**William T. Grant**
FOUNDATION

# Research Grants on Reducing Inequality

**2022 Application Guidelines**
*Updated November 2021*

**2022 Application Deadlines**
*January 12, 2022, 3:00pm ET*
*May 4, 2022, 3:00pm ET\**
*August 3, 2022, 3:00pm ET*
*\*Letters of inquiry for Officers' research grants are not accepted in May*

# Contents

# At A Glance

### Synopsis

This program funds research studies that aim to build, test, or increase understanding of programs, policies, or practices to reduce inequality in the academic, social, behavioral, or economic outcomes of young people ages 5-25 in the United States, along dimensions of race, ethnicity, economic standing, language minority status, or immigrant origins.

*Proposed studies must:*

- identify a specific inequality in youth outcomes
- make a convincing case for the dimension(s) of inequality the study will address
- articulate how the findings will help build, test, or increase understanding of a specific program, policy, or practice to reduce the specific inequality that you have identified.

### Funding Amounts

- Major research grants: $100,000 to $600,000 over 2-3 years, including up to 15% indirect costs.
- Officers' research grants: $25,000–$50,000 over 1-2 years, including up to 15% indirect costs.

### Funding Rates

- Major research grants: About 15% of letter of inquiry submissions are invited to submit full proposals; about 20% of full proposals are approved for funding.
- Officers' research grants: About 8% of letter of inquiry submissions are approved for funding.

### Application Timeline

Letters of inquiry are accepted on three deadlines each year (two deadlines for Officers' research grants). Successful letters of inquiry for major research grants will result in invitations to submit full proposals. Officers' research grants are awarded on the merit of the letter of inquiry alone. For all applications, review decisions are emailed to investigators within eight weeks of the letter of inquiry submission deadline. For major research grants the total timeline from letter of inquiry to funding decision is generally 10-15 months.

# Introduction

## Overview

This program supports research to build, test, or increase understanding of programs, policies, or practices to reduce inequality in the academic, social, behavioral, or economic outcomes of young people ages 5-25 in the United States. We prioritize studies that aim to reduce inequalities that exist along dimensions of race, ethnicity, economic standing, language minority status, or immigrant origins.

> **ⓘ  KEY DEFINITIONS**
>
> **Programs:**
> Coordinated sets of activities designed to achieve specific aims in youth development.
>
> **Policies:**
> Broader initiatives intended to promote success through the allocation of resources or regulation of activities. Policies may be located at the federal, state, local, or organizational level.
>
> **Practices:**
> The materials and activities through which youth development is enabled (e.g., coaching, mentoring, parenting, peer interactions, teaching). Practices involve direct interaction with youth (in-person or virtual).

## Background

Our focus on reducing inequality grew out of our view that research can do more than help us understand the problem of inequality—it can generate effective responses. We believe that it is time to build stronger bodies of knowledge on how to reduce inequality in the United States and to move beyond the mounting research evidence about the scope, causes, and consequences of inequality.

## Research Interests

Our research interests center on studies that examine ways to reduce inequality in youth outcomes. We welcome descriptive studies that clarify mechanisms for reducing inequality or elucidate how or why a specific program, policy, or practice operates to reduce inequality. We also welcome intervention studies that examine attempts to reduce inequality. Finally, we welcome studies that improve the measurement of inequality in ways that can enhance the work of researchers, practitioners, or policy-makers.

We invite studies from a range of disciplines, fields, and methods, and we encourage investigations into various youth-serving systems, including justice, housing, child welfare, mental health, and education.

*Applications for research grants on reducing inequality must:*

1. **Identify a specific inequality in youth outcomes, and show that the outcomes are currently unequal by engaging with the extant literature on the causes and consequences of inequality.**

   *We are especially interested in research to reduce inequality in academic, social, behavioral, or economic outcomes.*

2. **Make a convincing case for the dimension(s) of inequality the study will address.**

   *We are especially interested in research to reduce inequality along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, economic standing, language minority status, or immigrant origin status.*

- Avoid treating dimensions of inequality (e.g., race, poverty) as variables without providing conceptual and/or theoretical insight into why and how the identified inequality exists.

