance of success with their inclusion goals.

Finally, a methodological note is needed to guide the reader of this paper. The term "mentoring" will be used to refer to interventions based on the interaction between unrelated adults or older peers with teenagers/young people who are supported in a particular process within a minimal structure that temporarily organizes the relationship. Regardless of the characteristics of those involved and the conditions and settings where the relationship takes place, the overarching element that stands out is personalized support based on the principle of role models for behavioral change.

## Chapter 2

### What the evidence says

#### ***What we know about the factors that most affect final outcomes***

Interest in mentoring programs has grown, in part, due to the importance of positive relationships with unrelated adults in promoting resilience in at-risk youth. The expansion of the use of this type of intervention relies heavily on the widespread belief that mentoring can compensate for a lack of positive role models within the family group and help develop different positive skills in youth. Nevertheless, not all programs are similar in design and implementation, and not all of the studies conducted are equally robust or capable of capturing results that are generalizable to different contexts. As mentioned in the previous chapter, there are also limitations on the scale of some of the programs with encouraging results and on the ability to expand them.

For the analysis that follows, we considered both evaluations of specific programs and systematizations (meta-analysis) of various programs with similar objectives or characteristics. In both cases, the selected studies evaluated groups of young people who benefited from the intervention and compared them to groups with similar characteristics that did not receive the intervention. Furthermore, this analysis considered evaluations of medium-term programs as opposed to pilot interventions.

Perhaps one of the most comprehensive studies on youth mentoring programs is by DuBois et al. (2002), who performed a meta-analysis based on a review of 55 evaluations. The studies included in this analysis looked at programs that apply the conventional youth-adult mentoring model, excluding the following models from the analysis: small group mentoring, peer mentoring (by other young people), and interventions in which the adult mentor is a mental health professional. In addition, the selected evaluations analyzed observable effects on youth as a result of their participation in mentoring programs, both by comparing the *ex ante* and *ex post* situation of the same young people, as well as the comparison of effects between groups of young people with and without mentoring. Lastly, the interventions chosen are those that have focused their work on the population age 19 and under.

To perform this analysis, we collected documentary evidence to piece together the best practices in mentoring. In this manner, we identified the three most influential factors in the achievement of the final results: the program's design features and implementation, youth characteristics, and the quality of the relationship achieved between the mentor and mentee.

The literature on these best practices in design and implementation is based on the comparison between interventions focused solely on mentoring and multidimensional interventions. The conclusion at this point is that greater benefits can be expected when mentoring is linked to other support services; however, although this is an essential condition for the success of the interventions, it is not the only one. The objective to be pursued through mentoring is one of the factors to consider—taking into account the enormous variety of applications that this method of youth work has—as some programs pursue *general goals* related to the positive development of youth, while others are more focused on *instrumental goals*, such as staying in school, finishing school, or getting a job.

Similarly, the literature we reviewed reveals a broad discussion on the ideal mentor profile and the type of training and supervision that should be provided, since some programs place special emphasis on the mentors' capabilities at the time of recruitment, while others opt to provide training in the required skills. In a study conducted in 2011, DuBois et al. analyzed randomized evaluations of 73 mentoring programs and found that the most effective programs are those for which there is a measure of consistency between the mentors' profile (their educational or professional background) and the programs' objectives (e.g., teachers or technical assistants in

education for programs in which mentoring seeks to motivate to achieve better educational performance, or social workers mentoring young people who are under preventive measures). This emphasizes the need for two principal functions to be met: the search for and selection of potential mentors. In any case, there is some consensus that it is essential for mentors to have an ongoing support mechanism. Other best practices mentioned in the literature relate to the following: ensuring a match between young people and their mentors in variables such as gender, ethnicity and race; providing clear definitions of expected minimum contact frequency and the duration of the relationship; ensuring that the mentoring activity relies on some additional support scheme that provides resources and linkages to other opportunities; and ensuring the support and involvement of parents in the process.

Closely linked to the aforementioned factors are those related to the relationship built between youth and the adults who intervene as mentors. The feature that is repeated among previous experiences is that there should be a regular *pattern of contact* over a significant period of time. Some evaluations showed negative results explained by inadequate levels of contact and the premature end of the bond without achieving the objectives sought by the program.

DuBois et al. (2002) subjected these different aspects—mentoring goal, mentor profile, frequency of contacts between mentor and mentee—to review, in an attempt to draw comparisons with the findings of their own work. Overall, they managed to validate the weight of some variables due to their greater contribution to the effectiveness of mentoring programs. As for the dimensions in which mentoring programs showed significant results, the following stand out: emotions, risk behaviors, social competence, educational attainment, and employability, although the magnitude of the effects is not that significant. Although there are a limited number of studies with follow-up evaluations once mentoring has concluded, it appears that the benefits of mentoring last for at least one year after the end of youth participation in the program.<sup>7</sup>

Also, it is found that the ability of programs to avoid undesirable effects on youth—as in the case of mentoring programs focused on preventing or discouraging risky youth behaviors—depends heavily on whether the intervention is coordinated *with* and mobilizes access *to* other services and whether the intervention focuses on specific goals.

Furthermore, it shows that the observed benefits are significant but minor considering what was maintained by some studies in the literature, most likely because many of the programs *have not met all the characteristics considered necessary to achieve greater impact*. Both in previous literature and in the findings of a study by DuBois et al. (2002), factors such as adequate training of mentors and parental involvement appear to be strong predictors of successful mentoring programs, especially the existence of a mechanism to monitor ongoing support and provide technical assistance to the mentors. The trend observed in the study shows that most programs neglect this aspect, focusing instead on procedures and preparatory activities, such as screenings, basic training, orientation, and matching of youth with mentors (71% of the studies assessed in this meta-analysis) while only a minority (23% of studies) concentrate their efforts on providing ongoing training to already-practicing mentors. Herrera et al. (2007) found that mentors who receive both types of training, before and after, had a closer bond with youth, continued mentoring for a longer period, and formed better quality relationships<sup>8</sup> (Herrera et al., 2013).

---

<sup>7</sup> Rhodes (2008) cites an evaluation of mentoring programs conducted in schools and communities, which showed how young people assigned to mentoring significantly improved their academic performance, their perception of academic self-efficacy, and their behavior in school, as compared to a control group of students who did not receive mentoring. However, in subsequent follow-up assessments after mentoring had ended, the differences were no longer significant (Scrine, 2012).

<sup>8</sup> Herrera et al. (2000) found that the greater the initial training given to mentors, the higher the quality of the relationship achieved with young people, only comparing mentors who received two hours of training or less to those who received at least six. Similar results were observed in the impact assessment of Big Brothers Big Sisters (Herrera et al., 2007), in which mentors who received initial training demonstrated a greater relationship of trust, greater efficacy, and greater willingness to continue mentoring for a second year. The evidence, however, is mixed in one regard: although mentors' previous training has a broad influence in some cases, it

This same consideration may call into question those mentoring interventions that rely on volunteer recruitment, since the weak relationship that volunteers establish with the program, as a product of their volunteer status, discourages a stronger, more stable bond in which supervision and continuous support are possible.<sup>9</sup> It is certainly a very attractive strategy because it allows for the promotion of social responsibility through the performance of unpaid community work, which dispenses with a major expenditure (that of financing human resources to perform that task); however, it also generates several operational challenges that are no less complex. The evidence is inconclusive regarding the impact of volunteer status on the performance of volunteer mentors and the level of results they achieve versus paid mentors.

It seems that the strongest findings relate to the effects of the *intensity* and *quality* of the mentor-mentee bond on the final results. In addition to the frequency of contact, factors such as the capacity for empathy and duration of the bond make a significant difference in the achievement of positive results in young people, although this particular study could not analyze the impact of these specific factors.

Another premise that the study sought to confirm refers to the type of young person for whom mentoring may work best. Positive effects were observed across all groups of young people, without finding significant differences when considering sociodemographic variables such as age, gender, race, ethnicity or family structure. In this sense, the literature on best practices has noted that the greatest benefits are achieved in young people whose vulnerability is related to the existence of a risk environment, rather than personal characteristics. According to DuBois et al. (2011), these interventions tend to be more effective if young people have presented behavior problems. When the support relationship focuses on overcoming these problems, young people are motivated to participate in the process and respond constructively to the guidance provided by their mentor. However, this method does not appear to work for young people with severe behavioral problems, in which case mentoring fails to serve as a substitute for other therapeutic services or specialized professional support.

The study by DuBois et al. (2002) shows that it is important to address *specific* determinants of vulnerability, even when this vulnerability is related to the household's level of economic deprivation. Mentoring is less effective if it focuses solely on issues of a personal nature that may require more specialized assistance. The message emphasized here is that greater effects have been reported in those programs in which *both* types of variables are simultaneously addressed—environmental factors and the determinants of vulnerability at play—in addition to personal factors such as young people's attitudes, dispositions and behaviors. Therefore, they should not be seen as opposing factors but rather as different dimensions that form part of the intervention.

### ***The influence of specific components on the effectiveness of mentoring***

Although essentially all mentoring programs are based on a support relationship, this relationship can take on very different characteristics in terms of its purpose, stakeholders, setting, duration, and interaction with other contextual elements. With regard to the factors that are important to analyze in a mentoring program, in addition to those mentioned above, several of the evaluations

---

does not seem to make a significant difference in others. The evidence suggests that just as important as the *intensity* of the training is the *way* in which it is provided—practical, experiential, and directly linked to the skills that the relationship puts to the test—and its ability to effectively help mentors relate to the children.

