

**Mentoring by Geographic Area in the
State of Michigan:
Results from the Mentor Michigan
Census, Wave II**

Kahle Research Solutions Inc.
(248) 541-6200
RWKahle@KahleResearch.com

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

Introduction

- The following is a brief summary of results of the Mentor Michigan Census (MMC), Wave II broken down by geographic area. Data referenced in this are shown on the attached data tables. Further information is included in the Executive Summary, the Frequently Asked Questions document or is available from Kahle Research Solutions. Detailed cross-tabulations are on file with both the Michigan Community Service Commission and Kahle Research Solutions.
- It is important to note that organizations have been placed in geographic groupings based on the main location of the mentoring organization. Some organizations serve youth only within their home county, while others serve multiple counties. Not all geographic groupings are mutually exclusive. As a result, percentages shown can be read only as a percent of the column (reading down), not across. The counties that comprise each of the larger regional geographic areas are listed in Table 1.
- As the geographic data was collected differently in Waves I and II, comparison of Wave I and II data at the regional level is not recommended. State totals can be compared.
- Sample sizes for the various geographic regions are sometimes quite small. Care should be used when making comparisons across regions. Differences by regions need to be quite large for the data to truly represent substantive differences rather than random statistical variation.

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

Funnel Measures (see Table 2)

- Forty-five mentoring organizations responded to Wave II from Southeast Michigan. This is the largest number of mentoring organizations in any single geographic area. Of the 45 organizations serving clients in Southeast Michigan, 35 of these are within the Tri-County (Wayne, Oakland and Macomb) area. The other geographic areas and number of organizations responding:
 - Grand Rapids/Muskegon: 30
 - Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula: 18
 - Mid-Michigan: 16
 - Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area: 15
 - Southwest Michigan: 12

- Of the total 27,090 Michigan children served by mentoring organizations in 2004 (full year), the largest proportion is in Southeast Michigan (7,972, of these 4,148 are within the Tri-County area), followed by Grand Rapids/Muskegon, Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula and Mid-Michigan, all with more than 4,000 youth served in 2004. Yet, while the counties of Wayne, Oakland and Macomb represent approximately 40% of the state's total population, this area represents only about 15% of the mentoring relationships in 2004.

- Organizations serving Southeast Michigan have the largest number of active mentors (as of Feb. 28, 2005) in the state at 3,751, with 1,624 of those active in the Tri-County area. Organizations serving Southwest Michigan report the smallest number (990) of active mentors. All other areas report more than 1000 active mentors as of early 2005. Of the total number of active mentors as of February 26, 2005 (10,546) the Tri-County area represents only about 15% of the total.

- Comparing 2004 to 2003, organizations serving the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area have shown the largest net growth in the number of mentor/youth matches (1,267). The only area showing a decline is Mid-Michigan (-329). Growth is reported in Southeast Michigan (almost 600 matches), with about half of this coming from the Tri-County area.

- State mentoring organizations report that there were more than 9,975 inquiries received in 2004 (full year) regarding becoming a mentor. Organizations serving Southeast Michigan report the largest number of inquiries (3,026), followed by those serving Mid-Michigan (1,749). Organizations serving Southwest Michigan report the smallest number of inquiries at 1,108.

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

- There were a total of 6,249 written applications to become a mentor received by state organizations in 2004 (full year). The largest number (2,944) are from organizations serving Southeast Michigan. Yet again, the proportion is smaller than the proportion of the state's population. The Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area shows a disproportionately large number of inquiries and applications. Similarly, compared to its population base, Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula has relatively large numbers of inquiries and new applications.

