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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Teen Trendsetters™ is a cross-age literacy mentoring program that pairs middle and high school students with struggling readers in first through third grade for weekly one-on-one reading sessions. The goal is to improve reading skills in these at-risk mentees, while promoting leadership and service qualities among mentors. This report summarizes the work and findings seen in the 67 Teen Trendsetters™ programs that operated in Florida during the 2019-2020 academic year. This evaluation is based on data collected by participating schools, including basic student demographic data, participation levels, and the results of locally administered standardized reading assessments conducted at the start and end of the academic year\(^1\). The report also draws on findings from mentee, mentor, advisor and parent surveys, as well as data provided directly by the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy.

Participants. A total of 1440 mentees and 1571 mentors took part in at least one Teen Trendsetters™ mentoring session during the 2019-2020 academic year. Mentees reflected the ethnic and racial diversity of Florida, with nearly half of mentees identified as Hispanic (48%), and the balance largely non-Hispanic Black/African American (24%) or white/non-Hispanic (21%). Mentees were fairly balanced between males (54%) and females (46%), and were primarily enrolled in first (43%) or second grade (35%). While 47% of mentees began the year reading one-half year up to one year below grade level, 22% started the year reading more than two years below grade level. Mentors showed similar ethnic diversity, and were enrolled in 6\(^{th}\) through 12\(^{th}\) grade.

\(^1\) Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the transition to distance learning, true “end-of-year” assessments were generally unavailable, and programs used Spring and late-Winter assessments when available. Nevertheless, for consistency, the report will use the term “end-of-year” assessment, with a mathematical adjustment made to reflect the shorter time period between the two assessments.
Participation. Between July 1, 2019, and June 30, 2020, mentees in Florida took part in 21,341 hours of mentoring, which is **35% more than the goal of 15,750 hours**. This translated to an average of 14.8 hours of mentoring for each mentee; however, it must be remembered that on-campus school-activity was cut short due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and so the majority of Teen Trendsetters™ programs ended early. By the end of the year, 82% of mentees took part in 12 or more mentoring sessions, while 61% took part in 15 or more sessions, and 27% took part in 18 or more sessions. Mentee participation levels were fairly consistent across demographic groups, with the only difference being females having a slightly higher attendance rate than males (means of 15.34 and 14.89, respectively).

Mentors took part in a total of 24,292 hours of mentoring services, for an average of 15.5 hours per mentor. Over three-fourths of all mentors (78%) took part in 12 or more mentoring sessions, while 62% took part in 15 or more sessions, and 36% participated in 18 or more mentoring sessions.

Impact on Mentee Reading. Start- and end-of-year standardized reading assessment data were converted to grade level equivalent scores (GLEs) and examined for the 804 mentees for whom this information was available. On average, mentees showed a 1.06 grade level increase in reading skills over a period of 0.68 academic years. **This corresponds to 56% more growth than would be expected for an average student during this time period.** However, it must be remembered that the mentees are not typical students – they were specifically chosen because they were reading at least one-half year below grade level. As such, one may expect them to show smaller gains than the average student who was reading at grade-level or above.

Consequently, the actual impact of Teen Trendsetters™ on mentees may be greater than the increase of 1.06 grade-levels would imply. Furthermore, the fact that the mentees show 56% more growth than expected for the average student suggests that many mentees...
are beginning to “catch-up” with their peers. Together, this suggests that the program is having significant and meaningful effects on mentee reading skills.

When examined by grade-level, 26% of first-grade mentees ended the year “caught up” and were reading at grade level. While not yet reading at grade level, an additional 39% were showing gains that were greater-than-expected for a typical student, and therefore “catching up” with their classmates. Among mentees enrolled in second grade, 22% were “caught up” and reading at grade-level by the end-of-year assessment, with an additional 44% “catching up” with greater-than-expected increases. Finally, among mentees enrolled in third grade 6% ending the year reading at grade-level, and an additional 42% were “catching up”.

Beyond performance on standardized tests, in their end-of-year surveys, nearly all parents reported that their child’s reading had improved “a lot” (44%) or “some” (42%) during the year, and that their child’s self-confidence had similarly improved “a lot” (46%) or “some” (42%). This is particularly noteworthy given the relatively modest intensity of the actual intervention (i.e., a mean of 14.8 hours of mentoring).

Data from mentee surveys also suggest that they benefited from social, emotional, and academic opportunities provided through the program. For example, 86% of mentees reported that their mentor made them feel important, and 83% stated that their mentor helped them learn new things – with 91% specifically indicating that they felt their mentor helped them improve their reading skills. At the end of the year, 94% of mentees reported that they enjoyed being in Teen Trendsetters™, and 81% reported that they enjoyed reading.

**Dosage Effects.** A natural question for any intervention is whether the degree of improvement increases with more services (i.e., a “dosage effect”). Analyses found larger gains for those mentees who received 16 or more sessions (mean gain of 1.17 grade-levels), compared to those who received fewer than 16 sessions (mean gain of 1.01 grade-levels). However, analyses also
found that more time in the program was associated with larger gains – even after controlling for the actual number of mentoring sessions received. In essence, mentees benefitted from both more sessions, and from more time in the program regardless of the number of sessions. One possible interpretation of the latter effect is that it is the result of other more fundamental changes occurring within the mentee and his or her family. For example, if a mentee enjoyed reading and began reading more at home with his or her parent(s), he or she may experience additional reading gains beyond the effect of the mentoring sessions alone. This would be consistent with qualitative feedback provided by both mentees and their parents.

Factors Related to Larger Reading Gains. Follow-up analyses found two student characteristics that were related to larger reading gains among mentees:

(1) Larger gains were observed among students who began the year further below their expected level, suggesting that Teen Trendsetters™ may be having the largest impact on those who are most in need.

(2) First-grade mentees were found to have larger gains than second- or third-grade mentees, suggesting that Teen Trendsetters™ may be particularly beneficial for younger students.

In addition, three program characteristics were found to be related to larger reading gains.

(1) Programs that served a larger percentage of first-grade mentees reported greater gains in reading skills.

(2) Larger gains were seen in those programs in which the average start-of-year performance was relatively further below expected levels.

(3) Programs that had a larger percentage of mentees identified as Hispanic reported larger gains in reading skills.

All five of these are consistent with evaluation results from prior years, suggesting that these findings are fairly robust.
Recommendations. The report concludes with several considerations for possible continuous improvement efforts:

- Continued development and monitoring of the Parent Guides, including identifying strategies for (1) ensuring the Parent Guides are brought home, (2) encouraging the subset of parents who do not use the guides to start doing so, and (3) collecting some type of follow-up confirmation from the parent.
- Continued expansion of the Mentor Guide, including additional strategies for sustaining mentee engagement, additional activities related to the readings, and worksheets or informal assessments as a way of assessing a mentee’s comprehension of the material.
- Collecting additional data from advisors regarding individual mentee engagement, interest, and strengths or challenges that may influence their participation and learning.
- Collecting additional data from advisors regarding individual mentor engagement, interest, and other factors that may influence their participation and relationship with their mentee.
- Linking individual mentor data to individual mentee data in order to better understand how mentors influence the degree of growth seen in their mentee.
- Collecting additional data from advisors or Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy personnel on the interest, engagement, and activities of advisors and programs.
- To whatever degree possible, continued movement to a common set of reading instruments and reported scores (e.g., grade-level equivalent scores).
- Inclusion of a comparison sample of similar children who did not take part in Teen Trendsetters™.
- Collaboration with the Maine Department of Education on a long-term follow-up study of former mentees using statewide education and testing data.
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BACKGROUND/OVERVIEW

Teen Trendsetters™ is a cross-age literacy mentoring program that pairs first- through third-grade students (“mentees”) who are reading at one-half year or more below grade-level, with middle and high school student “mentors”. Mentors provide support and help with reading skills for their younger mentee through regular one-on-one reading sessions. Cross-age mentoring has been found to provide academic and social benefits for both mentee and mentor (e.g., Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005), with literacy mentoring programs found to increase vocabulary and comprehension (e.g., Bond & Castagnera, 2006), as well as other positive academic and social outcomes (Wheeler, Keller, & DuBois, 2010; Sims, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Based on the individual needs and requirements of participating schools, Teen Trendsetters™ mentoring sessions are typically scheduled once per week, and can occur before, during, or after school. In addition to the school-based sessions, mentees are given free books they can take home. This helps to encourage reading between parent(s) and children, as well as support the process of families creating their own collection of child-focused books. Beyond targeting reading skills in mentees, mentors receive training and educational material on how to support young readers, and in return are given service opportunities that benefit both them and their younger peers. As such, Teen Trendsetters™ seeks to help improve reading skills in mentees, while promoting leadership and service qualities among mentors.