- If proposing research on reducing inequality on a dimension other than race, ethnicity, economic standing, language minority status, or immigrant origins, or on ways in which a basis of inequality intersects with another, you must make a convincing case that this research will improve youth outcomes. For example, we encourage research on reducing inequality for LGBTQ youth, particularly in intersection with at least one of these prioritized dimensions.

- Be very specific in naming the groups on which the study will focus. Avoid vague terms such as "at-risk youth" or "vulnerable youth."

3.  **Articulate how findings from your research will help build, test, or increase understanding of a program, policy, or practice to reduce the specific inequality that you have identified.**

• Draw on extant theoretical and empirical literature to provide a rationale for why the specific programs, policies, or practices under study will equalize outcomes between groups or improve outcomes of a particular group.

• Identify how the study will investigate this rationale to determine whether it holds up to empirical scrutiny.

> **ⓘ NOTE**
>
> Recognizing that findings about programs and practices that reduce inequality will have limited societal impact until the structures that create inequality in the first place have been transformed, the Foundation is particularly interested in research to uproot **systemic racism** and the **structural foundations of inequality** that limit the life chances of young people.
>
> Such research shifts the focal point of change from individuals to macro-level social institutions and examines how these institutions might be altered to dislodge the deep roots of inequality and develop a way forward toward greater equity.
>
> Studies might examine how structural responses improve outcomes for youth, or the mechanisms through which such change occurs. Or they might ask how power hierarchies are disrupted, or how resources are redistributed. Examples include, but are not limited to:
>
> • Research on dramatic changes to the U.S. federal tax system, such as those examined in the Foundation-supported National Academies study, *A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty*
>
> • Research on shifts in power structures, such as changes in governance systems, or on the process through which the mindsets and behaviors of those who hold power are changed
>
> • Research on the role of social movements to reduce inequality in youth outcomes, as laid out by Jenny Irons and Vivian Tseng in "**Social Movement Research to Reduce Inequality for Young People**"
>
> • Research on the potential impact on youth outcomes of reparations to American descendants of enslaved people, as proposed by William J. Darity, Jr. in "**A New Agenda for Eliminating Racial Inequality in the United States: The Research We Need**," and in **a new grant awarded by the Foundation.**

- Research on the consequences for reducing educational inequality of significant school finance reforms, as discussed by former William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow Robert Kim in "**How School Finance Research Can Sharpen the Debate, Strengthen Policy, and Improve Student Outcomes**"

- Research on implementing new approaches to prosecution aimed at eliminating racial and ethnic disparities, such as explored in **recent Foundation grants**

- Research on whether equitable bank lending policies can reduce housing segregation, improve neighborhood quality, and enhance youth development

- Research on the consequences for youth outcomes of a reallocation of municipal resources away from punitive action and towards social services.

This list is intended to illustrate what we mean by systemic racism and the structural foundations of inequality. It is not an exhaustive set of possible grant topics. Please note that to be eligible for funding, the research still needs to focus on outcomes for young people ages 5-25 in the United States.

For a discussion of why research on programs and practices to reduce inequality in youth outcomes remains important even as the larger structures of racism and inequality persist, please see "**Research on reducing inequality: Why programs and practices matter, even in an unequal society**," by former William T. Grant Scholar David Yeager.

# Awards

## Major Research Grants

- $100,000 to $600,000 over 2-3 years, including up to 15% indirect costs.
- Projects involving secondary data analysis are at the lower end of the budget range, whereas projects involving new data collection and sample recruitment can be at the higher end. Proposals to launch experiments in which settings (e.g., classrooms, schools, youth programs) are randomly assigned to conditions sometimes have higher awards.

## Officers' Research Grants

- $25,000–$50,000 over 1-2 years, including up to 15% indirect costs.
- Studies may be stand-alone projects or may build off larger projects. The budget should be appropriate for the activities proposed.

> **ⓘ NOTE**
>
> In addition to financial support, the Foundation invests significant time and resources in capacity-building for research grantees. We provide opportunities to connect with other scholars, policymakers, and practitioners, and we organize learning communities that allow grantees to discuss challenges, seek advice from peers and experts, and collaborate across projects. To strengthen grantees' capacities to conduct and implement strong qualitative and mixed-methods work, the Foundation also provides access to a consultation service focused on those methods.