<sup>9</sup> Ritter et al. systematized evidence from 27 studies with experimental designs to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring by volunteers in terms of improving students' academic skills. Although the assisted learning approach has been around for some time and have yielded good results in this field, it remains a major dilemma if adult volunteers or paraprofessionals can be as effective as professional mentors. This meta-analysis concludes that the mentoring provided by volunteers does represent a potentially effective strategy for improving students' academic skills, at least in reading, writing and other related domains. By analyzing programs' specific attributes, researchers controlled for variables such as mentor type, children's ages, and programs' level of structuring, with no significant differences observed in any of the subgroups.

examined list some variables that appear to have a greater influence on results. A summary of the main references found is presented below:

- DuBois et al. (2002) and Lawner et al. (2013) found that *mentoring-only programs* are equally effective as those that include mentoring as a component within a larger design, mixed evidence that is also supported by other authors' findings.
- DuBois et al. (2002) found no differences in terms of results between programs with *general goals* related to youth development, such as personal development and social integration, and programs with *more specific goals*, such as academic, cultural, psychological, interpersonal or vocational goals.
- Regarding the *setting* in which interventions take place, DuBois et al. (2002) found no significant differences between the outcomes of mentoring carried out in schools, communities or rural areas, although the authors caution that each setting involves some adaptation of the mentoring model to overcome logistical challenges (e.g., the mentoring of youth living in remote areas or those areas with limited availability of local mentors) and to control for the negative effects produced by some mentoring situations (e.g., selective mentoring at school).
- Lawner et al. (2013) analyzed the effects of mentoring, with results disaggregated by *mentor age*, and found that mentoring by adults was equally effective as mentoring provided by older peers or college students. The difference in results seems to depend on the profile and experience of the mentors rather than their ages.<sup>10</sup> Karcher (2003) found higher positive effects when the mentor is at least two years older than the young person and also when the mentor and the mentee attend different schools. Bowman and Myrick (1987) found smaller effects with adult mentors working in primary and lower secondary schools than with mentors working in upper secondary. There have also been better outcomes with adolescent mentors who have experience in community service and have acquired knowledge and developed skills for youth work. Morrow-Howell (2001) found better results in mentoring performed by older adults than younger ones, but only when it comes to young people experiencing difficult circumstances and going through processes of change. It is not conclusive regarding the effectiveness of this model for youth facing other risk factors.
- Regarding the criteria for *pairing* mentors and mentees, Sipe (1996) and DuBois et al. (2002) found that there is no significant relationship between the procedures used and results achieved. In light of other similar investigations, Liang and West (2007) recommend that assignments be made based on young people's needs and their families' preferences.
- As for *activities* performed, several studies point to the importance of 1) achieving balanced participation by mentors and mentees in terms of selecting and engaging in activities and 2) establishing guidelines to facilitate this selection and ensure that activities are consistent with the goals to be met through the intervention. DuBois et al. (2002) found that better results were observed with structured activities.
- Regarding the *duration* of the relationship, the literature indicates that this topic is difficult to explore, mainly because it may take a significant amount of time before the benefits of mentoring become apparent. However, there are compelling findings that are worth considering:

---

<sup>10</sup> DuBois et al. (2011) found that rather than being based on demographic variables, the matching of young people with mentors seems to be related to factors such as the existence of common interests. It is unclear whether the fact that there is such a highly structured process for the selection and assignment of mentors contributes to the achievement of final results, or if, on the contrary, when a less demanding matching process is conducted, this factor moderates impact.

- Merely building a relationship of closeness and trust may take at least six months (Sipe, 1996). Herrera (2004) found that the greatest benefits observed in participants in these programs are achieved with a relationship lasting at least 12 months, especially if an attempt is made to achieve outcomes such as improved social skills, attitudes, and behaviors in the classroom. Grossman and Rhodes (2002), who studied the Big Brothers Big Sisters program, observe something similar, stating that peer mentoring requires at least one year of work to be effective.
- DuBois et al. (2002) found very modest effects when mentoring lasts less than a year, concluding that lasting relationships and support based on regular contact with mentors provide a wide range of positive changes in outcomes associated with development. This is confirmed by Herrera et al. (2007) in their study of mentoring performed in US schools. They found that the children who maintained longer, more frequent and higher-quality relationships obtained greater benefits than those who did not have this degree of intensity. In the same vein, other authors have analyzed the relationship between duration of mentoring and specific results such as improved academic skills, increased self-esteem and improving interpersonal relationships. The findings show that close relationships of at least 13 months (and up to 19 months) with young people generate better outcomes than those of a shorter duration or premature termination.<sup>11</sup>
- Grossman and Rhodes (2002) also show that children who participated for 12 months or more achieved better outcomes in self-esteem, perception of social acceptance, improved relations with parents, and decreased consumption of alcohol and drugs. On the contrary, the children who ended their participation before three months showed declines in self-esteem and perception of school competition.

Other findings related to the interaction of variables assess not only the specific weight of each component within the mentoring design, but they also mention that a particular set of factors can have a greater impact on the results. Sipe (2002)<sup>12</sup> observed seven *recurring variables* that explain good outcomes generated by mentoring: youth involvement in deciding how to spend time together; the shouldering of commitments consistent with the permanence of the mentor in the life of the young person; acceptance that there may be setbacks in achieving compliance with objectives and goals; commitment by both parties to maintain the active bond; the offering of concrete opportunities for shared enjoyment; the ability to understand the young person's point of view; the mentors' search for professional advice and counseling from fellow staff.<sup>13</sup>

### ***Areas in which outcomes attributed to mentoring are observed***

The multi-functionality of mentoring seems to be the attribute that makes it such a promising type of intervention. While it is true that its results can be seen in different dimensions, it is important to be cautious because the type of mentoring heavily influences the type of result to be achieved. Furthermore, the mere existence of a support relationship does not guarantee results or that these results will be lasting in the long term. In the study of DuBois et al. (2002) described above, almost 10% of the analyzed programs showed, on average, negative effects, 30% of cases showed *neutral* results, and 60% showed *positive* impacts; however, in most cases, the benefits were modest. This shows, first, that there is great variability in the magnitude of the results achieved

---

<sup>11</sup> Liang and Rhodes (2007); Rhodes and Dubois (2006); DuBois et al. (2002); Grossman and Rhodes (2002); Kelly (2005); Rhodes (2005). Cited in Scrine et al. (2012).

<sup>12</sup> Cited by Scrine et al. (2012).

<sup>13</sup> This is consistent with the finding in the study by Morrow and Styles (1995), also based on BBBS, with a non-experimental comparison group. This study analyzed the influence of the mentor's role on the results obtained in young people, comparing the developmental style and the instrumental style, showing significant differences in favor of the former.

by mentoring programs for young people and, second, that there is ample room for improvement in efficiency.

Some of the main findings on how mentoring impacts behavior, by type of outcome, are as follows:

- Many mentoring programs have the goal of improving **academic performance**. Youth who participate in these programs have shown improvement in their attitudes toward their studies and greater confidence in completing tasks, especially those of an academic nature. They are also more likely to regularly attend class, resulting in less absenteeism (Dubois et al., 2010; Funk and Ek, 2002). Evidence gathered in Canada suggests that students who participate in mentoring perform twice as well academically and are two and a half times more likely to participate in extracurricular activities (DeWit, 2013). Wood (2012) and Karcher (2008) report that mentoring programs do not exert greater influence on the final academic performance of supported students.<sup>14</sup>
- Herrera et al. (2007) analyzed the effectiveness of mentoring in **school settings**.<sup>15</sup> In analyzing the programs' performance, they observed a mentoring model that, while not academic, did provide proper structure for school activities. The main positive outcomes were observed in behavior and school performance: greater academic proficiency, better behavior, and improved attendance. However, these results were difficult to sustain in the year following the intervention, which is attributed to the inadequacy of just one year of mentoring and the interruption occurring between academic cycles.
- Meanwhile, Karcher et al. (2007) studied the effect of mentoring in schools along with other supports or services, comparing the results in students who only received these services, with students who also benefited from mentoring. The children who were mentored reported a better connection with their peer group, higher self-esteem, and an improved relationship with the group. However, no results were found in other areas, which is consistent with the findings of other similar studies.
- The **social-emotional and psychological dimension** reveals observable results in the short and medium term. This may be due, in part, to the fact that children receive assistance to improve academic performance, increasing their sense of accomplishment. The most frequently reported results relate to self-esteem, confidence, interaction with peers and greater willingness to participate in class (Karcher, 2008; Wood, 2012; Langhout et al., 2004).
- Some studies indicate improvements in the **quality of the relationships** that children have with other adults, especially their parents (Funk & Ek, 2002; Jekielek et al., 2002), showing

---

<sup>14</sup> Both studies analyzed the best available evidence on school mentoring programs. They included random and quasi-experimental evaluations, always with a comparison group. It is important to expand the available knowledge on this point because the evidence is mixed. Miller et al. (2011) evaluated a recognized program in Ireland, aimed at improving literacy skills among elementary students with low academic performance. The program leverages the corporate social responsibility programs of companies and organizations, from which it recruits employees who serve as volunteer mentors, working with students in different settings, once a week for one school year. The study showed strong evidence of effectiveness in improving outcomes related to this field, in particular decoding skills and reading ability and fluency. Similarly, positive effects were observed in other areas of non-cognitive performance, such as future aspirations.

<sup>15</sup> School-based mentoring is the most widespread form in the United States. With this type of mentoring, mentors meet with the children at school. It is very different from mentoring performed in other settings for this exact reason. One of its main strengths—given that it takes places within the structure of the school context—is that it is easier to monitor and, therefore, facilitates the incorporation of agents who would not usually be considered for mentoring in other settings; for example, older students who need close supervision. Furthermore, this approach fosters greater academic participation among children, who are more interested in and committed to regularly attending school. Alternatively, this setting places a number of restrictions on the development of mentoring activities, such as a limit on the time available for these meetings, interruptions caused by school recesses/vacations, and the inability to perform non-academic and recreational activities with mentees. Moreover, the effects of this model at the peer level have not been sufficiently explored, since meetings occur in their presence. Although there are no conclusive experimental evaluation studies, the available information suggests that not all young people benefit in the same way with this model. Some authors suggest that females take advantage of this resource more as a support relationship than as a social opportunity; others point out that primary school students are much more susceptible than those in lower or upper secondary school.

greater closeness with them and decreased conflict in the relationship. Better relationships are also observed at the peer level; many mentees improve the quality of interactions with other children and decrease the level of conflict with their friends.

- Research suggests that mentoring can correct **behavioral problems**, strengthening skills that are useful for achieving more positive development. Dubois et al. (2002) examined the impact of mentoring on criminal behavior in youth, finding that major changes were seen in this dimension.
- In the same vein, some studies analyze the effect of mentoring on **drug and alcohol use**. Thomas et al. (2013) found a decrease in alcohol consumption and a reduction in the youngest adolescents' experimentation with drugs (Herrera et al., 2013). Lorenzetti et al. (2011) analyzed the effects of mentoring on drug and alcohol consumption in children between the ages of 12 and 16, based on four experimental studies in this field. Three of them provide evidence that mentoring has a preventive effect on alcohol consumption and three show effects on drug use, although in the latter case without very significant differences. The authors note that the quality of the available evidence must be reviewed and expanded, because the findings reveal rather modest benefits in these areas, presumably due to the composition of the samples used, which mostly included children with a lower rate of relative consumption. However, all four studies analyzed included ongoing training of mentors, monitoring of the implementation of interventions, structured activities for the children, and clear expectations regarding the frequency of contact and involvement of parents or caregivers, which coincides with other findings that recognize factors with greater impact on the positive results generated by mentoring (Dubois, 2002).
- The previously cited study by Tierney and Baldwin (2000) conducted on Big Brothers Big Sisters discussed the impact of mentoring in six areas: **anti-social activities, academic performance, family relationships, relationships with friends, self-concept, and social and cultural performance**. Among young people who received mentoring, the study found that they were 46% less likely to use drugs, 26% less likely to begin consuming alcohol, and 33% less likely to hit someone, and it found improved family and social relationships, especially among males. Other results are not as convincing, with more modest gains in self-esteem, self-confidence, social participation and performance in school activities.
- Herrera et al. (2013) analyzed program results by comparing youth with various **types of risk**, finding that young people with different profiles achieve similar relationships in terms of the intensity and duration of mentoring, and positive, short-term results are also comparable. The strongest common benefits observed in young people are a decrease in depressive symptoms, an increase in social acceptance, improved attitudes toward school, and improved academic achievement.