The following report summarizes activities of the Florida Teen Trendsetters™ program between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020. This includes recruitment, training, mentoring, and standardized reading assessments conducted at the start and end of the academic year\(^2\). The report is based on data obtained from (1) the Salesforce online data system that includes information on participants and day-to-day program activities, (2) anonymous online surveys that were completed by advisors (n=66), mentees (n=77), mentors (n=612), and parents (n=59), and (3)

---

\(^2\) Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the transition to distance learning, true “end-of-year” assessments were generally unavailable, and programs used Spring and late-Winter assessments when available. Nevertheless, for consistency the report will use the term “end-of-year” assessment, with a mathematical adjustment made to reflect the shorter time period between the two assessments.
information that was provided directly by Barbara Bush Foundation personnel working with these programs. Note that mentee participation in the end-of-year surveys and testing was considerably lower than previous years due to COVID-19 restrictions.

**PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

During 2019-2020, a total of 67 Teen Trendsetters™ programs were active across Florida, while an additional 16 programs were recruited and started the process of forming, but did not become active. As summarized in Table 1, nearly half of all active programs were based in Broward and Miami-Dade counties (n=18 and 15, respectively). In addition, Collier, Hillsborough, Lee, and Palm Beach counties each supported 4 to 6 programs, while Alachua, Pasco, Polk, and Seminole counties each supported three, and Hendry, Lake, and Pinellas counties hosted one program each. The relative number of programs that did not become active was consistent with the previous year and reflected a variety of reasons, including conflicting school schedules that made it impossible to find a common time of day for mentoring sessions, a failure to find the necessary minimum of 15 mentors, and an inability to find a teacher or staff to oversee the program.

Available data suggests that nearly all programs met once per week (93%), which is more than was seen in the previous year (78% in 2018-2019), with the remaining programs meeting two or more times each week. Most programs also operated after school (57%), while 39% held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sessions during the school day and 4% met before school. This is also consist with the timing of mentoring sessions in previous years. The geographic distribution of Florida counties served by Teen Trendsetters™ programs is presented visually in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.** Florida Teen Trendsetters™ Programs by County.
TRAINING

ADVISOR TRAINING

In open-ended questions contained within the end-of-year surveys, advisors generally provided positive reports about how their training had prepared them for their role. When asked if they recommended any modifications to the advisor training, 61% of advisors indicated that they had no suggested changes. Representative comments included:

- I thought the Advisor training was thorough and I loved it.
- Training is fine. PowerPoint is excellent for new advisors.
- I wouldn't recommend any major changes to the advisor training, it was effective and all the material provided seemed purposeful and applicable to the program.
- I thought the advisor training was great. I guess it was my first taste of online learning.
- I believe that everything for the advisor training was well thought out.

While positive, 24% of advisors did indicate that additional material or content would be welcomed. For example, several noted that more handouts and material related to the training would be helpful – particularly copies of the Mentor Guide.

- New advisors would benefit from a PDF of the main handouts/examples to go alongside the PowerPoint training. It would be helpful to also have a set of materials in hand or at least a separate PDF one pager of what it will look like for the upcoming year.
- I believe it would help if the advisors had a set of Mentor Guides to utilize during training and throughout the program.
- I needed a sample manual to look at as I watched the video to really understand and to be totally prepared.
[It would be helpful to] have a hard copy for the mentors to go over as they watched the video training.

Furthermore, advisors noted additional resources that could be included as part of the training and then made available throughout the year:

I would like to have a separate guide and/or schedule to help advisors keep track of which reading material to use on a weekly basis.

I think including videos that model an effective lesson would help.

[A] step by step guide through the enrollment process and navigating the website.

The website was not user friendly - perhaps more step-by-step instructions [on] adding students, attendance, etc...

Finally, several of advisors also felt that it would be helpful to include additional tips or suggestions for launching and operating Teen Trendsetters™ programs, as well as ideas for addressing challenges that may emerge. One specific strategy that was mentioned involves facilitating advisor interactions in a “learning community”-style atmosphere – either online or in person.

I really would not change anything. Examples provided and the ideas shared between advisors helped implement the program.

Include ideas that advisors can share with mentors if the session seems to move too quickly, if mentees do not want to concentrate or cooperate, if they become emotionally stressed, etc.

It would have been great if ALL of the advisors in our area had a meeting together. Experienced advisors could have shared tips for success.

Have someone provide real life examples rather than read the slides.
MENTOR TRAINING

Overall, advisors were similarly positive about the mentor training. Of those who provided an answer to this open-ended question, a plurality (39%) stated that they felt the training was effective and did not feel any changes were needed.

Nothing. Training was informative and prepared our mentors for the sessions.

Nothing really, I thought it was good.

Mentor training is thorough and easy to understand.

The training and video provided were excellent. It allowed time to pause and have the mentors share...

I thought it was great. We spent several lunch periods / "lunch and learn" sessions talking about the training and practiced mentoring.

However, 14% of advisors felt that it would be helpful for the mentor training to include additional guidance or strategies for addressing challenging situations. Several of these advisors suggested tips and suggestions designed to help mentors deal with distracted or bored mentees:

Provide alternatives to the regular routine that our mentors can follow when students are experiencing distress, acting up, not able to concentrate, etc.

Maybe some suggestions as to what to do with the mentor if they finish early

More about ethics and how to deal with students who have trouble sitting still and focusing

However, most specifically suggested that the training incorporate role-playing or similar activity opportunities for mentors…

Maybe some modeling--role play

I would like a more interactive training that involves role playing.
Have mentors act out different scenarios they may encounter while mentoring the younger children.

I advise that next year you have children showing the mentors how to properly front load before reading, proper during reading strategies, etc. I think it's important for the kids to see the process literally in action so that it is easier to replicate the mentor/process.

I wouldn’t recommend any major changes to the mentor training. The only thing I would possibly suggest would be an expansion on discussing problem solving, maybe even including some sort of practice game, where you set up a situation and then have a mentor in training try and identify what steps they should take next to resolve the issue.

...Maybe recording high school mentors doing the different pieces of the training....the kids might like seeing peers do it.

Perhaps related to the last theme, 5% of advisors felt that the mentor training would benefit if it were made more interactive:

[Make] the video be more interactive.

Shorten the length of the video and include some hands on activities.

[Include] interactive components

In addition, 6% of advisors volunteered that it would be helpful if additional material and supplies were available as part of the training:

I believe it would help if the mentors had a tangible copy of the Mentor Guide to reference during their training.

To have the books and guide ahead of time to help them use the guide more effectively.

They need to have the book in front of them when they see the training video. I will save the manuals for next year’s training.

Supplies to go with the activities
Eleven percent of advisors reported that they felt the training may be too long or slow-paced:

The speaking was a little too much because the visual was not changing with the anecdotes. The timing went over 45 minutes when you paused for feedback.

The narrator was slow and plodding. It was boring. The training from the previous year was better. I would like a PP presentation so that I can stop and start when I want to elaborate.

Only provide the PowerPoint for the advisor to go through at their own pace. The audio was slow and uninteresting for mentors.

Students lost interest after 20 minutes

Maybe having it be shorter. But I understand the reason for the length. Maybe putting it into modules so students can watch different sections at a time in case they need a refresher.

Finally, approximately 14% of advisors offered a range of other specific suggestions, such as additional training or planning days, having new Teen Trendsetters™ programs partner with more established programs, and providing different training options for new versus experienced mentors.

I like the Mentor training but feel that we should have a refresher course mid-year, to keep mentors focused and keep the program running smoothly.

The only thing I would recommend would be to have a lesson plan day for the mentors and advisor to go over the resources and clarify any concerns, kind of like a mentor planning day

I think the training I provide using the PowerPoint and veteran mentors works well for me. If an advisor is starting from scratch, I recommend maybe some mentors from a nearby school to help at training. Maybe you can pair up a nearby school to help on training day.
Off campus training, face to face.