# Eligibility

### Eligible Organizations

- The Foundation makes grants only to tax-exempt organizations. We do not make grants to individuals.

- We encourage proposals from organizations that are under-represented among grantee institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), Alaska Native-Serving Institutions, Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, and Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs).

### Eligible Principal Investigators

- The Foundation defers to the applying organization's criteria for who is eligible to act as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator on a grant. In general, we expect that all investigators will have the experience and skills to carry out the proposed work.

- We strive to support a diverse group of researchers in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, and seniority, and we encourage research projects led by Black or African American, Indigenous, Latinx, and/or Asian or Pacific Islander American researchers.

### Eligible Studies

- Only studies that 1) align with the stated research interests of this program and 2) relate to the outcomes of young people between the ages of 5 and 25 in the United States are eligible for consideration.

- We do not support non-research activities such as program implementation and operational costs, or make contributions to building funds, fundraising drives, endowment funds, general operating budgets, or scholarships. Applications for ineligible projects are screened out without further review.

# Application Requirements

*Letters of inquiry for all research grants must include the following:*

## 1. Project Information

- Project title
- Start and end dates
- Total requested amount (including the combined direct and indirect costs for the full grant period)
    - Indirect costs may not exceed 15 percent of total direct costs.
- Brief description (1,500 characters maximum)
    - Start with the major research questions or aims.
    - Briefly summarize the project's rationale and background.
    - Describe the research methods, data analysis plan, and intervention (if applicable).
    - Use language appropriate for an educated lay audience.

## 2. Curriculum Vitae, Biographical Sketch, or Resume

*One page maximum. No formatting requirements*

- Include a one-page curriculum vitae, biographical sketch, or resume for each Principal Investigator and Co-Principal Investigator.
- Be sure to include education and training, peer-reviewed publications, and grants.
- Do not submit full curricula vitae or resumes.

## 3. Project Narrative

*Five pages maximum. Format your narrative as follows: 12-point Times New Roman font, single-spaced text with a line space between each paragraph, numbered pages, and 1-inch margins on all sides. If you have a reference list, include it in this upload. It will not be counted toward the five-page maximum.*

- State the major research questions or aims guiding the proposal.
- Provide a strong rationale that:
  - includes a brief literature review on the dimensions(s) of inequality to be addressed and the associated unequal outcomes
  - indicates how the project complements and extends prior and concurrent research
  - describes the theories that provide the foundation or organizing frame for the proposed strategy to reduce inequality and demonstrates how the project advances theory
  - identifies the program, policy, or practice to be examined in the study and explains how and why it is expected to reduce inequality
  - identifies the project's relevance for policy or practice.
- Include specific hypotheses and/or research questions to be tested or addressed.
- Describe the methods and data collection plan, including:
  - sample/case definition and selection procedures
  - research design
  - key constructs, data sources, and procedures for data collection
  - intervention (if applicable).
- Summarize the data analysis plan for addressing the hypotheses and/or research questions.
  - Identify the key measures.
  - If you are proposing quantitative analyses of a causal nature, provide convincing evidence that the study will be adequately powered to detect effects.
  - If you are using qualitative data, provide some detail about coding processes and the plan for establishing that the coding is reliable.
  - If you are proposing to develop or improve measures, discuss how you will show that the measures are valid and reliable.

**ⓘ** NOTE

**If you are applying for an Officers' research grant, you must also submit with your letter of inquiry:**

- a budget and a budget justification form
    - templates for both are provided in the online application
    - indirect costs may not exceed 15 percent of total direct costs
- the applicant organization's IRS tax-exempt status determination letter.

**These materials are not required for major research grants letters of inquiry.**

# Application Review Criteria

All letters of inquiry are initially reviewed by internal staff with social science expertise. On occasion, internal reviewers will request more information from applicants or solicit expert opinions to better assess a project. In general, however, given the breadth of studies proposed in letters of inquiry, internal reviewers may lack deep knowledge of an applicant's specific area of work, so avoid disciplinary jargon and use language appropriate for an educated lay audience.

We begin application reviews by looking at the importance of the research questions or hypotheses. Then we evaluate whether the proposed research designs and methods will provide strong empirical evidence on those questions.