It is worth making a special mention of mentoring as a **support strategy for social reintegration**. Mentoring programs are increasingly sought as an alternative to intervene with particularly vulnerable or at-risk youth, such as those in residential facilities or the juvenile detention system, or those with an incarcerated parent. Mentoring has been implemented by the criminal justice system as a promising type of social intervention for reducing recidivism, for which the influence of mentors has been explored in terms of improving the living conditions of repeat offenders. They have offered direct assistance with processes such as job hunting or a housing search, while acting as a positive role model. With this support, it is expected that young people can achieve positive outcomes such as increasing their level of education, better job training, and access to employment.

In this dimension, Jolliffe and Farrington (2007) analyzed a universe of 18 programs with randomized evaluations in an attempt to summarize the best evidence on the effects of mentoring

on reoffending. The general feature of mentoring programs included in the baseline meta-analysis is contact between an at-risk youth and a positive role model with more experience and qualities that enable him or her to provide guidance, advice, and motivation to develop skills in the mentee. Although some evidence shows results in these indicators, more rigorous evaluation studies do not suggest that a statistically significant reduction in recidivism is achieved; of the 18 studies analyzed, an effect was observed in just 7 of them.

Of these, there are interesting findings worth noting. First, it is a fact that some programs are more effective than others. Specifically, those that demonstrated greater impact in terms of reducing recidivism have three main characteristics: (i) the duration of each meeting—those interventions where mentors and mentees spent more time together were more successful than those meetings with a lower average duration or those for which the expected duration of contact was not stipulated in a protocol; (ii) the frequency of contact—those interventions for which the meetings were held at least once a week achieved better results than frequency greater or those for which the frequency of contact was not stipulated; (iii) mentoring as part of a comprehensive intervention—in those studies where mentorships were the only intervention, the results are more limited. On the contrary, when mentoring is added to other interventions—for example, accelerated programs to complete secondary studies or employment programs—better results were achieved in terms of reducing recidivism.

## Chapter 3

### ***Promising regional experiences***

To date, there is no known inventory of youth mentoring programs in Latin America and the Caribbean, nor are there programs of this type that have gained special regional notoriety. It is quite likely, however, that these types of experiences are emerging, in part, because of the influence of those experiences that have managed to achieve visibility and have become models for addressing youth risk behaviors.

To give a more concrete application to the aspects discussed in the previous chapter, we sought out programs that—because of their position within their particular institutional context, the relevance of their objectives, the length of time they have been implemented, and the centrality of mentoring to their designs—would be useful in this analysis. Due to the combination of all these factors and because they represent important innovations in the way they have approached work with at-risk youth populations, they are considered to be promising experiences. The three programs selected—*Caminho Melhor Jovem*, the state of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; *Abriendo Caminos*, the Security and Opportunities Subsystem of the Social Protection System, Chile; and *Jóvenes en Red*, the national government of Uruguay—are three relevant cases that have chosen to incorporate a professional mentoring component into their work with adolescents and young adults, as a strategy to counteract the determinants of vulnerability and risk. This section provides an overview of the most relevant features of each program, making specific mention of their intervention methodologies and the operationalization of the youth mentoring support component.

Lastly, we discuss some topics related to the breakthroughs that these program experiences have generated in different fields, which, unfortunately, are not always accompanied by figures that can put these results in perspective. They do, however, allow us to describe notable aspects in terms of the effectiveness of these modalities. In the same way, the identification of some of the main challenges that these programs face is useful for contextualizing this discussion in the broader field of debate on juvenile social inclusion services and the feasibility and functionality of a one-on-one model when working with these populations.

### ***Mentoring to restore youth trajectories in communities with high social unrest: the case of the Caminho Melhor Jovem Program***

The main objective of the *Caminho Melhor Jovem* (CMJ) Program of the government of the State of Rio de Janeiro is to contribute to the social and productive inclusion of young people ages 15 to 29 who live in areas with Police Pacification Units (UPPs).<sup>16</sup> To this end, the program addresses two dimensions. First, it works to generate an accessible range of services in health, education, vocational training and social welfare support. Second, it looks to strengthen the skills of vulnerable youth through mentoring and counseling and to reduce risk behaviors and promote positive life trajectories, especially in the five groups identified as most vulnerable: (i) those who have extricated themselves from drug trafficking; (ii) those fulfilling social-educational measures; (iii) young people who are not in education, employment or training; (iv) pregnant teens or teen mothers; and (v) young people with problematic drug use.

The program was started in 2011 based on the government of Rio de Janeiro's interest in strengthening the pacification strategy led by the UPPs, which seeks to restore the rule of law,

---

<sup>16</sup> UPPs are a special contingent of military police installed in communities in the urban areas of the State of Rio de Janeiro. In the past, these areas were overrun by drug trafficking, but today they have been reclaimed and are undergoing process of reorganization. The UPPs have been defined as a community police force, highlighting the territorial nature of their actions through the generation of collaborative links with the communities they serve. Their main objective is to reclaim and maintain control over areas formerly under the rule of drug traffickers.

deactivate drug trafficking networks and organized crime, and reduce violence in the favelas. After installation of the UPP contingent in these areas, the government proposed the improvement and expansion of a set of social services as a first step. The reason is that, up until this point, not only was the government's presence in those areas virtually nonexistent from a public safety perspective, but it was also very limited in terms of the delivery of social services, even in such critical areas as health and education. Although there was great variability among territories, the population's link to these services ultimately depended on the ease of travel (i.e., access to public transportation and level of safety) and proximity to services in other parts of the city. Various assessments that were conducted showed a very low youth participation rate in existing services, including processes that are considered a priority for this stage of development. One telling statistic is that just one in two 19-year-olds had completed secondary school. This, coupled with high exposure to violence and a propensity for involvement in illicit activities, contributed significantly to segregation and exclusion of a significant segment of the youth population in these localities.

Along with the government regaining control of these areas and the expansion of the supply of services, it proved necessary to have strategies to strengthen the skills of particularly vulnerable young people to enable them to have effective access to these services and, in this way, generate alternatives for inclusion. At this point, it was easy to see that the mere expansion of services was not sufficient to ensure the effective transition of adolescents and youth through new opportunity structures. In fact, it was necessary to simultaneously develop a related project that focused on juvenile attitudes, values, character and practices. For this reason, the program created an intervention strategy based on support, with the aim of spurring demand and generating those social skills required for the cessation of risky behaviors and practices that generate exclusion, such as drug micro-trafficking or the use of violence.

However, the dimensions of supply and demand do not act separately. On the contrary, the program's strategy is to achieve coordination between the demands of young people and the supply of services. As for the latter, the program works to expand the number of slots, redesign models of care, and adapt or create programs in the areas of health, education and social assistance.

This strategy of expansion and improvement of supply is the essential counterpart of the psychosocial support provided by counselors and mentors, who are part of the Comprehensive Care System that the program implemented in communities. While the program neither replaces nor creates a supply parallel to that offered by the regular care system, it does seek to make agreements to provide its young people with preferential access to other services. In addition, it allocates resources to finance the supply of services it considers essential to support the inclusion trajectories of young people. For example, CMJ funds the provision of slots in accelerated education programs for those young people who have dropped out of school and are unable to return to the formal education system. In those areas where there is no local supply, the program also signs contracts to offer training courses on adolescent health, languages, and information and communication technologies, among others.

Each Territorial Management Unit (UGT) has access to an assessment of all public, private and non-governmental institutions in its territory. Based on these assessments and the demands made by young people, each UGT must identify possible supply gaps or quality problems. The CMJ then has an obligation to make institutional agreements with other state and municipal departments and to finance the creation of new slots for young people in their communities. Since it has proven quite complex for the program to establish agreements to improve and expand the supply through other state and municipal entities, it has chosen to deepen the search for alliances with third-sector organizations and other community-based entities present in the territories.

On the demand side, this coordination is performed through counseling and mentoring, based on a direct care tool that represents a long-term support alternative for each young person. For this, the program has trained teams specialized in the highly-individualized care and support of youth. Currently, these teams of professionals are working in 14 UGTs—located in some of the areas where UPPs are present—and have their own physical spaces that act as points of care, although these services can be offered at any of the places in the community where young people live and work on a daily basis. In fact, an essential feature of this model is taking interactions out of program offices and into the community, which is key to strengthening the bonds between counselors/mentors and youth. The main role of these teams is to seek out young people, establish a bond of trust, identify vulnerabilities and interests, jointly establish an action plan, facilitate contact with service offerings, and support the young person's trajectory through these processes, acting as a long-term support. Incidentally, this support is not limited to linking youth with services; instead, their support has a strong psychosocial emphasis.

Since the program attempts to prioritize beneficiaries characterized by their poor linkage to public services, who live or have lived in high-risk situations, it is essential to have strategies that actively identify youth. In each community, the UGTs must continually work to disseminate information about the program and to attract potential beneficiaries. For the same reason, they must periodically review the records of government programs present in the same areas and identify eligible youth who can be prioritized according to the selection criteria defined by the program. To that end, each UGT has a group of coordinators who are a part of the community, know the details of the territory, and have a robust network of contacts and referrals.

Every young person who enters the program goes through a process of initial interviews that aims to determine their vulnerability. During this interview, a Youth Profile Form is completed to initially establish an outline of the young person's interests and to identify vulnerabilities or risk behaviors. Based on this initial contact, a counselor specifically assigned to this task, together with the UGT team, determines whether the young person will be directed toward a process of counseling or mentoring. While counseling is the gateway to the program for all young people and is characterized by a form of prolonged contact that is spaced out over time, mentoring involves more intensive support. In fact, it is the most specialized resource included in this model of care and is reserved for those cases where closer monitoring is needed to encourage and support behavior change. Assigning young people to either form of care, which must be followed to achieve effective results in terms of inclusion, is not random, as it makes use of a diagnostic tool that allows staff to assess whether counseling or mentoring is the most appropriate resource for each case, based on both observed risks and the complexity of the youth's trajectory. Counseling consists of periodic individual meetings during which a closer look is taken at the map of interests and an action plan with objectives is formulated according to those priorities. Subsequently, the counselor manages the search for alternatives that fulfill that plan, and he or she supports the development of the young person in that process, providing the necessary guidance in each case. Mentoring, in contrast, is intended for those young people who need to make important changes related mainly to non-cognitive aspects, such as motivations, attitudes, behaviors, and commitments, which require deeper psychosocial support for a longer period of time. Young people who meet any of the conditions of vulnerability prioritized by the preferential care profile defined by the program are automatically steered toward the mentoring service.