Demographic Profile (see Table 3)

Mentors

- Sixty-eight percent of the state's mentors are women. The percentage of women mentors is highest in organizations serving the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area (75%) and Southwest Michigan (85%). Men are under-represented as mentors in every geographic area of the state.
- The age of mentors varies greatly by geographic area. Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula has the highest percentage of mentors less than age 18 (28%). Southwest Michigan has a large 55 plus population working as mentors (51%). Grand Rapid/Muskegon also has a large 65 plus population of mentors. Strong Foster Grandparent programs in these areas are likely driving the large proportion of senior mentors, while peer and/or team mentoring cause the relatively high proportion of younger mentors in several of the regional areas.
- Michigan mentoring organizations report that their mentors are mostly Caucasian (78%), with the highest percentage of Caucasian mentors (97%) serving Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula. African-Americans serve as mentors most often in the Tri-County (40%) and Flint/Saginaw/Bay Areas (38%). Substantial numbers of Hispanic mentors are found in Southwest Michigan, Grand Rapid/Muskegon and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area. Only in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula do we find significant numbers of Native American mentors.

Children Served

- In total, organizations report the children they serve are about equally split between males than females. In both Mid-Michigan and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area, more boys than girls are served (57% and 58% respectively). Other areas of the state, however, continue to serve more females than males, just as they did in Wave I.

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

- Like the mentors who befriend them, children served across the state are most often Caucasian (57%). The percentage of Caucasian children served is highest in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula (93%) and Southwest Michigan (77%). The percentage of Caucasian children being served is lowest in the Tri-County (26%), Grand Rapids/Muskegon (36%), and Flint/Saginaw/Bay Areas (46%). In these areas, more African-American children are served. In the Tri-County area and Flint/Saginaw/Muskegon, the majority of youth served are African-American. Five percent of the children serviced in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula are Native American.
- Most children served by mentors are in the 6-11 or 12-14 age categories. This is especially true in the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area where the proportion of younger children served is highest. The Tri-County area serves more children age 15-18 than anywhere else in the state (45%).

Site of Organization and Mentoring Type (see Table 4)

- Throughout the state, more than 66% of mentoring matches are defined by reporting organizations as one mentor to one mentee, with comparatively fewer group (13%), peer (7%) and team (13%) mentoring programs being reported. This holds true through each geographic breakdown, with the exception of Southeast Michigan and the Tri-County area. Programs serving children in these areas report much more diversification in the type of programs offered, with group and team mentoring being the next most common types.
- In Michigan, 63% of mentoring organizations are housed within non-profits. This holds true with each geographic area, ranging from a high of 71% serving Southeast Michigan and the Tri-County area to a low of 53% serving Grand Rapids/Muskegon and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area. Schools are the second most common type of mentoring organization (13% state-wide), with the highest number of those (33%) serving Southwest Michigan. None of the reporting organizations serving the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area claim to be a school-based organization. Twenty-two percent of the organizations serving Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula report being government-based, compared to a state-wide average of only 10%.

Screening, Capacity and Cost per Match (see Table 5)

- Five percent of the total 6,382 potential mentors screened in Michigan during 2004 were disqualified. Southwest Michigan reports the highest percentage of mentors disqualified during this time period (15% of 354 screened). Most other areas report between two and seven percent of potential mentors being disqualified due to information uncovered during the background checking process.

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

- In aggregate, mentoring organizations report a total annual match capacity of 25,060. The largest capacities are in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula (8,351) and Southeast Michigan (7,343). Southwest Michigan reports the smallest match capacity of 831.
- The mean annual cost per match for all mentoring organizations reporting is \$1,542. This ranges from a high of \$2,496 in the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area to a low of \$658 in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula.

Barriers to Mentoring Growth (see Table 6)

- “Too few male mentors” is the most commonly cited barrier to creating more matches throughout the state. This holds true for every geographic area. Other common barriers include:
 - Lack of staff to support recruitment
 - Too few minority mentors (African-American in the Tri-County and Flint/Saginaw/Bay Areas, Hispanic in Southwest Michigan and Native American in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula)
 - Lack of staff to supervise matches
- To a lesser extent, organizations cite these barriers to creating successful matches:
 - Too few female mentors
 - Potential mentors do not follow-up
 - Lack of staff to support mentor training
 - Mentors don’t commit to minimum time requirements
- Few organizations list problems with conducting background checks as barriers to successful matches.