> ⓘ **NOTE**
>
> For major research grants applications, based on internal review of the letter of inquiry, the Foundation either invites a full proposal for further consideration, or declines the application. We do not accept unsolicited full proposals. Officers' research grants are awarded on the merit of the letter of inquiry alone.

*The letter of inquiry functions as a mini-proposal and is reviewed against the following criteria:*

## 1. Fit with Research Interests

- The proposed study aligns with this program's research interests.
  - Specifically, this means that the proposed study aims to build, test, or increase understanding of programs, policies, or practices to reduce inequality in the academic, social, behavioral, or economic outcomes of young people ages 5-25 in the United States, along dimensions of race, ethnicity, economic standing, language minority status, or immigrant origins, or on another basis for which there is a compelling case.
  - Studies that primarily focus on documenting the causes and consequences of inequality are *not* a fit with our interests.

- The letter of inquiry makes clear how findings will inform policies, practices, or programs that can or will be implemented through organizations, institutions, and/or systems.
  - It is not adequate to propose a study that will document inequality and conclude with a general statement that research will be relevant for policy and practice

## 2. Conceptualization and Relevance

- The letter of inquiry reflects a mastery of relevant theory and empirical findings.
- The letter of inquiry states the theoretical and empirical contributions the study will make to the existing research base.
- The letter of inquiry discusses how the findings will be relevant to policy or practice.

## 3. Methods

- The proposed study employs rigorous methods (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed) that are commensurate to its goals.
- The study's design, methods, and analysis plan fit the proposed research questions.
- The description of the research design makes clear how the empirical work will test, refine, or elaborate specific theoretical notions.
  - Quantitative analyses might emphasize hypotheses and plans for testing them, while qualitative analyses might elaborate on how the research will illuminate processes underlying specific programs, policies, or practices.
- Plans for case selection, sampling, and measurement clearly state why they are well-suited to address the research questions or hypotheses.
  - For example, samples must be appropriate in size and composition to answer the study's questions. Qualitative case selection—whether critical, comparative, or otherwise—must also be appropriate to answer the proposed questions.
- The quantitative and/or qualitative analysis plan demonstrates awareness of the strengths and limits of the specific analytic techniques and how they will be applied in the current case.
- If proposing mixed methods, plans for integrating the methods and data are clear and compelling.
- If proposing quantitative methods, the letter of inquiry demonstrates that the study will have adequate statistical power to detect meaningful effects.

- Where relevant, the letter of inquiry discusses the potential generalizability of findings.
- The letter of inquiry demonstrates adequate consideration of the gender, ethnic, and cultural appropriateness of concepts, methods, and measures.

## 4. Feasibility

- The proposed methods, time frame, staffing plan, and other resources are realistic.
- The letter of inquiry assures that data will be successfully collected, describes the team's prior experience collecting such data, and identifies strategies for maximizing response rates and access to data sources.
- Prior training and publications demonstrate that the research team has a track record of conducting strong research and communicating it successfully.
  - Be sure to demonstrate that the research team is well-positioned to address the varied tasks demanded by the study's conceptualization and research design. This might include combining expertise across disciplines or methods.
  - Be specific about the value of each member's contributions to the team. We strongly discourage teams that comprise many senior investigators for very limited time and effort or otherwise make cursory nods to multi-disciplinary or mixed-role project teams. Instead, clearly justify the unique value of each team member and the specific role each will play in different stages of the project.

*Where appropriate, we value projects that:*

- harness the learning potential of mixed methods and interdisciplinary work
- involve practitioners or policymakers in meaningful ways to shape the research questions, interpret preliminary and final results, and communicate their implications for policy and practice
- combine senior and junior staff in ways that facilitate mentoring of junior staff
- are led by members of racial or ethnic groups underrepresented in academic fields
- generate data useful to other researchers and make such data available for public use
- demonstrate significant creativity and potential to advance the field, for example by introducing new research paradigms or extending existing methods, measures and analytic tools to allow for comparison across studies.

For major research grants, the review process for a successful application—beginning with the submission of a letter of inquiry and ending with approval by our Board of Trustees—is 10 to 15 months. If you are invited to submit a full proposal, you will be offered two deadlines to submit it, ranging from approximately six weeks to six months from the time of the invitation.