A distinctive feature of this model is that the frequency of contact with young people is set by each professional depending on the complexity of the processes to be faced. Thus, the assumption is that the greater the risks, the more closely the young person should be supported. On average, young people who receive support are expected to participate in the program for at least one year, and one-on-one meetings of young people with their counselor or mentor must be conducted every two weeks, although this criterion is flexible, depending on each individual's support needs.

Currently, about 1,700 young people are served monthly through counseling or mentoring in the areas targeted by the program. In 2016, the CMJ expanded into new territories, and the goal is to double the number of monthly visits. It is worth considering these data as a baseline rather than an indicator of the effort toward greater coverage that the program is called to make in relation to the magnitude of its potential demand; instead, this coverage corresponds to the cohorts of young people who entered in the early stages of the program. Although the program's design has been in place since 2011, the complexity of the conditions necessary for its implementation have kept CMJ from expanding its coverage at a faster rate, thereby postponing its expansion phase and operation scheme until 2014 and beyond. By expanding its service capacity, the program aims to individually serve 10,000 young people over the next two years. This does not mean that that exact number of beneficiaries will receive mentoring. As has been pointed out, under this comprehensive care model, counseling captures the greatest share of coverage, while mentoring is reserved for cases requiring greater support.

Although the number of young people actually served by any of the modalities of the Comprehensive Care System is still quite small, the mere implementation of these tools in these areas represents an important milestone in the process of pacification and recovery of citizenship. This is an unprecedented initiative, since the CMJ intervention model, more so than infrastructure, has the calling to become an alternative response for adolescents and young people in need of professional counseling and psychosocial support, as well as concrete opportunities to study, train, work and care for their sexual and reproductive health in contexts of greater security and skills promotion. This tool acts as an efficient intermediary of supply and demand, not only because it manages resources in the territory and seeks their mobilization for achieving development goals and the inclusion of young people, but because it intervenes on the proximate determinants of risk and juvenile vulnerability.

This is a challenge of major proportions if one considers that many of these young people—socialized amidst the violence that is typical of drug trafficking and organized crime—have the leaders and community role models with whom they were linked in the past. Instilling in them the desire to change aspects of their behavior and to resume the path toward positive social inclusion—particularly by way of education, training and work—is not an automatic process; on the contrary, it requires positive models that are able to compete and detract from other (less positive) participatory mechanisms. Hence the importance of mentoring as a highly promising resource for the promotion of prosocial values, the activation of resilience, and the instilling of a sense of purpose more focused on the functional link with the world of education, training and work.

Moreover, the program's ability to identify the most vulnerable cases is mentioned as an important achievement of this initial phase, and without an active search strategy, many of these beneficiaries would have never accessed formal services on their own. In those territories where a solid team of professionals has been assembled, they have identified and registered young former drug traffickers, young people who are disengaged from school and work, youth in compliance with social-educational measures, and youth who are mothers or fathers, many of whom were unknown to the system. Without this action, these young people would have remained outside the system. As a highly vulnerable, hard-to-reach group, strategies for active search and initial contact in many cases are insufficient, which is why the CMJ is continually exploring other ways of approaching young people considered priorities by the system.

Despite these difficulties, the majority of youth who have been effectively captured and incorporated into the program have shown a high degree of commitment to fulfilling the agreed upon goals and activities in their action plans. More importantly, those who have been referred by the psychosocial care component of mentoring and guidance of counseling have shown not only to be effective in terms of access but also continued use of other services, which could be

attributable both to their quality and the effect produced by the support. All that remains is to quantify these achievements and perform experimental evaluations to isolate the effect of mentoring on this process, as well as on the final results of the program, all of which are related to inclusion.

*Mentoring as a skill activation strategy in youth in especially difficult circumstances: the case of the Abriendo Caminos Program*

In Chile, a country with almost 18 million people, there are just over 136,000 persons connected to the prison system, including 42,000 individuals serving time in a closed environment (incarceration) and those in a semi-open or open system (probation, work release program, nighttime confinement, or some other alternative). Then, there are individuals in the post-release system—that is, those in the process of a criminal record review to establish credit for time served—who are seeking to have their record expunged, or those who have received a pardon or commutation of their sentence and are served by a support center for social Integration or similar entity.

Arrest or imprisonment involves the forced separation of a household, affecting both the detainee and his or her immediate family. If the individual is an adult responsible for the guardianship, care and upbringing of minor dependents, the impact on them is considerable. It is important to consider that Chile is among the three countries in Latin America with the most prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants, and the figures from the last decade show a sustained upward trend.

The Chilean model of social protection is strongly rooted in the benefits of social security, rights granted to workers through a formal employment contract, which includes unemployment insurance, universal primary and secondary education, and universal health insurance benefits. For the 60% most vulnerable households, according to their mechanism of social stratification, there are subsidies conditioned on the fulfillment of certain requirements, while the pension system provides coverage to people who failed to accumulate resources through individual capitalization during their active working years. Differentiated actions specifically aimed at the care of vulnerable households—either because they are under the poverty line or because they are carriers of a condition that makes them more susceptible to risks—are organized in the Security and Opportunities System (formerly known as *Chile Solidario*), maintaining the previous program's organizational structure and logic of social benefits and main support programs. This system includes four programs that are designed to work with households and individuals given priority care status. They aim to facilitate the provision of services and benefits to those with guaranteed or preferred access, under a support scheme carried out by individual psychosocial support professionals or teams. One of them is the *Abriendo Caminos* Program, aimed at those under 18 years of age from households with adult detainees.

The program falls under the Ministry of Social Development and is currently present in 14 regions of the country, albeit with very different levels of coverage. The service offered is implemented by public or private entities, which sign funds transfer agreements with the Ministry, with the obligation to meet certain coverage levels over a period of time, forming intervention teams that fulfill all pre-established functions in the general program design.<sup>17</sup>

*Abriendo Caminos* has existed since 2008 and was created to provide protection for children and adolescents affected by the imprisonment of relatives or caregivers. In theory, if those homes are vulnerable according to the Household Social Register, they could enter the social protection system via the Social Investment Fund's (formerly Bridge Program) psychosocial support program for households. However, the characteristics of these households and the dynamics generated by imprisonment mean that the support strategy based on a single home visit by a family support

---

<sup>17</sup> During 2014, the program served 7,633 people, including children, adolescents, young adults, caregivers and other family members; a budget of more than four billion pesos, equivalent to just over six million dollars, was mobilized. This budget includes beneficiaries who enter the program during the year and the second year of support for the cohort of beneficiaries who entered the program the previous year. Source: Ministry of Social Development (2015). Social Program Monitoring Report, ending December 31, 2014. Integrated Bank of Social Programs.

worker<sup>18</sup> is insufficient. For this reason, it was considered that families in crisis, susceptible to rapid deterioration of their conditions of safety—particularly if the detainee fulfills the role of provider within the family economy, or is a parent or direct caregiver for children and adolescents in their care—require an alternative, more intensive model with differentiated resources to support the family and children. In light of this, it was decided to maintain the general methodological principles of the model applied by the network of psychosocial support programs offered by *Chile Solidario* (personalized support, home visits, intervention plan based on goals for improving specific welfare conditions, guaranteed direct cash transfers, preferred access to other social programs), while generating a specific model of support for these families.

Adaptation of this model involved the differentiation of the family support worker's functions and his or her organization in an intervention team. This team is composed of a counselor who is responsible for the relationship with the family, especially ensuring the materiality and security of children ages 0 to 6; mentors; and professionals who work exclusively with child and adolescent family members ages 7 to 18.<sup>19</sup> In addition, specialized professionals participate who provide complementary services and who intervene in specific issues, especially legal advice and counseling. Counselors are tasked with directly linking with the adult responsible for the children, administering the case file within the system, and updating the family's and individual members' information. He or she holds weekly or biweekly meetings with families if they are at a more advanced stage of the intervention. The counselor also organizes and monitors the mentor(s) who work with the children of that family, as well as other child-focused interventions mobilized by the program, especially those directly provided by the team itself. It is worth mentioning that since its inception, the program's design contemplated the existence of specialized professionals on implementation teams that could complement the work of counselors and mentors with specific interventions, primarily, psychological care, welfare counseling by social workers, stimulation of cognitive development and leveling of learning abilities by educational psychologists, and legal assistance provided by legal assistants or lawyers.

The program's theory of change identifies the main problem as the impact of the detention of adults on the lives of both their younger and older children. Based on the indications of some evidence and advances made in developmental psychology, it is assumed that an effective method for preventing children from getting involved in practices that put their well-being at risk is the implementation of an *early support system*, especially through the figure of a mentor capable of triggering a process that can contribute to their resilience. Thus, mentors would be responsible for generating social skills and competencies so that children can properly engage with themselves, their families and their environment. This system would be complemented with work aimed at the family in order to enhance their protective skills. In this case, family counselors would intervene in parenting skills for greater protection and a better upbringing for children and youth.

Accordingly, the strategy adopted by the program is a specialized multidisciplinary service to meet the security needs of the family that have an impact on the children, and to address their personal and proximate determinants of vulnerability through psychosocial support aimed specifically at

---

<sup>18</sup> Family support worker is the generic name given to the worker from the psychosocial support program responsible for managing the process in the family support model. In this scheme, each family is served by a professional who is responsible for facilitating the development of an intervention plan, managing solutions, and bringing the resources of the institutional support network within reach to achieve an improved standard of living for the family group at the end of two years of work. The process is organized around visits where working sessions are conducted with families. The family support worker acts as a counselor and has the dual role of providing psychosocial support and performing social case management (in a role similar to that of a social services case manager in the United States, which has a long history in the development of these types of services).

<sup>19</sup> For children that the program serves through family counselors, the emphasis is on support for parenting skills of the adults in charge to ensure acceptable standards of care and upbringing as well as verification of nutrition and health status and participation in early childhood education. For children of these ages, although the focus remains on working with families to ensure the safeguarding of the welfare and safety conditions essential for children, the introduction of a mentoring component places a spotlight on education, guidelines for family living, and the development of life skills.

them. This intervention is performed as a complement to the basic platform of services and benefits that the protection system grants to all prioritized vulnerable families.<sup>20</sup> The immediate outcome sought by the program is the basic material security of children and youth and the creation of conditions to avoid further risks of loss of welfare. In adults, the expectation is that their capacities and competencies of care will be strengthened. In young children, the expectation is that the minimum welfare conditions in terms of health, nutrition and stimulation will be guaranteed. In adolescents, the expectation is that self-esteem, self-confidence and positive social values will be strengthened. Lastly, in young people, the expectation is to prevent or substitute risky behaviors.<sup>21</sup>

The role of mentoring in this scheme is unprecedented—and likely unique up until now—within the social protection system and its programs that support the inclusion of vulnerable populations because it is an intervention specifically aimed at adolescents and young adults. The program has established the mentor profile as a professional in the area of social sciences or education, preferably a teacher, psychologist or social worker, with at least two years of professional experience working directly with vulnerable children and/or youth.<sup>22</sup> The mentoring that the program provides corresponds to the typical model of support from an unrelated adult, a one-on-one relationship with the young person in order to develop a conversation that helps the mentor recognize the young person's needs and resources and enhance the development of skills and abilities. The program's general methodological definition suggests twice-monthly meetings in the first stage of the intervention and twice-monthly meetings in the monitoring stage, but it makes it clear that this schedule depends on the needs and characteristics of the adolescent.