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

Inquiry to Match: Time and Needs (see Table 7)

- Most mentoring organizations report that their matches are completed within 8 to 60 days from potential mentor inquiry. Those in Mid-Michigan report most of their matches are completed within 30 days.
- Recruiting more male mentors is the item most often cited by these mentoring organizations as the factor that would reduce the time between mentor inquiry and match. This holds true across all geographical areas. Other factors that would assist in this area include:
 - Central, affordable background checking and screening support
 - More minority mentors (African-American in Mid-Michigan, Southwest Michigan, Southeast Michigan and the Tri-County area; Hispanic and Native American in Southwest Michigan)

Reasons for No Matches, Match Criteria, Liability (see Table 8)

- According to mentoring organizations across all geographic areas, the top reason potential mentors do not get matched is that they fail to submit an application.
- Time availability and scheduling are the top criteria required by these mentoring organizations. Other common criteria include:
 - Mentor and youth are the same gender
 - Common interests between mentor and youth
 - Mentor and youth living in the same geographic area
- Very few mentoring organizations require that the mentor and youth be of the same race.
- Most mentoring organizations report that concerns about liability do not prevent them from completing matches.

Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II

Mentor Michigan: Satisfaction and Services Used (see Table 9)

- Forty percent of mentoring organizations report being “very satisfied” with Mentor Michigan, with 38% “somewhat satisfied.” This satisfaction level is generally consistent across geographic areas. Only 1% of organizations report being “not at all satisfied” with Mentor Michigan.
- Ninety percent of all mentoring organizations report having been touched by Mentor Michigan in some way. Electronic resources are the most widely used. Thirty-six percent report having attended a regional meeting, and 57% report hearing First Gentleman Mulhern speak.
- Building awareness through marketing, enhanced linkages and support for recruitment are the most frequently mentioned perceived benefits of Mentor Michigan. Mid-Michigan stands out with 56% of its organizations choosing “None of the above” on a list of Mentor Michigan Initiatives/Resources Used.
- Satisfaction with Mentor Michigan is relatively lower in Mid-Michigan, the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area and Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula. Mid-Michigan reports the highest percentage of organizations indicating that they have not benefited from Mentor Michigan services and also the highest percentage indicating that they have not participated in Mentor Michigan sponsored activities.

**Table 1
Geographic Areas by County**

Geographic Area	Counties Included:
Tri-County	Macomb, Oakland, Wayne
SE MI	Lapeer, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, Wayne
SW MI	Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Cass, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph, Van Buren
Mid-Mich	Branch, Calhoun, Eaton, Hillsdale, Ingham, Jackson, Lenawee
GR/Musk	Clinton, Gratiot, Ionia, Kent, Mecosta, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newago, Oceana, Ottawa
Flint/Sag/Bay Area	Bay, Genesee, Huron, Isabella, Midland, Saginaw, Sanilac, Shiawasee, Tuscola
Northern/UP	Alcona, Alger, Alpena, Antrim, Arenac, Baraga, Benzie, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Clare, Crawford, Delta, Dickinson, Emmet, Gladwill, Gogebec, Grand Traverse, Houghton, Iosco, Iron, Kalkaska, Keweenaw, Lake, Leelenau, Luce, Mackinac, Manistee, Marquette, Mason, Menominee, Misauke, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Ontonagon, Osceola, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Ilse, Roscommon, Schoolcraft, Wexford

**Table 2
Funnel Measures Summary Table
Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid- Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
17	2004 - # of inquiries to be a mentor	9,975	2,599	3,026	1,108	1,749	1,041	1,717	1,334
18	2004 - # written applications to be a mentor	6,249	1,473	2,944	616	906	768	117	898
17	Jan/Feb 2005 - # of inquiries to be a mentor	3,903	1,037	1,277	272	625	426	1,054	249
18	Jan/Feb 2005 - # written apps. to be mentor	1,852	692	868	117	423	230	54	160
19	Youth Served (2004 Full Year)								
	Total	27,090	4,158	7,972	1,692	4,397	5,065	3,509	4,455
	Mean per Organization	133.4	99	139.9	89.1	125.6	123.5	152.6	159.1
27	Background Check - [M.R.]								
	State Criminal Background Check	79%	71%	72%	85%	76%	81%	83%	88%
	Federal Criminal Background Check	29	29	29	30	41	33	25	9
	Sex Offender Registry	64	57	57	65	54	65	88	75
	Child Abuse Registry	48	63	53	60	22	46	58	56
	Drive record/license	60	55	56	60	65	58	71	56
	Personal character reference	81	84	76	85	97	60	88	94
	Employment reference	33	47	35	25	57	35	21	16
	Credit check	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Written application	84	82	79	85	86	79	92	91
	Personal interview	87	90	76	95	97	79	96	100
	Home visit	9	4	7	0	11	6	13	16
	Home Assessment**	12	10	11	20	22	6	8	13
	None of the above	6	2	10	5	0	10	4	0

