



## ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

### Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

## ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

### Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

# User Report

Police and Youth  
"Looking to the Future"

No. 1994-14

LIBRARY  
SOLICITOR GENERAL

HV  
8079.25  
P64  
1994

Solicitor General Canada  
Ministry Secretariat

Canada

HV  
8079.25  
P64  
1994

Prepared by: Dowrich Management Services

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.  
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for  
any intended use  
Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent  
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent  
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

**Police and Youth  
"Looking to the Future"**

No. 1994-14

LIBRARY  
SOLICITOR GENERAL CANADA  
  
JAN 10 1996  
  
SOLICITEUR GENERAL CANADA  
OTTAWA (ONTARIO)  
K1A 0P8

**Executive Summary of the Final Report of Pilot Project  
Police/Youth Mentoring Program,**

This project was jointly funded by the Ontario Ministry of the  
Solicitor General and Correctional Services and the Solicitor  
General of Canada.

The views expressed in this working paper are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada and the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services. It is made available as submitted to the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. The English version was reviewed and formatted by Tessier Translations Corporation.

---

CAT: JS4-1/1994-14  
ISBN: 0-662-21461-7

---

**INTRODUCTION AND**

**BACKGROUND**

In the Spring of 1993, close to 200 adults and youth took part in a 12-week pilot demonstration project, as a police/youth mentoring program.

*Who were involved?*

Police services personnel served in the role of mentors, while young persons selected from the local community assumed the role of proteges.

*Project Objectives*

The primary purpose of the police/youth program was to:

- **positively alter the perceptions, attitudes and behaviour of youth and police services personnel:**
- **promote and enhance efforts for the community and police services organizations to work more closely on common goals: and**
- **position employment within police services as an important and viable career option for qualified members of the Aboriginal and Black communities.**

These objectives are consistent with the Declaration of Principles stated in the Police Services Act (1990).

- "the need for cooperation between the providers of police services and the communities they

serve"

- "the need for sensitivity to the pluralistic, multiracial and multicultural character of Ontario's society"
- "the need to ensure that police forces are representative of the communities they serve".

***Participating Organizations***

Police organizations which participated in the pilot phase were: Metropolitan Toronto, Ottawa/Carleton, Windsor and Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg Reserve. As well, their respective local communities volunteered to be involved in this program so that the principles and framework for a customized mentoring model, appropriate to police services organizations, could be tested.

***Key Stakeholders***

The primary stakeholders were police personnel representing three different geographic locations in the Province of Ontario, and an Indian Reserve in the Province of Quebec; and eligible young people in the age range 12 to 24 from the same communities.

Participation was voluntary.

***Who Initiated and Supported It?***

The initiative was spearheaded by the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services and supported through partial funding by the Ministry of Citizenship of Ontario, and by Solicitor General Canada.

The project received its overall direction and management from a Corporate Steering Committee comprised of staff of the Ministry, with regional representation; officers of Metropolitan Toronto Police Services; and representatives of Toronto based community organizations. The Aboriginal and Black community were represented on the Committee.

*External Consultants*

A consulting firm, Dowrich Management Services, was contracted by the Ministry to undertake the study.

*Project Evolution*

The principles, concepts and rationale for the development of a police/youth mentoring framework or model were documented, in some detail in the late spring of 1992 in what has been labelled - *The Police Youth Mentoring Program - User's Guide*. The highlights of this document were subsequently presented in the form of an Executive Summary. Another noteworthy document related to this initiative, was a training/orientation package for mentors, proteges, parents and community organizations. This training package was developed and used before the pilot phase started.

This initiative covered nearly two years, commencing in December 1991.

*Full Report on Pilot  
Evaluation*

A full report on the evaluation of the pilot phase has been completed and may be obtained from the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, Policing Services Division.

*Pilot Phase Program  
Design*

Police services organizations selected Aboriginal and Black personnel - uniform and civilian, male and female. Community organizations selected youth participants.

Each pilot site established a small advisory committee comprised of police personnel and community members; and undertook responsibility for managing the program locally. Community responsibilities included the matching of mentors and proteges; coordinating the orientation sessions; appointing temporary administrative support staff and coordinating group events for the youth.

Program activities included visits to various sections of police organizations; other law enforcement institutions, organized recreational events. Mentors and proteges also developed individualized objectives for the 12 weeks.