With regard to results, the program has undergone qualitative assessments whose purpose is to check the internal consistency of the proposal and the validity of its strategy in terms of providing multiple professional supports to the same family within a defined timeframe. This would be to counter vulnerabilities and ensure basic conditions of security and protection for the children and young people from families with adult detainees. Evaluative approaches confirm that the design used does indeed consider the multidimensionality of the problem and the various stakeholders involved, and it correctly adopts the competencies approach, in terms of parenting (care and upbringing) and youth (fostering the development of non-cognitive skills and functional skills essential for processes of inclusion). Also, it is noted that this tool that integrates multiple resources does have the ability to address highly complex cases.<sup>23</sup>

Similarly, there is a critical judgement to be made about program duration, since the average length of 24 months of family involvement in the process seems inadequate. First, intervening in proximate determinants of risk in highly vulnerable psychosocial contexts may require more time to make significant changes, and they can be sustained beyond the intervention. Second, the evaluable achievements in that period may be limited, given that the most important ones may occur in a more extended time threshold, outside the sphere of influence of the program.

---

<sup>20</sup> Today, *Abriendo Caminos* works in coordination with two other interventions that, as a whole, represent a comprehensive response from the social protection system to households with adult detainees and dependents. *Abriendo Caminos* is the core program responsible for making initial contact, including an assessment visit and determination of eligibility for families that have been pre-selected and recommended for the program. There is also a social and occupational support program, which specifically deals with working-age individuals from these families to help them improve their employability and find better employment options.

<sup>21</sup> Although some of the program's statements indicate that the detainee also participates in the program as the significant adult or role model for the children and adolescents being served, neither the scope of the work performed with the detainee nor the specific results to be achieved in terms of the parenting or caregiver role is clear.

<sup>22</sup>Ministry of Social Development. Vice Ministry of Social Services. Implementation Guidelines, Intervention Methodologies, and Procedures for Overall Management of the Intervention Model for Underage Users whose Significant Adult Is Detained. Exempt Resolution 0561. 2014.

<sup>23</sup> Monreal, V., Fernández, I., & Tapia, L. (2011). Evaluación Programa Abriendo Caminos del Ministerio de Planificación. Informe final del Panel de Expertos. Dirección de Presupuestos. Ministerio de Hacienda. Santiago de Chile.

Regarding coverage, although the evaluation of the pilot program conducted in 2008, in two regions with four executing agencies, highlighted its management capacity as a strength of the program—which could have allowed for a near doubling of the target population each year, with a larger budget, well managed,<sup>24</sup> and with greater territorial coverage—it is possible that this trend can be attributed to the implementation itself. A strategy of this nature faces significant constraints to growth if it is to achieve greater scale, given the complexity of the psychosocial support actions carried out by the program and the resulting need for specialized agencies to provide services. Undoubtedly, this represents one of the program’s main challenges: given that the program serves as a specialized emotional support tool for children and youth in this situation and that the country has a very high incarceration rate, it is necessary to strengthen this alternative response and more directly connect it to the prison system so that both act as a rapid response mechanism for child protection.

Past program performance evaluations have raised important questions regarding this tool’s links with stakeholders and institutions, which could be quite relevant to the achievement of final results. First, the issue of the relationship between the intervention model and the detainee was brought to light. Although the program’s technical guidelines have indicated that this relationship is important to the extent that it is possible to strengthen the parent’s skills without violating children’s physical integrity and safety, there is no clear strategy to be used or line that the counselor must be wary of crossing.<sup>25</sup> This is relatively easy to determine when it comes to people serving alternative sentences outside of prison and, therefore, are or may come in contact with children. However, working with people serving sentences in a correctional facility presents several challenges: the severity of the offense and how this affects the relationship with the family; the limitations of the prison system, which restricts external interventions; and poor coordination and synchronization with the pace of the social protection system. The prison system applies various rules that severely restrict the possibility of personalized, ongoing parenting work with detainees.

Alternatively, evaluations have highlighted the program’s ability to contribute to the progressive autonomy of families in their tasks of protection and childrearing and of adolescents in the mentoring process, both processes tied to a system of institutional support that facilitates them with the mobilization of a range of resources and opportunities. The methodology appears to be effective in its role of mediation. However, the question arises about the consistency that can be achieved between the performance of this tool and other public services, which are not always prepared to respond with the same level of customization to the needs and problems of its users. That interagency coordination, in terms of achieving greater synchrony and harmony between providers, is also strongly considered to be an aspect difficult to improve.

Lastly, previous program evaluations show the apparent rigidity of the program’s operating model—whose standards focus too much on administrative aspects and financial management—to be a weakness that could hinder teams’ community action, reducing the flexibility they need to respond to the diversity of situations that demand a much greater dynamism of these tools.

---

<sup>24</sup> The same evaluation conducted by the Budget Office found that the program was effective in terms of average expenditure per beneficiary. In addition to national programs with a similar target audience, it was compared to well-known mentoring program Big Brothers Big Sisters, whose approximate cost was identified at the time as US\$1,200 a year versus the cost of *Abriendo Caminos* at US\$1,156 per child.

<sup>25</sup> Martínez, V., et al. (2012). Evaluación analítica a la implementación de la fase piloto del Programa “Abriendo Caminos.” Informe final. Ministry of Social Development. Santiago, Chile.

## ***Mentoring to reverse functional disengagement and youth inactivity: the case of the Jóvenes en Red Program***

*Jóvenes en Red* (JER) is an interagency program managed by Uruguay's Ministry of Social Development (MIDES) aimed at achieving functional re-enrollment of adolescents and youth between the ages of 14 and 24 who do not study, have not completed the basic cycle, are not engaged in formal employment, and belong to poor households. The focus of action revolves around JER youth disengagement from the education system and labor market.

The program has been in place since 2012 and forms part of Uruguay's Social Protection Matrix, which seeks to guarantee the social rights of citizens and the overcoming of poverty and social exclusion, from the coordinated implementation of universal and targeted policies, which are reflected in services and programs offered under different forms of care. JER's proposal of recognizing that access and retention in the education system and the labor market are key areas for the realization of social rights and effective access to networking opportunities.

The problems addressed by JER—more specifically those that stem from dropping out of school and those associated with informal employment—are longstanding issues in Uruguay, problems whose solutions are admittedly complex, depending on multiple determinants that affect an individual's ability to study and work, especially in contexts of greater vulnerability. Studies in 2011 revealed the existence of a large number of young people in the age range of 14 to 24 in this condition; 122,823 people were neither studying nor working, a figure representing approximately 16% of young people in that age group. While analyses demonstrated different situations within the group, about 41,800 of these young people were not studying, working, or looking after household chores, corroborating a significant rate of inactivity. Alternatively, it was also identified that, in relative terms, the highest proportion of young people in this situation lived in small towns outside the capital (23%), as compared with 14% in Montevideo. The data also indicated a high percentage of young women who did not study, work, or take responsibility for household chores. It was also telling that 47% of these young people are members of households in the first income quintile, and the vast majority had not enrolled in secondary school. Lastly, 40% of young people who have had some work experience at some point in their lives lacked contributions to social security.

In response to this situation, the government of Uruguay created the JER program with the aim of promoting the exercise of the rights of adolescents and young adults disengaged from the education system and the formal employment market, through a comprehensive approach to adolescence and young adulthood from a territorial, decentralized, local setting. JER's approach seeks to build alternatives for and with young people, prioritizing community-based actions aimed at the appreciation of local identities, spaces, and stakeholders and the strengthening of social, formal, and informal networks.

JER forms part of a set of social programs that has emerged in recent years in Uruguay, with a common approach and methodological principles of intervention framed within community-based, one-on-one work with their beneficiaries. In addition to an interagency structure for management and access to benefits, care and services, these programs have a team of professionals in the field, who are in charge of individual, personalized support. First, they are available to help bring about behavioral changes in individuals and/or families, in accordance with the problems identified and the objectives and achievements defined by the program and agreed upon with the beneficiary. Second, they work proactively in the coordination of policies and services that allow for more effective access to the social safety net, with priority given to the benefits to which individuals are entitled, according to their conditions. In this vision, JER, the CERCANÍAS program, and *Uruguay Crece Contigo* (UCC) form a triad of innovative, prioritized government

programs that share similar strategies, focusing on proximity to their beneficiaries to reach vulnerable and/or at-risk populations.<sup>26</sup>

In terms of results, the program puts forth five specific objectives: the improvement of personal conditions for access to and integration with the basic social assistance network; the strengthening and promotion of personal and social conditions for the development of personal projects; the development of opportunities and skills for social integration and participation with autonomy; the incorporation of knowledge and basic social skills to develop educational pathways; and the joint development of personal projects focused on employment, as well as developing strategies to accomplish them. To address these objectives, the program provides for the delivery of a number of services and the performance of activities that constitute a menu of options, which varies depending on the case and the territory.

The community-based program<sup>27</sup> seeks to coordinate three different components (social, educational and labor), and its services are adapted to match the needs and characteristics of local demands. The intervention methodology is based on working in close proximity to the young person to provide support for a period of 6 to 24 months, depending on his or her demands and personal characteristics. To support the reintegration processes and achieve social inclusion, the program works with a combination of elements that translate into three pillars: (i) the individual and personalized support for building a plan that can be sustained over time, with support from the social educators who perform mentoring activities; (ii) participation of youth in collective spaces for development of functional skills and social-emotional abilities; and (iii) a cash grant to cover the basic costs generated by the participation of young people in the process.

The program's social component<sup>28</sup> is translated into a set of actions that are aimed, first, at guaranteeing the right to basic care (health care, access to basic services, and cash transfers) and, second, at guaranteeing *social circulation*, consisting of specific financial support for transportation to and participation in tourism programs, cultural visits, and cultural and sporting/recreation venues.

The educational component is translated into actions that favor educational insertion and others that involve actual educational insertion. With regard to the former, technical teams implement activities to generate linkages between participants and the formal education system. The latter is based on direct actions carried out by the staff at formal and non-formal educational facilities in intervention areas.

Lastly, the labor component includes actions for labor market insertion, by way of job training or intermediation and job placement support. In the first case, the territory's technical teams, together with JER recruiters, provide training to help individuals develop useful skills for insertion into the labor market. Similarly, individuals engage in work experiences consisting of collective labor activities performed in the community or at companies.