**Table 2
Funnel Measures Summary Table
Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid- Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
26	Total number of matches								
	Percent of organizations reporting an increase	40%	45%	44%	35%	41%	35%	50%	34%
	Percent of organizations reporting a decrease	12	6	6	5	24	8	21	19
	Percent of organizations reporting no change	25	43	33	30	16	25	21	19
	Don't Know	22	6	17	30	19	31	8	28
	Increased #	3,282	378	774	274	228	412	1,338	256
	Decreased #	1,066	96	175	2	557	88	71	173
	Net Change #	2,216	282	599	272	-329	324	1,267	83
23	Total mentors in 2004	15,977	2,183	5,725	1,347	1,486	2,400	1,818	3,201
23	Active mentors as of February 28, 2005	10,546	1,624	3,751	990	1,110	1,342	1,320	2,033
24	2004 – Total mentors on waiting list	1,243	228	579	233	138	65	102	126
25	2004 – Total youth on waiting list	3,428	491	654	428	419	1,022	271	634
24	Jan-Feb, 2005 - Mentors on waiting list	1,059	238	567	127	142	44	61	118
25	Jan-Feb, 2005 – Youth on waiting list	2,988	486	592	372	363	902	168	591
31	Minimum time of mentor/youth match								
	No minimum	14%	12%	10%	5	14	15	38	9
	1-2 months	1	0	0	5	0	0	4	0
	3-5 months	15	20	17	15	19	13	8	13
	6-8 months	11	14	13	5	8	13	8	16
	9-11 months	22	14	19	15	41	13	13	31
	12 months	28	33	25	45	14	40	25	28
	More than 12 Months, less than 2 years	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0
	More than 2 years, less than 5 years	2	2	1	5	3	2	0	3
	Don't know	3	0	13	5	3	6	4	0

Table 2
Funnel Measures Summary Table
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid- Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
32	Average time for mentor/youth match								
	No minimum	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%
	1 – 2 months	2	6	4	0	3	0	4	0
	3 – 5 months	12	16	13	0	27	10	0	13
	6 – 8 months	9	10	11	0	5	10	4	13
	9 – 11 months	17	20	17	10	11	19	38	9
	12 months	10	18	14	10	8	13	13	0
	More than 12 months, less than 2 years	12	10	13	20	8	8	8	16
	More than 2 years, less than 5 years	15	6	6	20	8	21	17	31
	More than 5 years	3	2	1	5	3	4	4	3
	Don't know	19	8	21	35	27	10	13	16
33	Minimum time per week for mentor/youth match								
	No minimum	13%	12%	17%	5%	8%	15%	13%	16%
	1 hour / week	42	51	38	65	43	29	29	66
	2 hours / week	15	12	14	5	19	17	17	13
	3 hours / week	9	10	8	5	5	19	8	3
	4 hours / week	2	4	3	5	3	0	0	0
	5 hours / week	2	4	3	0	3	0	0	3
	6 hours / week	2	0	1	0	0	4	4	0
	More than 6 hours / week	9	4	3	10	16	6	29	0
	Don't know	7	2	14	5	3	10	0	0
30	Number of hours in-person training for mentors								
	None	5%	4%	3%	15%	3%	6%	4%	3%
	Less than 1 hour	6	2	6	15	8	6	0	3
	1 – 2 hours	20	16	13	15	27	25	8	34
	2 – 4 hours	28	41	39	30	27	10	17	41
	4 – 6 hours	7	8	6	0	16	6	13	3
	6 – 8 hours	11	12	8	0	5	25	13	6
	9 or more hours	15	16	14	20	3	13	46	9
	Don't know	8	0	13	5	11	8	0	0