The mentor training seems like it needs to be individualized [for] experienced and new mentors ... for experienced mentors they almost feel they are too knowledgeable and then miss any needed retraining on best practices and changes to materials...

Include [the] elementary advisor
MATERIALS

Beyond the training itself, end-of-year surveys also assessed advisor, mentor, parent, and mentee impressions of various Teen Trendsetters™ materials. These included the Parent Guide, the Mentor Guide, and Mentee books.

PARENT GUIDES

Advisor Impressions. Advisors reported overall positive impressions of the Parent Guides. When asked in an open-ended question for suggestions on how to improve the Parent Guides, 52% indicated that they saw no need for any changes.

Nothing. I liked this new piece this year. Please keep it.

I loved the parent guides!

The kids seemed to enjoy taking the parent guides home. I'm not sure if there is a better way.

None. This was PERFECT

However, while positive of the Parent Guides, nearly one-third of advisors (31%) recommended that they in some way be directly combined with the books. They felt this would help streamline the delivery process – and ensure that parents received the guides.

I had my mentors place the parent guides with the books for the week and once they gave the book to the mentees they included the guide inside.

We would place the Parent Guide each week in the actual book students were reading, but started stapling them because they were falling out. Maybe a more secure way of attaching the guide?

We placed our Parent Guide in the student book for students to take home with them. It worked.
I would like the parent guide to be imbedded into the book as oppose to be being a separate entity.

The parent guides were probably a waste of money. We put them in the mentee books and they fell out and never made it to the parent. Can it be a part of the book?

On a related theme, 5% of advisors suggested a formal process to ensure parents received the Parent Guides:

Maybe a signature sheet to indicate that it was received.

I would love to have a response card that the kids could return the following week with maybe a cute survey for the parents to complete...such as this week, my child was a starfish or something

Maybe a signature sheet to indicate that it was received.

It should be noted that these concerns are somewhat at odds with mentor impressions, who reported that they always (81%) or sometimes (12%) made certain the Parent Guides went home with the children. Nevertheless, a system to help ensure parents receive the Parent Guides might prove useful.

Finally, a few advisors also expressed a desire for bilingual or multilingual versions of the Parent Guides:

Could the parent guides be one way English and flip [for] Spanish so that they are both available (and/or links to other languages that could be printed out to meet those family’s needs)?

I would recommend an electronic version in English/Spanish and creole for the Parent Guide.

Parent Impressions. Consistent with advisor impressions, 75% of parents reported that their child brought Parent Guides home with their books, while 15% reported that they did not receive Parent Guides and 10% were not sure. Among parents who reported receiving Parent Guides,
89% indicated that they did the associated activities with their child. Of those, 87% reported that they and their child enjoyed doing the activities together – with 83% reporting that their child’s favorite part was simply reading together and discussing the book.

**Mentee Impressions.** Consistent with parent reports, 26% of the mentees reported that they did not do the Parent Guides activities with their parent(s). Among those who performed the activities, overall mentee impressions were positive, with 30% reporting that their favorite activity was “All of them.” Twenty nine percent of mentees indicated that their favorite activity was simply the additional opportunity to read and learn:

- *Reading outside of school*
- *Reading and talking about the book*
- *Talking about the pictures in the book, learning new words and drawing*
- *Learn new words*

...while 8% specifically noted doing so with their parents:

- *Reading to my parents*
- *Working with my mom to read the books*
- *Reading the books with my mom.*
- *Having my mom do them with me.*

In addition, 12% of mentees identified other specific activities as their favorite part, such as drawing, “the zoo one”, “the one about the trees”, and “the nature activities.”

**THE MENTOR GUIDE**

**Advisor Impressions.** Advisors reported that mentors typically spent at least five minutes reviewing the Quick Reference Guide before each session (“Always” = 48%, “Sometimes” = 41%), as well as five or more minutes previewing the lesson in the Mentor Guide (“Always” = 65%, “Sometimes” = 34%).


When asked in an open-ended question to identify their favorite aspect of the Mentor Guide, over one-third of advisors (35%) noted that it was clear and easy to follow:

The Mentor Guide was exactly what it said. The guide made it much easier for the mentors.

I like that it was easy to navigate and everything for that week could be seen without turning pages

[The] Mentor Guide was easy to follow and had great extension suggestions.

I like that it gave them great structure, strategies, and extensions.

The mentor guide is organized and easy to read and follow.

The same number of advisors (35%) pointed to the suggestions and ideas included in the Mentor Guide, as well as its step-by-step approach to help guide the mentors through the mentoring process:

How it provides ideas on how to work with the mentees, in regards to skills, strategies, and activities. Kids were able to recognize how the instruction was similar to what we learn in class and now they were able to share their knowledge and know-how with others.

The guided lesson plans were incredibly helpful in their accessibility to mentors of different levels of experience. For first year mentors, they could lean more heavily into the provided steps for each lesson, while more experienced mentors could take a more independent approach and just use the lesson plan to guide discussions.

I liked how the mentor guide went through the reading process step by step!

It was an excellent guide for the mentors! The step by step instruction helped them.

All of the details and suggestions to make the mentoring experience a success!

The tips to help frustrated mentees.
In addition, 13% of advisors identified the variety of activities included in the Guide as their favorite aspect:

The mentor guide helped mentors organize the tutoring sessions, and provided activities related to the reading materials to keep mentees engaged throughout the session.

The variety of activities that supported the text.

It had more information and activities for the mentors and mentees to complete together.

It gave mentors many options and ideas for extension activities.

Just the activities and giving the mentors ways to teach their mentees.

**Mentor Impressions.** Overall, mentor impressions of the Mentor Guide were consistent with those of the advisors. For example, 36% of mentors pointed to the suggestions and step-by-step guidance as their favorite part of the Mentor Guide:

The mentor guide gave me amazing ideas of what to do with my mentee.

I liked that the mentor guide provided ideas for what to do with the mentee if you finished the book early and needed an activity to be productive with.

What I liked most about the Mentor Guide was that it showed some tips to help get [your mentee] engaged with the book.

I liked that it had suggestions for possible discussion topics that I could use to engage my mentee in really understanding the material.

[I liked that] it shows me words for them to know before reading the book

It gives you examples that you are able to give to the student when he or she is having difficulties

I liked that it gives a step by step explanation of what to do.

What I like best was that it gave you ways to guide through the reading with the mentee.
Also consistent with Advisor impressions, 27% of mentors volunteered that their favorite aspect of the Mentor Guide was its clarity and easiness to read and understand:

*The things that I like the most about the Mentor Guide was that it was easy to follow and it helped guide us to a smoother and less messy session.*

*It was very easy to use and I didn't have to keep flipping through the pages to find what I needed thanks to the table of contents.*

*The mentor guide is short and straight to the point. The instructions are very simple and there are extra ideas and games related to the book...*

*I loved how explanatory it was and how easy it was to understand what our goal was to teach that day to our mentees.*

Finally, 12% of mentors identified the various activities included in the Guide as their favorite aspect. This was also consist with advisor impressions:

*The feature that I liked best was the interactive activity part. It provides a fun way to get the kids learning with excitement!*  

*I like how they offered many activities to do with the children after reading the book. This gave us time to connect with the children and have fun with them.*

*I liked the activities in the books that we could actually participate in. For example, the light and the shadows. Using a flashlight and a pencil to see the difference.*

*It has ideas for games or activities to do along with questions to ask about the book.*

*It gives me new ideas for activities I could do with my mentee that relate back to the book we just read.*

*It gave you [activities] to do with the children, which came in handy because I would have not known what activity to do with them.*
However, in terms of preparation for mentoring sessions, mentor reports of their actual use of the Quick Reference Guide and Mentor Guide were less strong than advisor impressions. For example, 89% of advisors, but only 79% of mentors reported that mentors “Always” or “Sometimes” spent at least five minutes reviewing the Quick Reference Guide before each session. Similarly, 98% of advisors, but only 83% of mentors reported that mentors spent at least five minutes previewing the lesson in the Mentor Guide before each session. Seventeen percent of mentors reported that they rarely or never previewed the lesson in the Mentor Guide prior to a session.