In general, the full proposal follows a format similar to that of the letter of inquiry, and includes a proposal narrative of about 25 pages, a complete budget and budget justification, and full curriculum vitae or resumes for key investigators and staff. If you are invited to submit a full proposal, we will provide additional detailed instructions on developing the proposal. Institutional Review Board Approval is not required at the time of the proposal's submission but is required before issuing grant funds. Full proposals are reviewed using a scientific peer review process involving two or more external reviewers with content, methodological, and disciplinary expertise in the proposed work.

Following external review, the Foundation's Senior Program Team reviews promising proposals and offers additional feedback. Applicants who receive positive reviews with critiques that can be addressed within a short time frame are asked to provide written responses to internal and external reviewers' comments. Applicants' responses to external reviews are then further reviewed by the Senior Program Team. Finally, the team makes funding recommendations to the Program Committee and the Board of Trustees. Approved awards are made available shortly after Board meetings, which take place in March, June, and October.

## Appendix A: Useful Links

---

1.  **Resources for Applicants**
    **wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-resources**

    - Applicant Guidance
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-resources#applicant-guidance

    - Recommended Reading
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-resources#recommended-reading

      *Topics Include:*
      - Conceptualizing reducing inequality
      - Methods and measurement
      - Research agendas for reducing inequality

---

2.  **Frequently Asked Questions**
    **wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq**

    - What We Do and Do Not Fund
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq#what-we-fund

    - Research Interests: Reducing Inequality
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq#research-interests

    - The Letter of Inquiry
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq#LOI

    - Study Designs and Methods
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq#designs-methods

    - Research Grant Budget and Human Subjects Approval
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq#budget

    - Officers' Research Grants
      wtgrantfoundation.org/RI-faq#officers-research

---

3.  **Awarded Grants, 2004–Today**
    *(Search and filter all awarded grants by program and focus area)*
    **wtgrantfoundation.org/browse-grants**

## Appendix B: Featured Grants

### Immigration Status and Higher Education: Evidence from a Large Urban University

*Principal Investigators: Amy Hsin and Holly Reed, Queens College, City University of New York; Sofya Aptekar, University of Massachusetts Boston; and Thomas DiPrete, Columbia University*

Amy Hsin and her team are examining whether recent national, state, and university policies improve the educational outcomes of undocumented students.

Due to financial constraints, the threat of deportation, and familial obligations, undocumented youth are less likely than immigrant students with legal status to graduate from college. Yet, our understanding of the sources of educational inequality for undocumented students—and the potential levers of change to reduce them—is limited. In addition, existing studies often lack access to high-quality quantitative data, often focus on selective four-year institutions rather than the community colleges that many undocumented students attend, and rarely look beyond college attendance as the main outcome.

With this mixed-methods study, Hsin and colleagues will advance the field by investigating how legal status and immigration reforms affect the educational outcomes and behaviors of a large and ethnically diverse population of undocumented students who attended two-year and four-year colleges within a large, public university system between 1999–2015. Further, whereas earlier research

either inferred legal status or studied non-representative samples, Hsin and colleagues will draw on unique administrative data that will enable them to accurately identify legal status and study the population of undocumented students attending college in a large metropolitan area.

The team is examining the effects of two policies intended to increase the college persistence of undocumented youth: President Obama's 2012 executive order known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which allows youth who arrived before their 16th birthday to work legally on a temporary basis and provides temporary relief from deportation; and state professional licensing laws that allow eligible DACA recipients to obtain occupational licenses if they meet all other requirements for licensure except for documentation status. They will also identify institutional policies and practices that create a supportive environment for undocumented students and analyze how they affect outcomes.

By matching undocumented students to similar peers with legal status, the team will identify the causal effect of DACA on college performance, transfer, graduation, and attendance, as well as the impact of professional licensing reforms on these indicators and choice of major. In addition, interviews will be conducted with past and present students, family members, staff and faculty, and campus and community leaders.

## Talking Justice: Identifying Interactional Practices to Improve the Quality of Police–Civilian Encounters

*Principal Investigators: Nikki Jones, University of California, Berkeley, and Geoffrey Raymond, University of California, Santa Barbara*

Nikki Jones and Geoffrey Raymond will identify practices that can build trust and encourage civilian cooperation to reduce the use of force by police officers.