Table 2
Funnel Measures Summary Table
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

**Table 3
Demographic Profile Table
Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
34	Mentor Gender								
	Males	32%	38%	34%	15%	35%	33%	25%	33%
	Females	68	62	66	85	65	67	75	67
35	Mentor Age								
	< 18	20%	20%	21%	3%	21%	3%	16%	28%
	18 – 25	39	10	43	15	29	36	28	48
	26 – 35	14	25	12	8	12	11	30	13
	36 – 45	9	21	11	15	13	9	8	4
	46 – 55	6	14	7	9	10	5	5	4
	56 – 65	4	7	4	22	4	5	3	2
	65 +	7	2	1	29	12	31	10	1
36	Mentor Race								
	Caucasian	78%	54%	70%	69%	86%	77%	58%	97%
	African-American	16	40	21	26	11	15	38	<1
	Hispanic	2	1	1	4	1	5	4	<1
	Native American	1	<1	<1	1	<1	1	<1	3
	Asian-American	2	1	5	0	1	1	<1	<1
	Arab-American	<1	2	1	0	<1	0	0	0
	Other	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0

**Table 3
Demographic Profile Table
Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
37	Youth Served Gender								
	Males	51%	47%	48%	42%	57%	49%	58%	44%
	Females	49	53	52	58	43	51	42	56
38	Youth Served Age								
	< 5	4%	1%	2%	11%	1%	2%	7%	7%
	6 – 11	59	26	52	41	63	43	85	54
	12 – 14	17	26	18	31	11	24	3	23
	15 – 18	20	45	27	13	26	28	4	15
	19 – 21	19	2	1	0	0	2	1	<1
	22 – 25	<1	0	0	<1	0	0	<1	0
26 +	<1	<1	<1	2	0	1	<1	0	
39	Youth Served Race								
	Caucasian	57%	26%	40%	77%	51%	36%	46%	93%
	African-American	36	64	50	16	39	46	51	1
	Hispanic	4	5	4	5	4	17	3	1
	Native American	1	<1	<1	1	0	0	<1	5
	Asian-American	<1	<1	1	0	<1	<1	0	<1
	Arab-American	1	2	1	0	<1	<1	0	0
Other	1	2	3	1	5	<1	0	0	

Table 4
Site of Organization and Mentoring Type
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total 2004	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
13	Site of Organization								
	School	13%	9%	7%	33%	19%	17%	0%	11%
	Nonprofit	63	71	71	67	63	53	53	67
	Faith-based organization	5	3	2	0	0	17	7	0
	Business	2	6	4	0	0	3	0	0
	Government	10	11	13	0	6	0	13	22
	Higher Education Institute	4	0	2	0	6	7	7	0
	Other	4	0	0	0	6	3	20	0
22	Mentoring Type								
	One to One	66%	53%	58%	95%	65%	69%	66%	69%
	Group	13	7	7	5	24	17	23	6
	Peer	7	13	17	<1	1	5	0	7
	Team	13	27	18	0	6	9	11	18
	E-mentoring	1	<1	<1	0	5	0	0	0

Table 5
Screening, Capacity and Cost per Match
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
	1/1 – 12/31/04, potential mentors...								
28	Total Screened	6,382	1,552	3,134	354	1,064	651	92	1,087
29	Total Disqualified	341	110	171	54	20	44	4	48
	% Disqualified	5%	7%	5%	15%	2%	7%	4%	4%
	1/1/ - 2/28/05, potential mentors...								
28	Total Screened	2,121	621	983	155	214	397	50	322
29	Total Disqualified	93	45	56	9	4	18	4	2
	% Disqualified	4%	7%	6%	6%	2%	5%	8%	1%
40	Total annual match capacity	25,060	4,692	7,343	831	1,313	3,138	4,084	8,351
53	Annual cost per match (Mean)	\$1,542	\$1,626	\$1,401	\$606	\$1,328	\$2,127	\$2,496	\$658

