

**PROGRAM: SPONSOR-A-SCHOLAR (SAS)**

**Population Served:**

Size: Approximately 150 students (30 per class) from Philadelphia public high schools  
 Age: Ninth grade (stay in program until first year of college)  
 Other characteristics: 75% black, 10% Hispanic, 7% white, and 7% Asian. Student's parents must support program goals; program open to motivated, low-income students with average grades.

**Program Components:**

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Mentoring	Volunteers	4 years; mentors asked to see students once a month with phone contact in between	1:1 ratio of mentors to students
Academic assistance	Academic coordinator	4 years; coordinator works part-time	Academic assistance; help with college applications and financial aid
Interface with schools and others	Program		
Money	Volunteers, businesses	One time	\$6,000 for college

**Program Objectives/Goals:**

Information, technical, education skills: Help students from Philadelphia public high schools stay in high school and enroll in college.  
 Material resources: Some financial assistance for those who make it to college.

**Study:**

**Johnson, A. (1999). *Sponsor-A-Scholar: Long-term impacts of a youth mentoring program on student performance*. Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.**

**Study objectives and measurements:**

Objective:

To assess whether the program influences the academic performance and educational attainment of the students and whether mentoring or participant characteristics are related to outcomes.

Measurement instrument:

GPA in tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades; participation in college prep activities; self-esteem; college attendance in first and second years after high school graduation; college retention rate between first and second years of college. Students were surveyed during each of the 4 years of the evaluation via a self-administered questionnaire, and via a telephone survey after they left school. Each mentor was surveyed once, during the student's senior year in high school. Information was also collected from student transcripts, school districts, class coordinator's notebooks, and observations.

**Evaluation:**

Type: Quasi-experimental (matched-group)

Statistical techniques: Analyses control for background characteristics. Regression analysis and logistic regression analysis (where a dichotomous dependent variable is used); significance level=.10

Population evaluated: 434 high-risk high school students, 180 of whom participated in the program.

---

**Outcomes:**

Participants had higher GPAs than comparison group in tenth and eleventh grade. Participants did not have significantly different GPAs in twelfth grade. Participants did not have different high school graduation rates than comparison group students, although both had very high rates (in excess of 90%). Participants were more likely than controls to attend college and were engaged in more college preparatory activities. Participants and controls did not differ significantly in self-confidence or self-esteem.

---

**Other information:**

Response rates: Year 1, 98%; year 2, 99%; year 3, 92%; year 4, 95%.

---

**PROGRAM: MULTIPLE PROGRAMS**

---

**STUDY 1:**

**MP1** Grossman, J., & Johnson, A. (1999). Assessing the effectiveness of mentoring programs. In Grossman, J. (Ed.), Contemporary Issues in Mentoring (pp. 24-47). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

---

**Sample Population:**

Population Served: See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1.

Age: See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1.

---

**Study objectives and measurements:**

Objective

This study establishes benchmarks from the BB/BS and SAS data.

Measurement instrument

See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1.

---

**Evaluation:**

Type: Quantitative; random experimental assignment for BB/BS data; quasi-experimental design for SAS data (see BBS1 and SAS1)

Statistical techniques: Regression analyses controlling for background characteristics

Population evaluated: See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1

---

**Outcome:**

A large number of effects from the two programs were found for certain students or students in certain types of relationships and diminished for other groups. So, those who initially scored low in academic achievement, had high absentee rates, and had minimal family support experienced many improvements in academically related outcomes compared to those who were initially better off (those who initially scored low in academic achievement were also less likely to start using drugs). Students in long- lasting relationships, who have frequent contact with their mentor, or who are involved in youth-centered mentoring experienced many improvements in academic outcomes and less substance use compared with those in relationships of shorter duration, with less frequent contact or relationships characterized by low levels of youth-centeredness.

---

**Other information:**

---