The challenges confronting police reform stem in part from the frequency of encounters between police and people of color, especially young Black men; the quality of these interactions; and the challenge of accountability when these encounters go poorly. To address these issues, Jones and Raymond will identify the kinds of interactions that officers can use when they encounter youth to increase trust, reduce the likelihood of violence, and strengthen perceptions of police legitimacy.

Research shows that police legitimacy is lower among minority groups and that frequent encounters with the police can negatively impact the mental health of young men of color. While extant studies have documented encounters between the police and civilians, they tend to treat officer and civilian interactions as static variables rather than a dynamic interplay in which one party influences the behavior of the other.

In prior work, the team used video recordings collected with law enforcement agencies to examine how officers respond when civilians ask questions or make complaints challenging the officer's agenda. In this study, Jones and Raymond will use a combination of video analysis, conversation analysis, ethnographic methods, and statistical analysis to measure the emergence and management of trust/mistrust for the police officer and the youth and adult civilians. They anticipate that improved police and civilian encounters will reduce the likelihood that youth of color will be arrested for minor crimes such as loitering. They also expect that youth in high surveillance areas may have better mental health, as they will witness fewer aggressive police encounters, which have been found to traumatize bystander witnesses.

Jones and Raymond will examine three collections of video recorded encounters: two collected in collaboration with law enforcement agencies, and another collected by a civilian videographer. The team will code these recorded encounters for indicators of civilian mistrust and officer responses to these indicators, as well as how police suspicions inform how they initiate and manage civilian encounters. Policing patterns will be tabulated, and observed associations will be tested, controlling for civilian characteristics, officer gender, and time of day. The team will analyze the ethnographic interviews for how officers evaluate the trustworthiness of civilians and will use the civilian video data to focus on civilian complaints and how police officers respond.

## An Investigation of a Cultural Humility, Social Justice Training, and Support Intervention for Mentors of Youth of Color

*Principal Investigators: Bernadette Sanchez and David L. DuBois, University of Illinois, and Carla Herrera, Herrera Consulting Group*

In collaboration with Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBS), Bernadette Sanchez and her team are evaluating a training program to improve mentoring relationships and outcomes for low-income Black and Latinx youth.

A large body of research shows that out-of-school time mentoring can serve as an effective lever for improving outcomes for youth. Yet mentors and program staff are often White and middle-class, and mentees are largely from low-income racial-ethnic minority families. The very relationships that mentors aim to foster may be undermined without sensitivity to these differences.

Sanchez and colleagues' early research suggests that adults who work with youth in the context of social difference can create more effective mentoring relationships by developing cultural humility and a social justice orientation. Building on this work, Sanchez and colleagues are examining an intervention that will train volunteer mentors to demonstrate cultural humility and an informed commitment to social justice in their interactions with low-income youth of color. By developing more effective mentoring relationships across race and class differences, mentors can bolster youths' racial/ethnic identity, openness to adult support, efficacy coping with discrimination, critical consciousness, and academic beliefs—

personal resources that can, in turn, lead to improved educational and mental health outcomes.

Five hundred mentoring matches participating in three BBBS programs will be recruited to participate in the study. These matches include the mentor, the youth matched with that mentor, the youth's caregiver, and the supporting case manager. Mentees will be youth of color, ages 10-16, most of whom are Black and Latinx, and about 80% of matches will involve mentors of different racial/ethnic backgrounds. Three months into a new 12-month mentoring commitment, half of the mentors will be randomly assigned to receive the intervention, in addition to the standard training and case management. The intervention includes a 3.5 hour training to enhance mentors' social justice interest and awareness of cultural differences and to lessen pro-white bias and color-blind attitudes, as well as nine months of enhanced supervision and booster communications from program staff.

Sanchez and her team will use surveys at multiple time points with the mentors, mentees, caregivers, and case managers to measure the intervention's effectiveness. They will also conduct interviews with a subset of the treatment and control groups to understand how, why, and under what conditions the intervention works; how mentors experience the intervention; and relationship development over time. Findings will inform approaches to working with low-income youth of color in a variety of settings, as well as the design of interventions for reducing inequality in educational and mental health outcomes.