This scheme particularly highlights the role of mentoring. Community area teams are composed of three members: two social educators/operators and a team coordinator. These professionals are mostly social workers, psychologists, teachers, professors, and others linked to the social

---

<sup>26</sup> The support goal is different for each one depending on the population being served. While CERCANÍAS aims to generate skills in families so they can have better conditions to overcome poverty, *Uruguay Crece Contigo* focuses its intervention on pregnant women and children up to age 4, using the strategy of proximity to support the life cycle and child development trajectories. JER, meanwhile, uses proximity to support behavioral change and to create conditions to strengthen the social-educational and career paths of young people.

<sup>27</sup> The teams initially have a georeferenced list of households with potential program participants, supplied by the National Assessment and Monitoring (DINEM) of the Ministry of Social Development, which is supplemented with a list of institutional contacts and other references in the area of action. The social workers are assigned to pre-defined geographical areas based on the identification of territories with greater numbers young people with high socioeconomic vulnerability.

<sup>28</sup> The program also addresses cross-cutting issues such as domestic violence or drug use practices, and for this social-educational teams in the territories have the support of a specialized professional training in the field of social psychology.

sciences and education. Each area team is responsible for monitoring 60 young people, 20 per team member, who spend 30 hours a week on this task, maintaining an average number of weekly meetings. Professionals working in the program are identified through a competitive selection process that includes an analysis of the formal skills presented on candidates' resumes and an in-depth verification of the skills and experiences that qualify them to work with vulnerable adolescents and youth, a process carried out through interviews. In addition to educators who work directly with young people, there is a territorial consultant and a specialized technician for each of the program's main dimensions, who are responsible for supporting and providing guidance to the team.<sup>29</sup>

The work process used by the JER intervention model is based on the youth-mentor/educator relationship, a bond that is considered essential to the promotion of the school re-entry process, leveling of basic social and occupational skills, training, and even insertion in the labor market. Mentoring is organized into four distinct stages: recruitment, education agreement, implementation of the education agreement, and exit. Recruitment uses information from various sources to establish the initial contact, but the most important aspect of this stage involves teams going out to meet with youth who fit the profile for program participation. Once familiarized with the existing offer and work methodology, young people officially join the program and consent to participate by signing an education agreement, in which they commit to developing an educational or work reintegration project. At this stage, a detailed assessment of the participant's full profile is completed (only those who have signed the education agreement). Next, the work proposals are carried out with the young people, designed on the basis of the young person's expectations and interests and an analysis of the supply available in the area.

The education agreement is carried out with one-on-one support for each young person, through weekly meetings that attempt to create the conditions necessary to overcome the obstacles to labor market integration or school re-entry. Once the young person is involved in an educational course, whether formal or informal, monitoring of the process is carried out to analyze compliance with the agreement, which involves multiple individuals, including teachers and school officials. The fundamental role of the mentor is to strengthen the young person's educational and career paths; to fulfill this role, it is important for the mentor to be aware of the background and conditions of each young person when assessing his or her chances for higher education. In terms of labor opportunities, the focus is on producing conditions that allow participants who aspire to enter the labor market to have the basic competencies and skills necessary and also to acquire his or her first work experience. The program also provides a scholarship conditioned upon the young person's fulfillment of the education agreement. Participants move into the exit stage when operators consider that the young people have fulfilled their agreements and when they foresee favorable conditions for the sustainability of the processes initiated. Program participation lasts between 6 and 18 months and can be extended to 24 months at the mentor's request.

The intervention tool used by educators responsible for mentoring is conversation, while the education agreement provides a framework for the support. Far from being just a tool for activity planning with the young person and the networks that the program mobilizes to achieve its goals, it is an educational resource that allows young people to recognize their own resources, evaluate their options, and set goals that they probably would not have tackled without this motivational trigger.

---

<sup>29</sup> Among the tasks performed by teams include the construction of a georeferenced local map that locates the target population and existing services; the recruitment and enrollment of youth in the program; monitoring compliance objectives and goals of the program in their area; defining and monitoring the work of young people and their families at various stages of the process; and planning activities undertaken in accordance with the required results. The area coordinator, besides working with 20 young people, tracks the total number of team participants and perform other administrative activities. The coordination of existing programs and public services in the territory to meet the needs of young people is a task performed by all team members.

The JER program has been in place since 2012, with a progressive increase in its coverage. Between 2012 and 2015, JER worked with 5,450 youth. The program is being carried out in nine of the country's departments, in communities or areas with high levels of socioeconomic vulnerability, specifically in the departments bordering Brazil and in the metropolitan area of Montevideo.

Since its inception, it has kept records in its monitoring system and qualitative assessments that show some achievements related to processes and products. In this regard, the following are worth highlighting: (i) the adequate targeting of JER, given that 49% of those enrolled had not yet started secondary school and another 45% have not managed to complete their basic (lower) secondary education; (ii) the use of recruitment strategies by territorial teams that allow them to move beyond initial records to identify and connect with youth who had not been detected by other institutional channels; (iii) the effective improvement of guidelines for living and socialization of young people with their peers and family members, cited by operators, family and neighbors; (iv) the effectiveness of the strategy used by teams for the involvement of families and the community in the process of working with youth; and (v) the exit of a significant proportion of youth (about 30%) who managed to continuously uphold their agreements and commitments over the course of 18 months.<sup>30</sup>

Some of these qualitative results are consistent with the preliminary results recently shown by the program's first impact assessment,<sup>31</sup> of which it is worth mentioning the following: (i) positive effects on young people's perception of their living conditions and their capabilities; (ii) positive effects on the establishment of close relationships, especially with children (in women under age 19), reflected in increased school enrollment of children and regular school attendance; and (iii) greater access to and knowledge of the network of social services and programs in their neighborhoods to which they are entitled, as well as improvements in their level of participation in the community. It is also important to mention that, in terms of the core of educational inclusion, the effects found were practically nil for formal education, with better results in the processes related to education and non-formal learning (e.g., short courses and "bridge" processes that support the transition to school, such as attending community classrooms). A substantial increase in enrollment among adolescents is seen beginning in 2013, but doubts persist as to whether these results should be attributed to the program. With regard to labor, the evaluation managed to capture a positive effect on the formalization of workers, who then went on to contribute to social security. A greater connection with entities involved in job intermediation and preparation has also been found, mostly among adolescents ages 14 to 18. Options for the upper age range (ages 19 to 24) remain a challenge when thinking about viable alternatives for this group.

These results establish a number of challenges that need to be addressed to improve both the program's performance as well as the mechanisms to record and verify results at the level of their impacts. Although the program has been incorporating lessons learned throughout its implementation, some challenges remain relevant and likely have implications in terms of results. With regard to supply, in spite of the fact that the program's central coordination relies on an important group of institutions—giving its management model interinstitutional attributes and denoting that it seeks to offer a wide range of activities—in terms of slots available for young people to access services and programs, resources are insufficient. This means that, in practice, the lack of resources ends up limiting the educational and employment opportunities for young people to the supply that is actually available. Additionally, it has been found that the effectiveness of management agreements is rather contingent upon the conditions and capabilities of each

---

<sup>30</sup> The data mentioned here refer to the 2013 youth cohort from an analyzed universe of 2,394 young people mentioned in the JER qualitative assessment report, prepared by the National Office for Monitoring and Evaluation (DINEM) of MIDES.

<sup>31</sup> Selected information from the *Jóvenes en Red* Impact Assessment Report. Universidad de la República, 2015. Unpublished at the time of this writing.

team in the areas of implementation, which introduces a factor of significant variability in terms of the performance and results achieved by local implementation units. The question that this raises is, how much could the work of teams be standardized to generate greater uniformity in the intervention model, with clearer standards that allow for the comparison of performance and a more precise reading of the program's success factors? While each area has particularities that undoubtedly shape the format of the processes, it must be considered that the discretion of operators in the territory can generate certain biases—for example, toward work with more or less vulnerable youth.

Dissimilarities between areas and departments also add challenges to the program, in terms of having adequate and effective designs to respond to different situations. Given its national nature, the consideration of rurality is important when adapting the program's design to those areas. The adjustment needs already made explicit by teams include issues related to available resources, the duration of processes, demands on network management, and the outlook with regard to fulfilling goals, among others. Thus, for example, in areas where there are strong community ties and even stronger participatory pathways, some problems of this nature were quickly resolved, and the program has achieved better levels of acceptance and recognition.

The labor component has presented less convincing results as compared to others and were mostly linked to initiatives in favor of labor market insertion, which do not necessarily culminate in a specific employment outcome. Instead, they are limited to the development of actions that could contribute to that goal without guaranteeing it. Examples include a job interview preparation workshop, introduction to the use of the Internet and information and communication technologies, and job preparation courses offered by companies and private sector organizations. It is possible that much of the variability in these results is explained by the characteristics of certain territories—particularly those with economically depressed areas and decreased production—and insufficient educational capital, leading to a concentration of these youth whose level of education is inconsistent with the basic requirements of most available jobs. Considering the main objective proposed by the program, this is an extremely challenging issue in terms of design and coordination.

## Chapter 4

### ***Implementation of mentoring-based programs: lessons learned and challenges for LAC***

Mentoring constitutes an important strategy for working with young people, one that can substantively contribute to the prevention or substitution of risky behaviors. This is a promising tool, with some successful experiences in other regions and great potential in LAC, due to both the recent progress on social issues as well as the challenges that still lie ahead. The available evidence offers valuable lessons that should be taken into account by the agencies and entities responsible for funding and designing programs that use mentoring. While it is a type of intervention that is clearly attractive as a strategy to promote behavioral changes in young people, it is also highly demanding in terms of the conditions that must be safeguarded to ensure satisfactory final results. A summary of the most crucial aspects that must be considered when designing such interventions is presented below.

### ***Mentoring is recommended to prevent patterns of risky behavior in youth.***

One of the features that characterizes this type of intervention is its versatility, as it has been shown to work in different contexts, with different youth profiles, and in areas as diverse as the stimulation of prosocial behavior in high-risk contexts and the promotion of self-care in sexual and reproductive health. However, rather than concluding that this is a multipurpose strategy that is useful for achieving a number of goals, it should be thought of as a methodology that can function whenever the establishment of a support link is possible, in those conditions that are crucial to ensuring a high-quality relationship, namely, when (i) contact with young people can be made with acceptable frequency; (ii) there exists the possibility of having a substantive interaction in a safe, secure, and trusting environment; and (iii) contact can occur over an extended period of time.

Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that this type of intervention seems to work best with youth whose risk behavior is at a lower level—that is, those with a high probability of engaging in risky behavior but who have yet to do so—and those at an intermediate level, which is to say that they already behave in a risky way but the most negative results of that behavior are yet to be seen. Although there is no categorical evidence to discourage the application of this model in the most critical cases in which behaviors have generated consequences of greater severity, it seems that in such instances, the model must be adapted to the complexity of the situation and administered with greater intensity and in greater coordination with other specialized resources.