Table 6
Barriers to Mentoring Growth
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri-County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
41	Major barriers to creating more matches								
	Too few male mentors	63%	57%	53%	75%	69%	60%	60%	78%
	Lack staff to support mentor recruitment	43	40	42	33	50	50	20	56
	Too few African-American mentors	36	49	40	58	50	33	20	17
	Lack staff to supervise matches	32	26	31	33	38	30	13	50
	Potential mentors do not follow-up	30	37	33	33	25	30	20	33
	Lack staff to support mentor training	23	20	24	17	19	27	20	22
	Mentors don't commit to min. time reqs.	23	23	20	25	25	30	20	17
	Too few female mentors	22	14	13	25	31	30	7	33
	Too few Hispanic mentors	18	14	13	50	19	20	7	11
	Lack staff to support mentor screening	16	14	18	17	19	17	13	11
	Mentors don't commit to min. duration	16	14	13	17	25	20	13	11
	Potential mentors don't attend req. trng.	13	17	18	8	13	13	0	11
	Too few Caucasian mentors	11	14	11	17	6	13	0	17
	Too few Native American mentors	11	6	7	25	0	10	7	28
	Staff can't follow-up on mentor inquiries	9	11	16	0	13	7	0	6
	Mentors won't work w/ children on list	7	14	13	0	0	10	0	6
	Background checks are cost prohibitive	7	11	9	0	6	7	0	11
	Too few Arab-American mentors	4	9	9	8	0	0	0	6
	Mentors won't give info for back. checks	4	6	7	0	0	0	13	0
	Mentors failing background checks	3	3	2	0	13	0	7	0
	Other	21	17	20	25	19	20	27	17
	No barriers	2	3	2	0	0	0	7	6
	Don't Know	7	0	2	8	13	10	13	6

**Table 7
Inquiry to Match: Time and Needs
Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri-County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
42	How long from potential mentor inquiry to match?								
	Less than seven days	10%	17%	13%	0%	0%	20%	0%	6%
	8 – 14 days	16	3	13	17	38	10	7	22
	15 – 30 days	24	23	22	25	25	20	33	22
	30 – 60 days	24	29	22	33	19	27	13	33
	60 – 90 days	4	6	4	8	0	0	7	6
	More than 90 days	3	3	4	0	13	0	0	0
	Do not track time from inquiry to match	20	20	20	17	6	23	40	11
43	Which would help reduce the time mentor waits from inquiry to match?								
	Recruit more male mentors	50%	51%	49%	50%	63%	37%	53%	61%
	Central, afford. bkgrnd chk/screen suprt	30	40	36	50	31	23	20	22
	Recruit more African-American mentors	27	37	31	33	50	23	13	11
	Mentors to wrk w/difficult, special youth	25	26	24	25	25	27	20	28
	Quicker parent follow-up	24	17	16	17	38	30	20	28
	Recruit more female mentors	23	23	20	17	25	27	13	33
	Shared/centralized mentor training	21	23	24	17	13	13	13	39
	Assistance w/ mentor follow-up	21	17	22	33	31	13	7	22
	Standard mentor training curriculum	20	20	22	17	6	13	20	39
	Mentors w/ similar interests as youth	18	17	13	17	6	30	27	17
	Quicker referring professional follow-up	18	11	11	33	6	23	13	28
	Recruit more Hispanic mentors	14	14	13	42	13	13	7	6
	Recruit more Caucasian mentors	11	9	7	8	13	17	7	17
	Recruit more Native American mentors	10	9	9	25	6	7	7	11
	Recruit more Arab-American mentors	4	9	9	0	6	0	0	6
	None of the above	11	9	9	17	6	17	13	6
	Other	12	6	11	17	6	7	13	22
	Don't Know	11	6	9	0	19	17	13	6