**Mentor Suggestions for Changes to Mentor Guide.** Reflecting these positive views, when asked about changes they would recommend to the Mentor Guide, slightly more than half (53%) of all responding mentors indicated that no changes were needed:

- *I think the Mentor Guide was perfect. It was not difficult to understand and it also gave us an example of what to do after we were done reading with our mentees which is what I liked about it.*

- *I would not change anything for the Mentor Guide next year. It is perfect.*

- *Nothing, everything was very easy to understand and execute.*

- *I honestly feel that the Mentor Guide is very clear and fair and states everything really clearly and rules are very simple and easy to follow.*

- *No changes. I think the Mentor Guide helps perfectly.*

Consistent with overall impressions of the Mentor Guide, 17% of mentors nevertheless felt that additional activities should be included. These can help enhance engagement and learning, as well as provide multiple options in case necessary materials are not available:

- *I recommend more fun activities to do with the mentee. It helps them pay more attention and have fun while learning.*

- *Propose better games to create based off the book; hands on and engaging them makes them more excited about reading more books*
We should incorporate more logical and problem-solving activities for the kids to do. They like challenges.

Give better activities for the kids because they like that hands on things to help them learn more.

Provide more choices for activities, just in case someone doesn’t have access to whatever supplies the activity needs.

More activities that include drawing. Most of the kids really liked to draw.

In addition, 8% of mentors felt that it would be helpful to expand the number of questions that mentors can ask mentees about the reading. These questions can be used to further check comprehension and should provide varying degrees of challenge in order to reflect a mentee’s own level of knowledge. Also, some noted that additional “open-ended” questions that simply provided an opportunity for mentees to share their own opinion would help mentees engage with the reading material:

I might recommend that the guide include [direct] questions about the book directly... i.e. what happened in the plot, which character did what, etc.

I think that the Mentor Guide should include much more comprehension questions. This way, the students will try hard to think about the answers.

Giving more questions to ask the students for comprehension.

I feel that the Mentor Guide should be more accommodated to the students’ background knowledge. For example, sometimes it would tell me to ask the child questions that even I found difficult to answer.

The answers for some of the sample questions were too obvious. I would often have to think of my own to ensure my mentee actually comprehended the text.

I wish it had more questions that the kids made their own opinions about because they liked explaining their feelings on the books.
Finally, 5% of mentors noted that continuing to expand the tips and suggestions provided in the Mentor Guide would be helpful. Specific areas mentioned included tips for keeping distracted mentees on task, additional reading or teaching strategies, additional examples, and help for students with particular needs or issues (e.g., multilingual):

- [Ideas] to find a way to control the kids a little better.
- [Guidance] that we need to be more firm [with] the kids to keep them on track
- Some side ideas of what to do when the mentee does not want to participate.
- I think we should add more things to go over for reading techniques. Such as word endings like “ing” for the lower grade mentees. Mine really struggled with that.
- Talk more about different ways to teach the children.
- I think it would be better if it included different ways to read
- More than one example
- Something that I recommend for the mentor guide next year would be that they would have a section that shows how to help students with speech problems.
- We need a section that shows us how to work with our bilingual students.

**MENTEE BOOKS**

Mentees reported very positive impressions of their Teen Trendsetters™ books, with 96% indicating that they liked the reading material. Nearly all parents (90%) reported that their child brought the books home (3% were not certain); however, 17% of all parents volunteered that they did not read the books with their child.

The majority of parents, mentees advisors, and mentors felt the reading-level of the books was “Just Right” (parents = 57%, mentees = 51%, advisors = 67%, mentors = 66%). Across these sources, approximately one-third felt the books were “Too Easy” (parents = 33%, mentees = 27%, advisors = 33%, mentors = 32%). In contrast, there were differences of opinion regarding
whether the books were “Too Hard” for the children, with none of the advisors, 3% of the mentors, 10% of the parents, and 22% of the mentees reporting that the books were too difficult.

**Changes to Enhance Program**

Finally, in open-ended questions in the end-of-year surveys, advisors were asked for any overall changes or enhancements they would suggest for the program. Among those completing the surveys, 67% offered broad, general support for the training or simply indicated that no changes were needed…

*Having the weekly reminders with information and deadlines is absolutely important. I truly appreciate it and [it] keeps me on my toes.*

*Everything has been working just fine. We love Teen Trendsetters!*  

*It is set up really well - no changes.*

*I like being an Advisor and the weekly emails greatly help; let's keep that!*  

*Nothing. I love doing this every year!!*  

*Staff, resources, and supports were excellent ... keep making them available!*  

In addition, 10% of advisors suggested enhancements to the student information system – with nearly all of these suggestions aimed at improving data entry for student attendance:

*If there was a way to list an attendance chart and test score chart that would be editable (like as a spreadsheet) in the student data system, that would save time from having to input the data one at a time. Maybe some way to mass update the data?*

*Maybe a cell phone app? [It would be helpful] for attendance during the weekly sessions. But other than that I think it runs pretty smoothly.*  

*[Include a] different attendance page for the elementary and middle school students*

*The website functionality for attendance is tedious; if updates were made it would streamline attendance*
A step by step [guide] to using the SIS

Simplify the dashboard. It is not user friendly

Finally, 17% of advisors offered a wide variety of suggestions aimed at the overall organization or structure of the Teen Trendsetters™ program. These included leveraging online resources…

In regards to changes, maybe having FaceTime with other Advisors at least once a month and our leader, Ann Marie can help us to discuss ideas with each other [about] what works, what doesn't and help lift one another up.

I would like more online resources to enhance reading selection specifically with the lower reading level.

Love the program!! Maybe add an online element so kids can reach out to kids who miss.

…as well as building in more training, guidance, and engagement for mentors…

Resources for mentors to use if their mentee is ELL or does not speak English.

I think our mentors need more explicit instruction- in order to do this, students really need the mentor guides BEFORE they begin mentoring so that we can practice the process before we head over to the elementary school.

…and suggestions and questions regarding scheduling and required permissions:

Not needing parent permission as some of the neediest students lost out because parents would not return and sign the form. As we are doing it on school time do we really need to the parent signature in the future?

Meeting twice a week instead of once per week for me.

Understanding that it is very difficult to accomplish during the school day - it's best in an after school program OR allow more students to participate so that it could be a one class mentors to one class mentees, then it would be much easier during the school day.
PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

MENTEES

Demographics. A total of 1589 mentees had some initial contact with Florida Teen Trendsetters™ during the 2019-2020 academic year, with 1440 taking part in at least one mentoring session. The following analyses focus on these 1440 mentees. Mentees reflected the ethnic and racial diversity of Florida. As summarized in Table 2, mentees were fairly balanced between males (54%) and females (46%), and nearly half identified as Hispanic (48%), with the balance of mentees largely non-Hispanic Black/African American (24%) or white/non-Hispanic (21%). Mentees were primarily enrolled in first (43%) or second grade (35%), with 22% enrolled in third grade.

Table 2. Mentee and Mentor Demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentees (n=1440)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=1571)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE AND ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>RACE AND ETHNICITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Mult</td>
<td>Other/Mult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADE LEVEL</strong></td>
<td><strong>GRADE LEVEL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>7th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>8th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Start-of-Year Reading Skills.** In order to increase reading skills in young, struggling readers, Teen Trendsetters™ targets mentees in the first through third grade who were reading at least one-half year below grade level (i.e., 0.50 grade level equivalents or more below the expected level for their grade and time of year). Start-of-year reading assessment data were available for 1358 of the 1440 mentees actively participating in the program. Given different assessment instruments reported student performance using different scales (i.e., Lexile scores, RIT scores, and grade-level equivalent scores), whenever possible scores were converted to grade level equivalent scores or GLEs. As illustrated in Figure 2, mentees reflected a range of

---

**Success in Reaching Mentee Recruitment:** During 2019-2020, a total of 1589 mentees were recruited, with 1440 of those taking part in at least one mentoring session. This exceeded the goal of 1000 mentees by 44%.

---

**Figure 2.** Mentee Reading at the Start of the Year.
initial reading skill levels. For example, while 47% of mentees began reading one-half year up to one year below grade level, 22% started the program reading two or more years below grade level. Not surprisingly, the degree to which students scored below grade level varied by student’s grade ($F(2, 1316.8)=15.921, p<.001$), with first grade students starting the year an average of 1.40 GLEs below expected levels, second grade students starting an average of 1.06 GLEs below expected levels, and third grade students starting an average of 1.20 GLEs below expected levels.