The pilot phase started in March/April 1993 and ended in June/July.

*Program Evaluation*

Mentors and proteges were interviewed separately in the early stages of the pilot phase and at the end. Of the 117 youth who were initially recruited to the program, 52 were interviewed. There were 71 mentors signed up for

the program, and 44 of these were interviewed.

Characteristics of the mentor and protege groups are shown in the Registration Summary. The interviews conducted represented, to the extent possible, a representative sample of these participants.

A comprehensive questionnaire was used to obtain feedback from the participants on their experiences. The questions were different for mentors and proteges, and varied slightly within these groups between the first and second stage interviews. The interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes and were conducted in face-to-face sessions by two external consultants, interviewing simultaneously.

Interview themes covered mentor/protege relationships; special interests of proteges; skill needs of mentors; short term goals of proteges; level/variety of program activity; and program highlights identified by mentors and proteges.

A small number of parents were interviewed by telephone in a much shorter session. Parents were approached by the local staff, who coordinated these interviews.

***FINDINGS -***

***WHAT WE LEARNED***

Mentors and proteges had face-to-face meetings about once every 10 days. More than half (55%) of the

***Mentor/Protege Relationships***

mentors and proteges had known of each other or met before the program started. The vast majority (90%) of the mentor/protege relationships stayed intact during the 12 weeks of the project.

More than half of the mentors were assigned two proteges.

Proteges who shared a mentor got less one-on-one time than others and these opportunities decreased as the program progressed. Most proteges felt that personal time was important and increasingly looked forward to these meetings as the program advanced. However, mentors felt less strongly about the importance of one-on-one time. Mentors were more accessible in the early stages of the project.

Proteges assessed their relationships with mentors as "good" or better, with a significant number rating them as "excellent".

About 17% of the mentors rated the relationship with proteges "doubtful" to "poor".

***Proteges' Special Interests in Areas of Policing***

Proteges identified strongly with a particular area of policing at the early stages of the project, but were noticeably less certain towards the end. Proteges discussed their special interests with their mentors. Only half of the mentors were working in areas which were of interest to their proteges.

Proteges did not discuss their special interests with other relatives or peers to any great extent. Mentors were more inclined to discuss their proteges' interests with their colleagues.

***Proteges' Family Support***

Proteges' family commitment and or support, based on knowledge of proteges activities, declined slightly as the program progressed.

***Proteges' Profile in Police Organizations***

More than one-half of the proteges (56%) met their mentors immediate supervisor. A much smaller number met other senior management personnel such as the Police Chiefs, Board Members and representatives of the Police Association.

***Community Organizations***

Involvement of the schools was minimal. Just above one-quarter of the proteges thought their teachers knew about the mentoring project. Some of the other teachers in the schools, although not a significant number, heard about the project from the proteges.

Proteges held mixed views about turning to their teachers for guidance or assistance with matters related to the project. By the end of the program, only 29% of the proteges had sought assistance from their teachers.

The majority of proteges had no involvement in any other community organizations. Those proteges with other community interests indicated that these

organizations knew of the mentoring program and thought these organizations would be able to render assistance, regarding the project, if required.

Youth were more inclined to talk about the project in the community and away from school.

***Mentors' Program Support***

The majority of mentors identified other police operations for their proteges to visit. Such visits declined as the program approached the end. Most mentors preferred to accompany their proteges on visits to other operating units. However, there were those who held a different opinion and delegated this task.

A smaller number of operating units volunteered assistance and senior management support was either given on request or volunteered.

***Mentors Peer Group Support***

At the beginning of the program, most mentors (65%) thought their work peers were informed about the project, but could not be sure or specific in describing how their colleagues became informed.

Mentors indicated a strong desire to have the cooperation and support of their colleagues and called on that support during the project.

At the beginning of the project, three quarters of the mentors had identified someone in the organization who could substitute for them in an emergency or if work demands increased. The importance of this contingency

plan diminished somewhat (56%) towards the end of the project.

*Awareness of Proteges Skill Needs*

More than one-half of the proteges identified a specific skill which they needed or wanted to enhance. Some of these included such areas as physical fitness, writing, goal setting, and social interaction.

They discussed their skill enhancement needs with their mentors, with whom they had the greatest inclination to do so. Parents were the next group with whom they were prepared to discuss their skills needs, while teachers were the less favoured.