### ***Mentoring can drive social inclusion processes in combination with other resources.***

Many programs and social services concentrate their efforts on generating an accessible supply of services. Undoubtedly, this is a fundamental condition for populations to have the opportunity to utilize services that are essential to their welfare. However, it may not be enough, since the conditions for effective access and services may also be associated with other variables such as the firm belief that they are necessary, the social value attributed to them, the motivation to use them, and trust in the institutional stakeholders responsible for providing them. This is especially clear in the case of youth. The probability of returning to school after they have dropped out, of asking for birth control at a health clinic, of stopping drug use once there is a certain level of habituation, or of initiating a formal training process to learn a trade when they have already worked in the informal sector may depend heavily on external motivators that can help them to recognize the importance of these processes and, above all, to support them.

For those young people who have faced situations that brought them to the breaking point, such as a teen pregnancy or the decision to drop out of school, for those who have suffered violence, and, in general, for those who have experienced exclusion, it is necessary to create demand by stimulating the desire to start new processes and the confidence that not doing so carries a high opportunity cost. Mentoring offers the possibility to act as a motivational trigger and to fulfill that role, not only at the beginning of the process, but throughout it, avoiding setbacks and dropouts and encouraging the strengthening of stages that would probably be much more difficult to achieve without mentoring support.

The aforementioned has a clear implication: mentoring should be systemically aligned with other services, in such a way that they are all consistent in their objectives as they work to fulfill their particular aims (e.g., mentoring helps generate a firm belief and interest in studying within the adolescent, and the school offers the young person a place to make that possible, strengthening in the mentee a sense of accomplishment that serves to catalyze other self-improvement processes). Thus, mentoring goals concerning access to and participation in services should have, by design, some degree of certainty with regard to how they can be satisfied with concrete service offerings. Rather than leaving this task in the hands of the mentor, interagency agreements should be generated to make this possible.

***Mentoring is effective but only under certain operating conditions.***

It appears that there is sufficient, high-quality evidence to recommend the strategy of mentoring for work with youth. As in all things, this should be done carefully, observing the standards that have been identified as factors with significant impact on final results. Due to the nature of this type of intervention, the role of mentor is a determining factor in the process, as is the willingness and interest of the mentee to stick with it. Consequently, the truly critical element of this model is the relationship established between these two and, therefore, the conditions in which that relationship is built and developed are determining factors.

From this perspective, programs have a responsibility to generate situations that enable mentoring to be carried out under the best possible conditions so as to ensure the stability of the relationship, the frequency of contact, access to the daily lives of young people, and the development of skills that are functional within the dynamics of mentoring, in addition to the requirements imposed on the mentors. This means that the mere existence of a mentor and the establishment of a relationship with a young person do not guarantee in any way acceptable results related to the substitution of risky practices and behavioral changes. On the contrary, this is only effective if there is, at the very least, the following:

- a mentor selection system based on the recognition of core competencies for a one-on-one approach of this type
- a design that allows frequent contact between mentors and youth for a period of no less than one year
- a skills training system to support the mentor throughout the process
- a set of accessible resources that respond to the needs of young people, enabling them to realize their aspirations and achievements, particularly if they have to do with continuity opportunities, school progression, training, job placement, and sexual and reproductive health care

***Mentoring-based care models should consider scale to protect the quality of the intervention.***

Since this type of strategy is characteristically based on a support relationship to achieve behavioral change goals, these are models that naturally operate at the micro-intervention level. This does not necessarily mean that programs that use this type of strategy cannot be applied to a larger number of beneficiaries. It does mean, however, that care must be taken with the detailedness of the different variables involved, owing to the programs' growth projections; otherwise, expansion could jeopardize the likelihood of compliance with the basic standards that have the greatest influence on the quality of the interventions.

In this sense, the equation between coverage and the number of mentors is critical; therefore, an increase in the latter must occur in proportion to the increase in the number of youth to be served. The obvious question at this point is, what is the recommended number of young people to be assigned to each mentor? It is not easy to answer because the evidence does not emphatically point to an algorithm and also because it will depend on the actual amount of time mentors have available to work with children. To meet the challenge of scalability, these programs must carefully maintain the basic operating conditions considered optimal for a smaller group of young people, thereby ensuring their ability to do the following:

- continuously train mentors, encouraging them to develop skills that are essential for good support
- have a supervision system that allows for each mentor to be closely supported, with a monitoring scheme that—along with verifying compliance with the program's methodological standards—will provide guidance and timely technical assistance
- generate interinstitutional arrangements to ensure that, in addition to increasing youth mentoring coverage, more slots are made available for those services with recurring demand that should be open to young people during the process

## Annex

### Recommendations for the design and implementation of mentoring-based programs

Domain	Component to consider	Relevance	Recommendation
Conditions of implementation	Selection of youth to receive mentoring	⊙⊙	<p>Target mentoring to vulnerable youth in disadvantaged and risky contexts, in areas where it is still possible to carry out a preventive intervention based on role modeling. Therefore, dismiss young adults with significant adult figures who already fulfill that role and who also pertain to contexts where the burden of risk is less than the assets and protective factors observed. Furthermore, dismiss young people who present significant levels of dysfunctional behavior or who may need specialized care.</p>
	Mentor profile	⊙	<p>Adopt a mechanism for the recruitment of mentors according to the suitability of their profile, based on the detection of non-cognitive skills. At the same time, it should be based on verification mechanisms for the timely detection and dismissal of applicants with a history of improper conduct that could endanger the safety of the relationship to be established with young people (typically a history of abuse, violence or mistreatment).</p> <p>In the case of professional mentoring, there is no evidence of disciplines that guarantee a priori a greater likelihood of success in mentors. The recruitment and selection system should protect the essential criteria of any human resource management system with the responsibility for dealing directly with others.</p>
	Initial training of mentors	⊙⊙	<p>Incorporate a training system into the program's design that ensures the essential mastery of basic functions and support routines that the mentor is called upon to fulfill in the context of that particular program. The initial training of mentors is relevant in terms of offering general performance guidelines that emphasize support and define the expected competencies of this role. However, it is imperative that this be a training system in which coaching is accompanied by supervision.</p>

Domain	Component to consider	Relevance	Recommendation
	Matching (mentor assignment and training of work pairings)	⊙	Implement a mentor assignment/matching mechanism that considers basic criteria such as gender or race, whenever it has been detected that the target population has preferences related to these variables. Similarly, create mentor and mentee profiles on the basis of other interests and preferences related to vocation, sports, use of technology, and hobbies. These variables must have just as much or more weight as the others when pairing a mentor with a young person.
Methodological standards	Support goals	⊙⊙⊙	Specific goals should be defined in the mentor performance protocol to account for the expected results of the process. These goals should be defined on two levels: program goals (i.e., expected results of the intervention, observable in the behavior of adolescents and young people under that model) and individual goals (consistent with the aforementioned goals, referring specifically to the work plan in each case). While it is not anticipated that these definitions will reduce the necessary flexibility with which the program must operate throughout the support, they are expected to be focused on specific issues clear to both the mentors and the young people.
	Definition of temporary standards	⊙⊙⊙	<p>Set a minimum duration of participation for program beneficiaries. Independently of whether this can be flexibly managed to prolong the participation of young people who require further support, a general rule of participation should be established that states that young people will receive mentoring for at least 12 months.</p> <p>As for the frequency of contact between mentors and youth, the care protocol should explicitly state the recommended basic frequency. Although this can also be flexibly managed, depending on the circumstances and settings in which meetings occur, a minimum frequency of once a week is indicated.</p>

Domain	Component to consider	Relevance	Recommendation
	Structuring of support with specific activity guidelines	◎◎	<p>Include in the support program a guideline for the guided completion of some activities that may be relevant to the achievement of specific objectives. Although meetings between mentors and youth can occur in any setting where it is necessary and possible to do so—and the type of activities to be undertaken are determined through mutual agreement—the program may consider a specific list of activities that has to be performed with all young people. These guidelines should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— recreational activities for the shared satisfaction of young people and their mentor.</li> <li>— group activities to be performed with several young people who are involved in similar processes</li> <li>— Specific sessions to address certain issues such as information on sexual protection and prevention, vocational guidance, and information on available resources and opportunities to realize personal aspirations or interests</li> </ul> <p>Avoid prescriptive guidance in mentoring as a way of bonding with young people; conversely, use a methodology that allows mentors to act as guides and facilitators.</p>
	Links with families or other adult role models who are important to the young person	◎◎	<p>Design a strategy for working with families or other significant adults figures for the young person, to get them involved in the process and create together with them a system of shared work, in which family and mentoring actions are consistent and complementary. Mentors should focus their time and dedication on the young people with whom they work. The relationship with families, meanwhile, must become an essential condition to make the desired changes possible and maintain them over time. The program must generate other mechanisms to approach the family when there are needs and problems that cannot and should not be addressed by mentors, such as delegating this work to other team members or connecting the family to other specialized services in the local network.</p>
Management systems	Systems support for the work of mentors	◎◎◎	<p>Make available a permanent assistance and supervision mechanism for mentors, which not only provides ongoing support for the work they do with their cases but also serves as a space for consultation, guidance and professional counseling. The program should encourage the practice of sharing experiences among mentors and arrange a support mechanism for them to serve as a source of consultation and reference.</p>

Domain	Component to consider	Relevance	Recommendation
	Relation to the provision of services	⊙⊙⊙	<p>Organically link the mentoring-based intervention to other services that are essential to realizing specific achievements, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— sexual and reproductive health counseling</li> <li>— psychological services</li> <li>— formal or informal educational opportunities</li> <li>— formation of non-cognitive skills</li> <li>— job training</li> </ul> <p>For its part, the higher the level of risk for youth—there is a greater concentration of vulnerabilities or their risk factors have more weight—the denser the network of resources that form part of the program's opportunity structure must be.</p>
	Monitoring system	⊙	<p>Generate a system that allows follow closely the work performed by mentors, verifying that basic standards are met periodicity and continuity. Simplify to the utmost the recordkeeping mechanism required of mentors, to enable them to devote most of their time working effectively with young people.</p> <p>Design observation and record guidelines that facilitate the formulation and monitoring of specific goals established in the work plan with each young person, as well as observe and monitor relevant aspects of behavior for which there are expectations as part of the work to be done in the process.</p>
⊙	The component is important but in accordance with certain considerations to make an effective contribution to the program's operation.		
⊙⊙	The component is fundamental because it determines how the mentoring process should be undertaken, and it has consequences on the methodology.		
⊙⊙⊙	The component is critical because it has a direct impact on final results.		