No difference in initial relative reading performance was observed based on students race ($F(5, 1324.5)=0.548, p=.740$). However, males were found to have lower initial performance than females ($t(1302.1)=-2.238, p=.025$), with males starting the year approximately 1.27 GLEs below expected levels and females starting the year approximately 1.20 GLEs below expected levels.

**MENTORS**

A total of 1766 mentors had some initial contact with the Teen Trendsetters™ during the 2019-2020 academic year, with 1571 taking part in at least one mentoring session. As with mentees, subsequent analyses will focus on these 1571 mentors. Mentors showed generally similar ethnic/racial diversity, with 46% of mentors identified as Hispanic, 25% identified as white/non-Hispanic, and 19% identified as Black/African American. The majority of mentors were female (77%), and were distributed across grades 6 through 12 – with relatively fewer mentees in grade 6.

---

**Success in Reaching Mentor Recruitment:**

During 2019-2020, a total of 1766 mentors were recruited, with 1571 mentors taking part in at least one mentoring session. This exceeded the goal of 1000 mentors by 57%.
PARTICIPATION

MENTEE PARTICIPATION

Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, mentees in Florida took part in a total of 21,341 mentoring sessions, which translates to an average of 14.8 hours per mentee. However, it must be remembered that on-campus school-activity was cut short due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and so the majority of Teen Trendsetters™ programs ended early. As reflected in Table 3, 82% of mentees took part in 12 or more mentoring sessions, while 61% took part in 15 or more sessions, and 27% took part in 18 or more sessions.

Not surprisingly, this variation in mentee participation was also seen in differences in participation patterns across programs, with some programs showing higher overall levels of participation than others. These program-to-program differences are presented in the two panels comprising Figure 3, which illustrates the levels of participation across all mentees in each program. Note that Figure 3 must be interpreted carefully, because some programs included significantly more mentees than the required 15. Consequently, a program may have several mentees with lower participation rates, and yet have high participation among the required 15. Therefore, the total number of mentees is included in parentheses after the Program ID in order to help interpret the results.

Table 3. Florida Teen Trendsetters™ Participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Session</th>
<th>1-11</th>
<th>12-14</th>
<th>15-17</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success in Reaching Mentoring Sessions Goal: During 2019-2020, mentees received a total of 21,341 hours of mentoring services, exceeding the goal of 15,750 hours by over 35%.
Figure 3. Mentee Participation Rates by Program.
Figure 3. Mentee Participation Rates by Program (Continued).
For example, this pattern is seen in Program 871 (the second program from the top of the second Figure 3 pane). While ten participating mentees experienced fewer than 15 sessions, Program 871 worked with a total of 29 mentees – nearly double the required number. If one instead focused on the 15 mentees with the highest level of engagement, Program 803 would have a much higher mean level of participation. Consequently, this suggests that the program – and others like it – may have had difficulty initially engaging mentees who would remain active, but nevertheless persisted in their efforts in order to obtain a sufficient pool of engaged youth. As such, this information is valuable in that it illustrates the challenge that some programs experienced recruiting mentees who would fully participate.

**FACTORS RELATED TO MENTEE PARTICIPATION.**

Given this variation in participation levels, analyses sought to identify student and program characteristics that may be related to mentee engagement. Such information could help inform the design of future Teen Trendsetters™ programs, as well as help to identify mentees who are most likely to fully engage in the effort. Analyses were based on a series of two-level hierarchical linear models (HLM). HLM considers the wide variation in participation rates, and essentially divides it into variation that is related to program-to-program differences (e.g., does a program hold mentoring sessions before, during, or after school) and variation that is related to child-to-child differences (e.g., what is the child race/ethnicity or gender of the mentee). Initial analyses found that the variation in participation rates was nearly equally divided between the child-level (47%) and program level (53%). In other words, both child and program characteristics and differences (known and unknown) may have had a role in mentee participation. This invites the question of what those characteristics might be.

**Mentee Characteristics Related to Participation Levels.** A series of HLM models first examined possible mentee characteristics that were related to their level engagement (i.e., the number of mentoring sessions in which a mentee participated). A significant difference was observed based on a mentee’s sex ($\gamma=-0.46$, $t(1,380.6)=-2.490$, $p=0.013$), with higher levels of participation for females (mean=15.34 sessions) than males (mean=14.87 sessions), controlling for program-level variance. No other mentee characteristics were found to be related to participation levels. These included a mentee’s grade in school ($F(2, 1427.0)=0.178$, $p=0.837$),
race/ethnicity ($F(5, 1409.7)=1.245, p=0.286$), and their reading ability at the start of the school year ($\gamma=0.19, t(1,354.8)=1.124, p=0.261$).

**Program Characteristics Related to Participation Levels.** Similar analyses examined whether program characteristics were related to mentee engagement. However, no program characteristics were found to be related to mentee participation. Characteristics that were considered included the total number of mentees in the program ($\gamma=-0.08, t(63.1)=-1.205, p=0.233$), whether they met more than once per week ($\gamma=0.48, t(38.4)=0.223, p=0.825$), when the program met during the day ($F(2, 40.4)=0.909, p=0.411$), the percentage of mentees in first grade ($\gamma=-0.02, t(65.0)=-1.810, p=0.075$) or second grade ($\gamma=0.02, t(65.5)=1.859, p=0.068$), the percentage of mentees who were male ($\gamma=0.03, t(65.8)=0.838, p=0.405$), and the percentage of mentees who were Hispanic ($\gamma=0.01, t(65.4)=0.456, p=0.650$) or white/non-Hispanic ($\gamma=0.02, t(65.2)=1.045, p=0.300$), and the mean initial level of performance among mentees in the program ($\gamma=-0.64, t(63.6)=-0.730, p=0.468$).

**Mentor Participation**

Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, Teen Trendsetters™ mentors took part in a total of 24,292 hours of mentoring services, for an average of 15.5 hours per mentor. Consistent with the participation patterns for mentees, mentors also showed a range of levels of engagement (see Table 3). By the end of the school year, over three-fourths of all mentors (78%) had taken part in 12 or more mentoring sessions, while 62% had taken part in 15 or more sessions, and 36% had taken part in 18 or more sessions.

As with mentees, mentor participation rates varied significantly across programs (see Figure 4). However, given Teen Trendsetters™ is a volunteer program, it is not surprising that a subset of mentors would have low participation rates. For example, some mentors may initially volunteer, but then decide that mentoring, reading, or working with children does not reflect their own interests. Other mentors may volunteer for part of the year, but then need to stop due to sports, academic or work-related needs – an issue specifically mentioned in one advisor’s end-of-year survey.
Note that some upper-level schools supported two elementary school programs and had mentors serving in both programs. In order to avoid double-counting mentors, these programs were merged and appear with six-digit Program IDs when reporting mentor data.

**Figure 4.** Mentor Engagement by Program.
Figure 4. Mentor Engagement by Program (continued).
FACTORS RELATED TO MENTOR PARTICIPATION.

Given these differences in mentor participation, two-level HLM analyses were also used to examine whether there were student or program characteristics related to mentor level of engagement. Similar to mentee analyses, initial models found that the source of variation in participation rates was equally divided between the student (50%) and program level (50%), suggesting that both student and program characteristics may be playing meaningful roles in mentor engagement.

Mentor Characteristics Related to Participation Levels. Initial analyses examined mentor characteristics in order to determine whether participation levels varied among specific subsets of mentors. No differences in participation levels were observed based on a mentor’s race/ethnicity ($F(5, 1539.5)=0.688, p=0.632$), grade in school ($F(6, 1080.2)=1.457, p=0.190$) or sex ($\gamma=-0.43, t(1,523.7)=-1.516, p=0.130$).

Program Characteristics Related to Participation Levels. Similar analyses examined possible program-level variables related to mentor participation. While only 23% of mentors were male, higher overall mentor participation rates were seen in those programs with a larger proportion of male mentors ($\gamma=0.08, t(62.1)=2.216, p=0.030$). For example, a ten percentage point increase in the proportion of mentors who were male (e.g., 20% male to 30% male) was associated with approximately a 0.79 increase in the mean number of mentoring sessions for a program.