*Mentors' Family Support*

Close to half of the mentors (47%) said that their spouses/friends were aware of the project and supported them. Also, children and parents of the mentors, in one-quarter of the cases, were aware of the project.

Mentors for the most part, (84%) had previous volunteer experiences to draw on.

*Proteges' Goal Setting*

Most proteges set personal learning goals for the program. The number was 87% in the first set of interviews and decreased to 71% in the second group of respondents. They discussed these learning goals with their mentors, who in some cases had assisted them in developing these goals.

Several proteges indicated that career plans were the focus for setting goals, although the majority (56%) did not correlate the project goal setting with their long term plans.

One-third of the proteges said the project goals were related in some way to the completion of high school, while a slightly smaller number said their goals were related to higher education.

***Mentors' Leadership Skills***

Mentors identified a number of leadership skills which are critical to a mentoring program. These included, in order of significance, listening, verbal communication, coordination/organization skills, and planning. At the end of the program, respondents changed the weights attributed to these skills. Listening was reported as less critical while organization skills increased in importance.

Four out of five mentors indicated they would like to improve, at least one of their own leadership skills, in the critical areas identified.

***Project/Program Activity***

Mentors and proteges for the most part, thought the program included a variety of activities. Most of them said the pacing of events was "just right". A majority of them thought there were opportunities to interact with their peers in the project and with their mentoring partners.

A small number of mentors, thought the program

interfered with their personal and family agenda.

Mentors, as a group, reported that the experiences provided to them allowed for reflection on the vast and complex business of policing services.

Proteges on the other hand, were unanimous that the program provided a good introduction to police services.

***Program Highlights***

The majority of mentors and proteges acknowledged that the program did have some highlights, and were prepared to name one or more of them. They included trips and observations related to policing, as well as to recreational activities.

***Shortcomings/Concerns***

Three in four proteges in the early interviews said they had no concerns or reservations about the program. This statistic was less favourable (52%) in the responses at the end of the project.

Inadequate communication, low commitment by at least one of the parties, and unsuccessful mentor/protege matching were cited as areas of concern.

Some proteges shared their concerns with mentors. A much higher number discussed them with their parents, friends or program coordinators. Proteges thought that most of their concerns could have been addressed during the program.

Many mentors had some concerns or reservations, albeit minor, about the program. Often these were organizational and administrative matters, as well as issues pertaining to the project planning and design. The protege selection process was flagged as a primary concern.

Mentors shared their concerns with peers and with Program Coordinators, but very few of them approached their senior management staff with their concerns. One-half of the mentors thought their concerns could be addressed during the life of the project. The others were not sure or did not think these concerns could be addressed.

*Administrative Support  
Resources*

Just over one-half the number of proteges found the administrative support staff most helpful, while another one-third found them somewhat helpful. More than 35% of proteges found it necessary to contact these administrative support on a weekly basis.

One-half of the mentors found this administrative support of definite assistance with another 20% or more of mentors finding them of some assistance.

In the early stages of the program, a third of the mentors saw a need to contact the administrative support personnel on a weekly basis. However, this need diminished toward the end of the program.

*What Mentors Learned*

Mentors questioned at the end of the program, said they learned some things during the experience. They cited

proper guidance for youth, goal setting and cultivating sound interpersonal skills including listening as the most important lessons learned.

More than one-half of the mentors interviewed after the first four weeks of the project thought the relationship with proteges could have improved. At the end of the project, 38% thought these relationships could still have improved, even if slightly.

***Overall Program  
Assessment***

*Mentors and proteges overwhelmingly supported the need for this program and programs such as this one. They thought any future programs should be more than three months in duration.*

*Proteges would be interested in participating in future programs. They would recommend it to their brothers and sisters, and promote it among their friends/peers.*

***RECOMMENDATIONS***

Consideration should be given to the idea of ongoing mentoring programs in selected police organizations, where warranted. The programs should be introduced based on the need and not simply because they are reported as useful.

Where programs are being considered, attention should be paid to the duration. Three months is much too short given the required investment in planning the project and organizing and training the stakeholder groups. Six

months or two semesters would appear to be more feasible.

The mentor/protege ratio should ideally be one-to-one, however, in some unique situations, two proteges could be assigned to a mentor.