Table 8
Reasons for No matches, Match Criteria, Liability
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri-County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
44	Top reasons potential mentors do not get matched: Rank = 1								
	Pot. mentor does not submit application	29%	29%	24%	42%	6%	30%	33%	50%
	Declines after learning about intensity	15	17	18	17	19	13	13	6
	Declines after learning about duration	8	11	11	0	13	7	0	11
	Declines after lrng. youth needs.	5	3	4	0	19	3	0	6
	Declines after learning training require.	3	3	2	0	0	7	7	0
	Does not pass background check	1	3	2	0	0	0	7	0
	Has liability concerns	1	3	2	0	0	0	7	0
	None of the above	4	6	7	0	6	0	0	6
	Other	10	3	7	17	19	7	0	17
	Don't Know	24	23	22	25	19	33	33	6
45	Which criteria do you require for matching?								
	Time availability / schedule	57	60	60	50	69	53	47	56
	Mentor and youth same gender	42	46	47	42	31	43	40	39
	Common interests betw mentor/youth	35	29	24	50	38	40	33	44
	Live in same geographic area	26	23	18	17	44	20	13	56
	Mentor and youth same race	4	11	9	0	6	0	0	0
	Other	21	14	16	33	13	27	47	6
	Use no criteria for matching	10	9	7	8	6	13	13	11
46	How much do liability concerns prevent matches?								
	Liability concern major factor	4%	3%	4%	0%	0%	0%	7%	11%
	Liability concern minor factor	35	29	29	33	25	33	53	44
	Liability managed so not an issue	42	46	42	50	56	47	20	33
	Don't know	20	23	24	17	19	20	20	11

Table 9
Satisfaction with Mentor Michigan
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	136	35	45	12	16	30	15	18
55	MM services, resources, activities used since 9/1/04								
	Received email as part of "listserve"	74%	80%	78%	67%	63%	67%	87%	83%
	Visited MM Web site	74	80	78	83	56	67	80	78
	Heard FG Mulhern speak	57	57	53	50	56	57	67	61
	Attended MM-hosted training session	32	43	36	58	19	13	20	56
	Saw MM PSA on TV	29	40	33	33	19	20	27	39
	Partic. in Ntl. MM Month activity/progs	27	26	24	58	0	33	13	39
	Used National Mentoring Month toolkit	25	17	20	50	13	20	20	44
	Used MM directory	21	29	24	42	0	23	27	6
	VISTA/AmeriCorps members from MM	18	9	7	25	13	37	7	28
	Attended regional meeting in Warren	16	43	38	0	13	0	13	6
	Hear MM PSA on radio	15	23	20	25	6	13	7	17
	Attended regional mtg. in Grand Rapids	15	3	2	17	13	37	7	17
	Used MMC data in prog. eval./ planning	14	20	16	25	6	7	20	17
	Had FG Mulhern speak at event	11	23	18	25	6	10	0	0
	Used MMC data in funding proposals	11	14	11	17	0	10	7	22
	Serve on Providers Council	10	11	13	0	6	13	0	11
	Attended reg. mtg. in Mackinac City	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	None of the above	10	9	11	8	25	10	0	6

Table 9
Satisfaction with Mentor Michigan
Total and Geographic Breakdowns

Q #	Question	Wave II Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
56	MM initiatives benefited from since 9/1/04								
	MM marketing / awareness building	34%	31%	33%	58%	13%	33%	40%	33%
	Enhanced linkages w/ MI's mentor. orgs.	33	46	38	33	13	43	40	17
	Mentor recruitment	30	34	29	42	13	33	33	33
	Partnership development	26	40	33	25	19	27	13	28
	Training	24	29	24	42	19	20	20	28
	Resource Development	24	29	27	33	6	33	20	17
	None of the above	36	26	31	25	56	30	40	44
57	How satisfied are you with MM?								
	% Very – 4	40%	49%	42%	58%	25%	47%	33%	28%
	% Somewhat – 3	38	37	38	17	31	37	40	61
	% Not very – 2	3	3	4	8	0	0	0	6
	% Not at all – 1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0
	% Not aware of MM work	6	6	7	8	13	3	0	6
	% Don't Know	13	6	9	8	31	13	20	0
	MEAN	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.2