No other program features were found to be related to the level of mentor engagement. This included overall characteristics of the mentors, such as the total number of mentors in the program ($\gamma=-0.03, t(59.8)=-0.402, p=0.689$), the program-wide grade-level distribution of mentors (proportion in 6th through 8th grade: $\gamma=0.01, t(61.8)=0.991, p=0.326$; proportion in 9th or 10th grade: $\gamma=-0.02, t(61.8)=-0.847, p=0.400$; or proportion in 11th or 12th grade: $\gamma=-0.02, t(61.9)=-0.834, p=0.408$), and the racial/ethnic composition of mentors in a program (proportion ethnic minority: $\gamma=-0.01, t(61.6)=-0.537, p=0.593$). These analyses also considered differences in fundamental program operations, including the number of days the program met per week ($\gamma=3.46, t(36.7)=1.389, p=0.173$), and the time of day during which mentoring sessions were held ($F(2, 48.3)=2.409, p=0.101$). Neither of these operational characteristics were found to be related to mentor participation levels.
IMPACT ON MENTEE READING

In order to address the primary goal of increasing reading skills in at-risk early elementary students, a series of analyses examined the growth between the beginning- and end-of-year standardized reading scores for participating mentees. Not surprisingly, because individual districts chose the assessment instrument, the actual tool and type of score reported varied across programs. While numerous different assessment instruments were used, among the subset of children included in the following analyses, 37% used the iReady, while 21% used the Fountas and Pinnell, 15% used the STAR, 10% used the iStation, and the balance used one of several other instruments. Results were most commonly reported as either a Lexile score (48%) or directly as a grade level equivalent (47%), with 6% of reading assessments reported as RIT scores. In order to enhance the interpretability of the findings, whenever possible the results were converted to grade level equivalent scores.

GROWTH IN GRADE LEVEL EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR READING

A total of 804 mentees had both start- and end-of-year reading scores that were either reported as a grade level equivalent or were able to be converted to grade level equivalent scores (GLEs). Again, this number was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, the period between the start- and end-of-year assessment was shorter than typical (mean = 196.04 days), reflecting some districts reporting an earlier “end-of-year” assessment due to distance learning challenges.

On average, mentees experienced an increase in reading skills equal to 1.06 grade-levels. Given the assessment period covered less than a full year (0.68 academic years), this is 56% more growth than one would have anticipated during this time frame. In other words, one would expect the average or typical student – someone who is not a struggling reader – to grow approximately 0.68 grade levels during this time. As such, an increase of 1.06 grade levels corresponds to 56% more growth than would be expected -- even for a typical student.

In that regard, it must be remembered that these are not “typical” students. Mentees were specifically identified as being at least one-half year below grade level in reading, and as such, one may expect them to show smaller gains than the average student who was reading at grade-
level or above. If true, the actual impact Teen Trendsetters\textsuperscript{TM} had on these mentees would be greater than the increase of 1.06 grade-levels would imply. Furthermore, the fact that the mentees show \textbf{56\% more growth} than expected for a typical student indicates that the mentees are beginning to “catch-up” with their peers. Together, these suggest that the program is having significant and meaningful effects on mentee reading skills.

A summary of mean reading assessment scores at the start and end of the year, in grade level equivalents, is presented in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Mean Start- and End-of-Year Grade Level Equivalent Reading Scores.](image-url)
FURTHER ANALYSIS OF READING GAINS

First-Grade Mentees. To more deeply explore the nature and degree to which reading skills for mentees improved, start-of-year GLE scores and end-of-year GLE scores for individual first-grade mentees are presented in Figure 6. Each dot in the scatterplot represents one or more mentees with a given combination of start- and end-of-year scores. The size of the dot reflects the number of mentees with that specific combination of start- and end-of-year scores – with larger dots indicating more students having a given set of scores.

Based on this scatterplot, mentees can be placed into four groups that reflect the nature and degree to which their scores changed.

(1) Decrease. The red line in Figure 6 corresponds to no change in reading GLE scores: The end-of-year GLE score for a student is exactly the same as his or her start-of-year GLE score. Mentees who appear in the lightly shaded red area below the red line had reading scores that actually decreased over time, although this likely reflects measurement error at the low-range of reading assessments.

(2) Some Increase. The gold line indicates an end-of-year score that reflects the gain one would expect to see for a “typical” student, based on a given start-of-year score. Mentees who appear in the lightly shaded gold area between the gold and red lines had reading scores that increased, but did not increase as much as would be anticipated for an average student during this time period.

The Large Mentee Gains Would Likely Be Even Greater if Compared to Similar Struggling Readers. The increase of 56% more than the expected gain in reading is even more substantial given mentees began the program reading at least one-half year below grade-level. One may anticipate that struggling early readers would show less growth in reading than the average student, yet Teen Trendsetters™ mentees showed more growth than would be expected – even for an average student who was reading at or above grade-level at the start of the year.
(3) **Catching Up.** The horizontal blue line corresponds to performance at the expected grade-level for students at the time of the end-of-year assessment. Mentees who appear in the lightly shaded blue area between the blue and gold lines had reading scores that *increased more than expected for a typical student.* As such, they are catching up with their classmates, but have not yet reached their grade-level in reading. Note that the shape of the blue “catching-up” zone highlights the challenge that many mentees face: The further a mentee began the year behind in reading, the larger the gain they needed in order to “catch-up” with their peers.

(4) **Caught Up.** Mentees who appear in the unshaded area above the blue line had reading scores that not only increased more than expected for the average student, but actually increased enough that the mentee was reading at or above grade-level at the time of the end-of-year assessment.
As reflected in Figure 6, 26% of first-grade mentees ended the year “caught up” and were reading at grade level. Beyond those now reading at grade level, a further 39% were “catching up”. Again, these mentees experienced greater-than-expected increases – the gains were just not sufficient to fully offset the degree to which they started the year behind in reading. In this regard, particular attention should be paid to the group of mentees in the upper-left section of the blue “catching-up” zone: These are mentees who started the year particularly far below grade level and have made gains that are considerably greater than expected for typical students. While not yet reading at grade-level, Figure 6 suggests that with continued support they may be well on their way to meeting this goal in the future.

In addition, 22% of mentees enrolled in first grade showed a gain in GLE scores, but less than the expected gain for an average student (see the light-gold shaded area in Figure 6). These are perhaps the most difficult cases to interpret as it must be remembered that this may be more gain than expected for higher-risk students who began the year reading well-below grade-level. Finally, 13% of mentees showed no gain or a decline in GLE scores (see the light-red shaded area in Figure 6). Note that most of the mentees in this last group had GLE scores that reflected floor-effects – their start- and end-of-year assessments were at or below the minimum value for GLE scores. Consequently, these mentees may have shown actual gains, but simply began and ended the year outside of a range than can be reliably described in terms of grade-level equivalent scores.

**Second-Grade Mentees.** A similar pattern was seen when focusing on mentees in second grade. Figure 7 plots start- and end-of-year GLE scores for mentees in second grade, along with the four “progress groups” previously defined. Among mentees enrolled in second grade, 22% were “caught up” and reading at grade-level by the end-of-year assessment (see the unshaded zone). An additional 44% were “catching up” and showing greater-than-expected increases that were nevertheless not large enough to completely close the gap (see light-blue area). Finally, 26% of mentees enrolled in second grade showed a gain in GLE scores, but less than the expected gain for an average student (see the light-yellow area), while a total of 8% showed no gain or a decline in reading GLE scores (see the light-red shaded area).
Third-Grade Mentees. Finally, while overall gains were observed among third grade mentees, the general pattern was less strong (see Figure 8). Specifically, among the third-grade mentees, 6% were “caught up” and reading at grade-level at the time of the end-of-year assessment, with 42% “catching up” with greater-than-expected increases. Similarly, 44% showed an increase that was less than the expected gain for a “typical” student, while a total of 8% showed no gain or a decline.

ADDITIONAL IMPRESSIONS OF IMPACT

Beyond performance on standardized tests, in their end-of-year surveys, nearly all parents reported that their child’s reading had improved “a lot” (44%) or “some” (42%) during the year, and that their child’s self-confidence had similarly improved “a lot” (46%) or “some” (42%).
This is particularly noteworthy given the relatively modest intensity of the actual intervention (i.e., a mean of 14.8 hours of mentoring sessions).