Selection and screening of mentors and proteges should be assigned a great deal of attention and based on specific criteria.

Once mentors and proteges are carefully selected, adequate time should be set aside for their training and orientation.

Police organizations - senior management should provide clearer direction to supervisory personnel regarding adjustments of work schedules to facilitate the requirements of the mentoring project.

To achieve the above, the organizational climate must be one which supports the project, and overall staff communication should be adequate and clear, well in advance.

The local schools where proteges attend must be more directly involved. They should receive early notification and their input should be sought so that mentoring events and school activities are not in conflict.

Community members (individuals as opposed to agencies) should be more directly involved and a number of project tasks can be assigned to them on a volunteer basis. This will not only reduce project costs but tap into a growing resource pool of early retirees, including ex-police officers. Many youth welcome the opportunity to work along side adults whom they trust.

The age range for the selection of proteges might be narrowed down from the present 12-24 to approximately 15-21 years. Selection and planning of program activities will be more manageable with a more homogeneous age group.

The mentoring model should be adopted in communities other than Aboriginal and Black, where youth present a challenge for police personnel. Moreover, some programs may consider a two level experience for youth where the first three months (for example) are spent with a mentor of similar ancestry and then the youth would be assigned to a caucasian mentor with a view to building on what was achieved in the first phase. It is critically important that the twin objectives of (i) the youth's pride and self-esteem and (2) the broader interpersonal and social skills, are developed at the same time.

Future mentoring programs should provide an experience for youth which encompasses the broader justice system rather than be confined to police services. Mentors should also be sought out in these other areas of the

system.

Youth should be permitted to participate in these types of programs even if policing is not their career choice. Policing is too important and far reaching a public service to be restricted only to those who may be seeking employment.

Youth who have had a positive experience with police services in a mentoring or other program, should be enlisted to assist in promoting these programs and in encouraging other youth to get involved. The schools can be one of the points of entry for the promotion of such initiatives.

The foundation principles of mentoring should be emphasized in developing any program. Operating activities and related details should remain flexible and adapted to the unique needs of each police organization and local community.

With exceptions (very large organizations) programs of this type should initially be modest in size, not more than 10-15 mentors. This will permit the emphasis to be placed on the quality of the experience which the youth receives. It is more effective to repeat the program so that others can participate than to have too large a program which may be unmanageable.

## YOUTH MENTORING PILOT PHASE REGISTRATION SUMMARY

PROTEGES	KITIGAN ZIBI ANISHINABEG	OTTAWA/CARLETON				METRO TORONTO	WINDSOR	TOTAL
		OTTAWA	NEPEAN	GLOUCESTER	TOTAL			
Aboriginal	12	5	8	8	19	16	6	53
Black		12	2	5	19	36	9	64
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>117</b>
Under 15	3	5	3	2	10	5	7	25
15 To 18	9	9	5	4	18	31	4	62
19 To 21	1	3		6	9	8	2	20
22 To 24	1			1	1	1	2	5
Age Unreported						7		7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>119</b>
Male	9	8	7	8	21	27	8	65
Female	3	11	1	5	17	23	7	50
Unreported						2		2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>MENTORS</b>								
Aboriginal	7	4	4	7	15	9	1	32
Black		6	1	3	10	21	8	39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>
Ages Under 25	1					3		4
Ages 25 To 34	4					15	5	24
Ages 35 To 49	2					9	2	13
Age 50 And Over							2	2
With Age Unreported		10	5	10	25	3		28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>
Male	8	6	3	7	18	22	5	49
Female	1	4	2	3	9	8	4	22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>
Uniform Male	6	8	3	6	15	21	5	47
Uniform Female	1	1			1	9	4	15
Civilian Male				1	1			1
Civilian Female		3	2	3	8			8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>
With One Protege	2	3	2	7	12	8	7	29
With Two Proteges	5	7	3	3	13	21	1	40
With Three Proteges						1		1
With more than Three Proteges							1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>
Male With Only Male	4	3	3	5	11	13	4	32
Male With Only Female	1	3		1	4	2		7
Male With Both Female & Male	1			1	1	6	1	9
Male with unreported						1		1
Female With Only Female		3	1	3	7	8	4	19
Female With Only Male		1	1		2			2
Female With Both Female & Male	1							1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>