## References

- Arthur, M., Hawkins, J. D., Brown, E. C., Briney, J. S., & Oesterle, S. (2010). Implementation of the Communities That Care Prevention System by Coalitions in the Community Youth Development Study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, Mar; 38 (2):245-258.
- Bandiera, O., Buehren, N., Burgess, R., Goldstein, M., Gulesci, S., Rasul, I., & Sulaiman, M. (2013). Empowering adolescent girls: Evidence from a randomized control trial in Uganda. Gender Impact: The World Bank's Gender Impact Evaluation Database. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Blocher, K. (1993). *Factors in sustaining adult voluntary mentoring relationships with at-risk youth*. University of Kansas, United States.
- Bloom, D. (1993). AFDC: Welfare-to-work choices and challenges for states. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corp.
- Bowman, R., & Myrick, R. (1987). Effects of an elementary school peer facilitator program on children with behavior problems. *The School Counselor*, 369-377.
- Carrasco, P., Ceni, R., Perazzo, I., & Salas, G. (2015). Evaluación de impacto del programa Jóvenes en Red. *Informe Final*. Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Cheng, T., Haynie, D., Brenner, R., Wright, J. L., Chung, S., & Simons-Morton, B. (2008). Effectiveness of a mentor-implemented, violence prevention intervention for assault-injured youths presenting to the emergency department: Results of a randomized trial. *Pediatrics*, Nov, Volume 122 / Edition No. 5.
- Correa-Romero, F., Arizaga, L., & Lázaro, A. (2013). Impacto de la tutoría en factores familiares y de personalidad de un grupo de estudiantes de primaria en situación de riesgo. *Revista Uaricha*, 10 (23), 155-169 (Sep–Dec, 2013). Universidad de Guanajuato.
- DuBois, D., Holloway, B., Valentine, J., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 30, No. 2, April. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri.
- DuBois, D. (2007). *Effectiveness of mentoring program practices*. Chicago: University of Illinois.
- DuBois, D., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2) 57–91. Institute for Health Research and Policy (M/C 275), Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Funk, E., & Ek, N. (2002). Mentoring youth in Brandon: Successes, challenges and best practices. Working Paper, Retrieved from [https://www.brandonu.ca/rdi/files/2015/08/Mentoring\\_Youth\\_in\\_Brandon\\_Successes\\_Challenges\\_and\\_Best\\_Practices.pdf](https://www.brandonu.ca/rdi/files/2015/08/Mentoring_Youth_in_Brandon_Successes_Challenges_and_Best_Practices.pdf)

- Garringer, M. (2007). Research, best practices, and resources for effective youth mentoring. *Effective Strategies for Providing Quality Youth Mentoring in Schools and Communities*. To be published by the Hamilton Fish Institute and Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Portland, OR.
- Government of the State of Rio de Janeiro. (2015). *Relatório de auditoria de gestão 2015, Programa Caminho Melhor Jovem*. Auditoria Geral do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.
- Grafe, F., & Castillo, M. (2014). *Sistematización de la implementación del programa Jóvenes en Red*. Informe Final. Montevideo, Uruguay: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Grossman, J., & Rhodes, J. (2002). The test of time: Predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring relationships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2002 April; 30(2):199-219.
- Herrera, C. (2004). *School-based mentoring: A closer look*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Herrera, C., Baldwin, J., Kauh, T., Feldman, A., & McMaken, J. (2007). *Making a difference in schools: The Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring impact study*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Herrera, C., DuBois, D., & Baldwin, J. (2013). *The role of risk mentoring experiences and outcomes for youth with varying risk profiles*. New York, NY: Public/Private Ventures.
- Instituto Nacional de la Juventud de Uruguay. (2015). *Encuesta Nacional de Adolescencia y Juventud (ENAJ)*. ENAJ Report 2013. Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Jara, P., & Sorio, R. (2013a). *Análisis de modalidades de acompañamiento familiar en programas de apoyo a poblaciones vulnerables o en situación de pobreza*. Inter-American Development Bank, Technical Note, IDB-TN-545. May.
- . (2013b). *Redes de Protección Social. Mejores respuestas para adolescentes y Jóvenes*. Inter-American Development Bank, Technical Note, IDB-TN-539. May.
- Jekielek, S., Hair, E., & Moore, K. (2002). Mentoring: A promising strategy for youth development. *Child Trends*, Washington, D.C.
- Jensen, Robert. (2010). The (perceived) returns to education and the demand for schooling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May.
- Jemmott, J., Jemmott, L., Braverman, P., & Fong, G. (2005). HIV/STD risk reduction interventions for African American and Latino adolescent girls at an adolescent medicine clinic. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, Vol. 159, May 2005.
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. (2007). *A rapid evidence assessment of the impact of mentoring on re-offending: a summary*. Nov 2007. Cambridge University. Retrieved from [http://www.youthmentoring.org.nz/content/docs/Home\\_Office\\_Impact\\_of\\_mentoring.pdf](http://www.youthmentoring.org.nz/content/docs/Home_Office_Impact_of_mentoring.pdf)

- Jucovi, L. (2003). AMACHI: Mentoring children of prisoners in Philadelphia. *Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society*. University of Pennsylvania.
- Karcher, M., & Lindwall, J. (2003). Social interest, connectedness, and challenging experiences: What makes high school mentors persist? *Journal of Individual Psychology*. Fall 2003, Vol. 59 Edition 3, p. 293.
- Karcher, M. (2005). The effects of developmental mentoring and high school mentors' attendance on their younger mentees' self-esteem, social skills, and connectedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, Vol. 42(1), 2005.
- Karcher, M. (2008). The study of mentoring in the learning environment (SMILE): A randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of school-based mentoring. *Society for Prevention Research*, published online. [http://www.michaelkarcher.com/School-based\\_mentoring\\_files/Karcher\\_2008\\_SMILE\\_PrevSci.pdf](http://www.michaelkarcher.com/School-based_mentoring_files/Karcher_2008_SMILE_PrevSci.pdf)
- Karcher, M., & Herrera, C. (2007). *School-based mentoring*. Research in Action Series. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Langhout, R., Rhodes, J., & Osborne, L. (2004). An exploratory study of youth mentoring in an urban context: Adolescents' perceptions of relationship styles. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(4), Aug 2004, pp. 293–306.
- Lawner, E., Beltz, M., & Moore, K. (2013). What works for mentoring programs: Lessons from experimental evaluations of programs and interventions. *Child Trends*, Research Paper. 28 Mar 2013.
- Liang, B., & West, J. (2007). Youth mentoring: Do race and ethnicity really matter? *MENTOR: Research in Action*, Edition No. 9.
- Martínez, V., Vivanco, L., Palacios, M., & Zamora, C. (2012). Evaluación analítica a la implementación de la fase piloto del Programa Abriendo Caminos. *Informe final*. Ministry of Social Development. Santiago, Chile.
- Miller, S., Connolly, P., & Maguire, L. (2011). *A follow-up randomised controlled trial evaluation of the effects of business in the community's Time to Read mentoring programme*. Belfast: Centre for Effective Education, Queen's University, Belfast.
- Ministry of Social Development. (2015a). *Informe de Seguimiento de Programas Sociales con cierre al 31 de Diciembre de 2014*. Banco Integrado de Programas Sociales. Santiago, Chile.
- . (2015b). *Evaluación cualitativa Jóvenes en Red. Informe Final*. Dirección Nacional de Evaluación y Monitoreo (DINEM), Uruguay.
- Monreal, V., Fernández, I., & Tapia, L. (2011). Evaluación Programa Abriendo Caminos del Ministerio de Planificación. Informe final del Panel de Expertos. *Dirección de Presupuestos*. Ministry of Finance. Santiago, Chile.

- Morrow-Howell, N., Hinterlong, J., Rozario, P., & Sherraden, M. (2001). *Productive aging: Concepts and challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pryce, J., & Keller, T. E. (2012). An investigation of volunteer-student relationship trajectories within school-based youth mentoring programs. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 40(2), 228–248.
- Rhodes, J. (2007). Fostering close and effective relationships in youth mentoring programs. *Research in Action*, Edition No. 4. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Rhodes, J., & DuBois, D. (2006). *Understanding and facilitating the youth mentoring movement*. Social Policy Report, Volume XX, Number III, 2006, Society for Research in Child Development, United States.
- Ritter, G., Denny, G., Albin, G., Barnett, J., & Blankenship, V. (2006). The effectiveness of volunteer tutoring programs: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2006:7.
- Roberts, H., Liabo, K., Lucas, P., DuBois, D., & Sheldon, T. (2004). *Mentoring to reduce antisocial behaviour in childhood*. Child Health Research and Policy Unit, Institute of Health Sciences, City University, London.
- Scrine, C., Reibel, T., & Walker, R. (2012). *Key findings of the literature on effective mentoring programs for young people*. Telethon Institute for Child Health Research.
- Secretaria Estadual de Assistência Social e Direitos Humanos. (2012). *Regulamento Operativo do Programa de Inclusão Social e Oportunidades para Jovens no Rio de Janeiro*.
- Sexton, T., & Turner, C. (2010). The Effectiveness of Functional Family Therapy for Youth with Behavioral Problems in a Community Practice Setting. *Journal of Family Psychology*. June; 24(3): 339–348.
- Sikkema, K., Anderson, E., Kelly, J., Winett, R., Gore-Felton, C., Roffman, R., Heckman, T., Graves, K., Hoffmann, R., & Brondino, M. (2005). Outcomes of a randomized, controlled community level HIV prevention intervention for adolescents in low-income housing developments. *AIDS*. 2005 Sep 23;19(14):1509-16.
- Sipe, C. (1996). *Mentoring: a synthesis of P/PV's research: 1988-1995*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Spoth, R., Cleve, R., & Chungyeol, S. (2000). Reducing adolescents' aggressive and hostile behaviors. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*. 2000;154(12):1248-1257.
- Tavares Almeida, M., & Ribeiro Gomes, M. (2014). *Juventudes e Territórios de Favelas: narrativas, experiências e aprendizagens*. Rio de Janeiro.
- Terzian, M., Andrews, K. M., & Moore, K. A. (2011). Preventing multiple risky behaviors among adolescents: Seven strategies. *Research-to-Results Brief*. Publication #2011-24.

- Thomas, R., Lorenzetti, D., & Spragins, W. (2013). Systematic review of mentoring to prevent or reduce alcohol and drug use by adolescents. *Systematic Reviews In Adolescent Health*, Volume 13, Number 4.
- Tierney, J., Baldwin, J., & Resch, N. (2000). *Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers Big Sisters*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Vivo, S., & Saric, D. (2013). *Guía para medir comportamientos de riesgo en jóvenes*. Inter-American Development Bank. Division of Social Protection and Health. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <https://publications.iadb.org/bitstream/handle/11319/3756/esp%20GUIA%20MEDICION%20COMPORTAMIENTOS%20JOVENES.pdf>
- UNICEF. (2007). *Sistema de sostén para adolescentes tutelados*. Procuración General de la Provincia de Buenos Aires. Argentina.
- Waiselfisz, Julio. (2013). *Mapa da Violência 2013: Homicídios e Juventude no Brasil*. CEBELA y FLACSO.
- Wood, S., & Mayo-Wilson, E. (2012). School-based mentoring for adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sage Journals, Research on Social Work Practice* 22: 257.