Data from mentee surveys also suggest that they benefited from social, emotional, and academic opportunities provided through the program. For example, 86% of mentees reported that their mentor made them feel important, and 83% stated that their mentor helped them learn new things – with 91% specifically indicating that they felt their mentor helped them improve their reading skills. At the end of the year, 94% of mentees reported that they enjoyed being in Teen Trendsetters™, and 81% reported that they enjoyed reading.
FACTORS RELATED TO GROWTH IN MENTEE READING

While analyses were able to document statistically significant and meaningful increases in mentee reading skills, there nevertheless remained considerable variability in the degree to which individual children benefited and grew: Some children experienced particularly dramatic growth in reading levels, while others did not. Therefore, in order to gain insight into those differences, a series of HLM analyses examined possible student and program factors that may further impact program effects. For example, are the increases greater in mentees who started the year particularly far below grade-level? Are there characteristics of some programs that may lead to larger growth in their mentees? Such information may help identify strategies that can further strengthen the impact of the program on mentee learning.

Not surprisingly, when focusing on an outcome such as student learning, two-thirds of the variability in performance (67%) was related to student-to-student variability, while one-third (33%) was related to program-to-program variability. This suggests that factors related to mentees and mentee characteristics may be having the greater impact on why some students showed more growth than others. Nevertheless, the large degree of variability at the program-level suggests that school-to-school differences in the design or nature of the implementation of the program may also play a meaningful role in maximizing student growth.

IMPACT OF LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION ON GROWTH IN READING SKILLS

These analyses first examined whether the degree to which a mentee’s reading skills increased was influenced by the degree of his or her participation in Teen Trendsetters™.

Number of Mentoring Sessions. An initial simple regression (not adjusting for program-level variability) found that all mentees, on average, experienced a gain of 0.71 GLEs (slightly more than the expected gain for a typical student over the same time period), but then also experienced an addition gain of .022 GLEs on average for each mentoring session ($b=0.02$, $t(802)=3.031$, $p=0.003$). This general pattern continued to be present in HLM analyses ($\gamma=0.02$, $t(700.8)=1.721$, $p=0.086$), although the effect was only marginally statistically significant after controlling for program-to-program variation. The benefit obtained from a higher number of sessions was most apparent (and statistically significant) when comparing those mentees who
received 16 or more sessions with those who received fewer than 16 sessions ($\gamma=0.16$, $t(778.4)=2.180$, $p=0.030$). Specifically, after adjusting for program-to-program variability, those mentees who took part in fewer than 16 sessions experienced an average gain of 1.01 GLEs, while those who took part in 16 or more sessions experienced an average gain of 1.17 GLEs.

**Time in the Teen Trendsetters™ Program.** Analyses also considered the length of time in which a mentee was engaged in the program\(^3\). Both a linear ($\gamma=0.04$, $t(464.5)=2.100$, $p=0.036$) and a curvilinear (i.e., quadratic: $\gamma=0.01$, $t(339.0)=2.142$, $p=0.033$) effect for time in the program was observed. On average, the longer a mentee was engaged in Teen Trendsetters™ (i.e., time between their first and last mentoring session), the larger the gain that was observed for that mentee – with the size of that weekly gain itself getting larger over time.

For example, as illustrated in Figure 9, the estimated gain for 21 weeks of participation (approximately 2 weeks below average) was 0.92 GLEs, while the estimated gain for 22 weeks participation was 0.99 GLEs – a weekly gain of .07 GLEs. However, the estimated gain for 24 weeks was 1.19 GLEs, while the estimated gain for 25 weeks was 1.32 GLEs – a weekly gain of .13 GLEs.

When number of sessions (i.e., 16 or more vs. less than 16) and time in the program were analyzed together, the results suggested that both were having a significant, unique role in influencing mentee reading gains (Time: $\gamma=0.09$, $t(204.4)=2.754$, $p=0.006$, Quadratic time: $\gamma=0.01$, $t(342.1)=2.157$, $p=0.032$, Sixteen or more sessions: $\gamma=0.14$, $t(771.9)=1.893$, $p=0.059$). In essence, mentees benefit from both more sessions, and more time in the program regardless of the number of sessions. One possible interpretation of the latter effect is that it is the result of other more fundamental changes occurring within the mentee and his or her family. For example, if a mentee enjoyed reading and began reading more at home with his or her parent(s), he or she may experience additional reading gains beyond the effect of the mentoring sessions alone. This would be consistent with qualitative feedback provided by both mentees and their parents.

\(^3\) Time was number of weeks between the first and last session a mentee experienced, centered on the grand mean of 22.9 weeks.
IMPACT OF MENTEE CHARACTERISTICS ON GROWTH IN READING SKILLS

Additional analyses examined various mentee characteristics in order to determine whether the gains in reading skills varied for different subgroups of students.

**Baseline Reading Skills.** Analyses found larger gains for mentees who started the year further behind the expected level given their grade in school (γ=-0.17, t(775.1)=-3.266, p=0.001). Specifically, for each GLE a student was below his or her expected level at the start of the year, reading gains following participation in Teen
Trendsetters™ increased by 0.17 GLEs. This suggests that Teen Trendsetters™ may be having the largest impact on those who are most in need. However, it should be noted that additional analyses not reported in detail here also suggest that this pattern may not apply to some cases who started the year extremely far behind due to floor effects in GLE scores.

**Grade in School.** Analyses also found that gains in reading skills varied by mentee grade-level \( (F(2, 685.5) = 6.505, p = 0.002) \). Adjusting for program-to-program variability, the largest gains were seen among first grade mentees (1.28 GLE gain). On average, both second-grade \( (\gamma = -0.28, t(693.9) = -3.160, p = 0.002) \) and third-grade mentees \( (\gamma = -0.32, t(628.3) = -3.165, p = 0.002) \) experienced significantly smaller gains than first-grade mentees. This suggests that Teen Trendsetters™ may be particularly beneficial for younger students.

**Mentee Sex.** In addition, a marginally significant difference was observed based on mentee sex \( (\gamma = -0.10, t(767.0) = -1.805, p = 0.071) \). This suggested that on average, male mentees may have experienced a 0.10 GLE smaller gain – adjusting for program-to-program variability – than female mentees. However, it must be noted that this pattern was not statistically significant \( (p = .07) \).

**Mentee Race/Ethnicity.** Finally, adjusting for program-to-program variability, no race/ethnic differences were found in the overall reading gains \( (F(5, 779.4) = 0.781, p = 0.563) \). This suggests that the program effects are *equitable*, meaning that all students benefit to the same approximate degree.

Nevertheless, it is worth noting one interesting – and potentially important – pattern observed in the data: An initial simple multiple regression analysis that did not control for program-to-program variability suggested that Hispanic mentees may have benefited more from Teen Trendsetters™ than children of other ethnic backgrounds \( (b = 0.27, t(802) = 4.356, p < .001) \). However, this effect completely disappeared in the HLM models after controlling for program-to-program variability \( (\gamma = 0.00, t(800.0) = 0.017, p = 0.987) \). It must be emphasized that this does not mean the program had no benefit for Hispanic mentees – in fact, Hispanic mentees did experience large gains. Instead, this set of analyses suggests that Hispanic mentees may have been disproportionately enrolled in particularly strong programs where *all* mentees benefited due to a large program-level effect. Consequently, it is not a question of why Hispanic mentees
benefited more than others; it is a question of *what is it about the programs in which these mentees were enrolled that made the program so effective?*

**Program Factors Related to Growth**

In addition to considering mentee characteristics, a separate series of HLM analyses found several program-level features that were related to growth in mentee reading skills. Three program characteristics were found to be related to *larger* reading gains.

- **Younger mentees (i.e., first-grade students).** Specifically, programs that served a larger percentage of first-grade mentees reported greater gains in reading skills ($\gamma=0.004$, $t(39.9)=2.078$, $p=0.044$).

- **Lower average start-of-year reading scores.** Larger gains were seen in those programs in which the average start-of-year performance was relatively further below expected levels given the grade-level of mentees ($\gamma=-0.50$, $t(39.9)=-2.999$, $p=0.005$).

- **Larger enrollment by Hispanic mentees.** Program having a larger percentage of mentees identified as Hispanic also reported larger gains in reading skills ($\gamma=0.01$, $t(40.2)=3.873$, $p<.001$).

It should be noted that these three program-level effects have now been observed across multiple years, lending further credibility to those effects. The finding that effects may be greatest in programs that enroll more at-risk, younger students is consistent with the mission and vision of the Teen Trendsetters™ program. Future efforts should continue targeting younger mentees who are the most delayed in their reading skills. The finding that larger gains were also seen in programs with larger Hispanic enrollment is intriguing. While the exact mechanism behind this effect is unclear, data from the current year suggests that it may reflect particularly effective program leadership and initiative in the subset of schools that also happen to enroll large numbers of Hispanic students.

No other program characteristics were found to be related to growth in reading performance. This included the meeting time (i.e., before, during, after school ($F(2, 22.2)=2.670$, $p=0.091$), the number of days mentoring sessions were held each week ($\gamma=-0.46$, $t(22.2)=-1.042$, $p=0.309$), the mean size of the program ($\gamma=0.01$, $t(37.7)=0.628$, $p=0.534$), the total number of sessions held in
the program ($\gamma = 0.04, t(39.2) = 1.435, p = 0.159$) and the gender composition of the program ($\gamma = -0.01, t(39.7) = -1.330, p = 0.191$).
REVIEW OF ANNUAL GOALS

As reflected throughout this report, the Florida Teen Trendsetters™ program met – and in some cases far exceeded – all but one of the annual goals for 2019-2020. Success in meeting specific benchmarks is summarized below:

65 Programs Recruited. Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, 83 programs were recruited in Florida. This exceeds the target of a 65 programs by 28%. Programs were based in 13 counties throughout Florida, from Miami-Dade in the south to Alachua in northern Florida.

1000 Mentors Trained. With 1571 active mentors taking part in the program between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, the end-of-year goal of training 1000 mentors was exceeded by 57%.

1000 Mentees Served. Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, a total of 1440 mentees took part in one or more mentoring session. This exceeds the end-of-year goal of 1000 mentees served by 44%.

15,750 Mentoring Sessions Held. Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, mentees took part in a total of 21,341 mentoring sessions for an average of 14.8 hours per mentee. This exceeds the goal of 15,570 mentoring sessions by 35%.

65 Advisors Trained. Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, 58 advisors received training for the Teen Trendsetters™ program. With a target of 65 advisors trained, this was the one goal not met. However, as previously noted, the large number of mentors and mentees engaged across the in the 67 active programs more than offset this.

Significant Reading Gains. Finally, it is worth reiterating that mentee reading skills increased by an average of 1.06 grade-levels, which is 56% more growth than would be expected for an average student during this time period.
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Data collected throughout the 2019-2020 academic year clearly suggest that the Florida Teen Trendsetters™ program had a significant and meaningful impact on at-risk 1st through 3rd grade students. These gains are helping many mentees begin to catch-up with their peers, with more students reading at grade level following participation in the program. Follow-up analyses found two student characteristics that were related to larger reading gains among mentees:

(1) Larger gains were observed among students who began the year further below their expected level, suggesting that Teen Trendsetters™ may be having the largest impact on those who are most in need.

(2) First-grade mentees were found to have larger gains than second- or third-grade mentees, suggesting that Teen Trendsetters™ may be particularly beneficial for younger students.

In addition, three program characteristics were found to be related to larger reading gains.

(1) Programs that served a larger percentage of first-grade mentees reported greater gains in reading skills.

(2) Larger gains were seen in those programs in which the average start-of-year performance was relatively further below expected levels.

(3) Programs having a larger percentage of mentees identified as Hispanic reported larger gains in reading skills.

All five of these are consistent with evaluation results from prior years, suggesting that these findings are fairly robust.

Going forward, results from this evaluation are positive and should be seen as highly encouraging of the impact and value of the Teen Trendsetters™ program in Florida. Therefore, as program planning for future years continues, the following suggestions are proffered as ways...
to further inform and strengthen Teen Trendsetters™ activities and future evaluations documenting program effectiveness.

**Continued Development and Monitoring of Parent Guides.** Based on qualitative data, the Parent Guides appear to be playing a valuable role with mentees and their families. Questions remain as to the best strategies for (1) ensuring the Parent Guides are brought home, (2) encouraging the subset of parents who do not use the guides to start doing so, and (3) collecting some type of follow-up confirmation from the parent. Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy personnel and program advisors may wish to discuss strategies for addressing these three points, including some of the proposals noted in the body of this report, as well as others.

**Continued Expansion and Development of Mentor Support Documents.** In general, impressions of the Mentor Guide were positive, and both mentors and advisors reported that it was an effective tool that helped mentors prepare and plan for their sessions. Based on feedback by both mentors and program advisors, the continued expansion of support material for mentors would be helpful. This includes strategies for sustaining mentee engagement, additional activities related to the readings, and worksheets or informal assessments as a way of confirming mentee’s understanding of the material.

**Collection of Additional Data from Advisors.** While data clearly support the view that the Teen Trendsetters™ program is helping many children significantly improve their reading skills, there nevertheless continues to be considerable child-to-child and program-to-program variability in how much individual mentees benefit. Identifying and understanding why some children showed dramatic improvements while others showed less growth would be extremely valuable in future planning.

To do so, Florida Teen Trendsetters™ programs could collect additional identifiable data regarding mentees and mentors directly from program advisors. This might include information beyond student characteristics and participation levels, such as impressions of engagement, attention, interest, and other factors that may influence how much a mentee benefits. This information may provide significant insight into how the program is helping children and what future changes can be made to further broaden and strengthen its impact. Data could include:
- Advisor impressions of individual mentee engagement, interest, and strengths or challenges that may influence their participation and learning.
- Advisor impressions of individual mentor engagement, interest, and other factors that may influence their participation and relationship with their mentee.
- Advisor reports linking specific mentors with their mentees. This would make it possible to examine mentor characteristics (e.g., attendance) that may influence mentee interest and growth.

**Additional Data on Programs and Program Advisors.** This same reasoning can be applied to overall program activities and operations. This might include changing or expanding the advisor start- and end-of-year surveys to cover more personal, program, and school information. It might also include new surveys that are completed by Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy personnel in which they report on their own impressions of the interest, engagement, and activities of advisors and programs with which they work.

**Continued Movement to a Common Set of Reading Assessments.** Given that the choice of assessment instrument is made by individual school districts, the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy has no direct ability to influence which assessment instruments are used. Nevertheless, the more programs that share a common set of instruments and report using a common scale (e.g., grade level equivalent scores), the greater the ability to evaluate the impact of the Teen Trendsetters™ program on reading outcomes. This is particularly true if one is attempting to understand why some students show more or less gains than others. Continued movement towards common assessment instruments, or at least a common scale, should be encouraged whenever possible.

**A Mentee Comparison Group.** Nearly all children will show some degree of growth in reading skills over time. This inevitably raises the question of the degree to which observed growth is greater than what would be expected if a mentee did not take part in Teen Trendsetters™. Furthermore, given mentees were specifically chosen because they were struggling readers, their expected growth is likely less than the expected growth of an average student. Consequently, even if a mentee shows less than expected growth, it may still be more than would be seen had they not taken part in the program. To more accurately determine the degree to which children
are benefiting from Teen Trendsetters™, a comparison group of similar children who do not receive the intervention would be invaluable. The growth observed in the comparison group – which could be anonymous – would arguably reflect the growth one may have expected to see in the mentees had they not taken part in the program. This would significantly enhance the strength of the findings. **In fact, from an evaluation perspective, this may be the single most significant addition that could be made to future program cycles.**

**Long-Term Follow-Up.** Finally, working with the Florida Department of Education, it should be possible to follow these and previous Teen Trendsetters™ mentees into middle- and upper-elementary grades and beyond. This would provide an opportunity to assess long-term outcomes by leveraging existing state assessment data. Documenting long-term trends and maintenance of gains achieved through participation in Teen Trendsetters™ would provide powerful evidence of the impact of the program.
APPENDIX – DISTRICT SUMMARIES
Table A.1. Mentee Demographics by District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Mentees</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Multi-Ethnic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.2. Mentee Demographics by District (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Mentees</th>
<th>Start of Year Reading (Years Below Grade Level)</th>
<th>1.0 up to 1.5</th>
<th>1.5 up to 2.0</th>
<th>2.0+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.3. Mentee Participation and Outcomes by District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Mentees</th>
<th>Mean Mentoring Sessions</th>
<th>GLE Gain</th>
<th>Reading Gain Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.4. Mentor Demographics by District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Mentors</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Multi-Ethnic Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.5. Mentor Demographics and Participation by District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Mentors</th>
<th>6th Grade</th>
<th>7th Grade</th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
<th>9th Grade</th>
<th>10th Grade</th>
<th>11th Grade</th>
<th>12th Grade</th>
<th>Mean Mentoring Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>