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Abstract

Studies in 2008 showed that girls and boys in the juvenile justice system were using identical programming, in spite of the fact that research has identified two very different sets of needs (Miller, 1976). In 2010, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act offered Challenge grants that would entice facilities to create new, more gender-responsive programming for girls. This qualitative study analyzes the mental health and drug rehabilitation programs currently used with incarcerated girls in the Central Valley of California, both in the facility and outside the facility while on probation, to determine the level of gender-responsive methodology used. An examination of Community benefit organizations (CBOs) also looked for gender-responsive methods. An interview of leadership at each venue attempted to learn more about the presentation of programs, and in some cases, the effectiveness of these programs. In addition, a walk-through of each facility was conducted to ascertain to what degree the climate is gender-responsive. Using the framework supplied by Jean Baker Miller, and operationalized by Morgan and Patton (2002), a number of guidelines are included which are not considered when working with boys. In addition, using the concept of praxis, as defined by Paulo Freire, it can be seen to what extent the community is accommodating girls as they serve probation. This study provides a
progress report on our adaptation to the needs of justice-involved girls in the Central Valley of California, over the 5-year period 2010-15.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

They are California’s daughters, sisters, and even young mothers. Watching them chat and work on posters, they could be girls at any school lunch table. Between the ages of 14 and 18, they are all dressed in facility attire – khaki shorts or dark blue long pants, maroon T-shirts and orange sweatshirts. They wear dark blue and white slip-on shoes. It is quite cool in the club, but they say it is not cool in the cellblock or elsewhere in the juvenile justice facility, another good reason to join the Boys & Girls Club, established on site. If a girl will abide by a lengthy list of rules, she can participate in games, dabble in art, play music and dance, and take part in classes, like the one that is happening today.

I am at the Boys & Girls Club to conduct Diplomas to Degrees, a Boys & Girls Club educational program that helps to ready girls for life after incarceration, encouraging them to think about goal setting and college preparation. Today, Boys & Girls Club staff wonders about the fact that girls never seem to attend the Clubs back in their home neighborhoods, once they begin probation. Staff perceives that the Club has much to offer girls, by way of support, when they are back on the streets. With girls recidivating every 12 to 24 months, there needs to be a connection made with Club mentors and programs. However, instead, when we ask girls why they do not attend our Clubs on the outside, they all agree that, when they return home, they have changed, but no one else has. It is easier to succumb to their old ways of being, than to endure harassment for their new ways.

They, along with girls in 57 other county juvenile facilities, make up 12% of the total teens incarcerated in California in 2011 (Sickmund, Sladky, Kang, & Puzzanchera, 2011). Upon observation, one cannot imagine what crimes must prompt locking them away from society. In addition, what services would it take to get these girls back on track, and back to their high school lunch tables again? Chapter 1 will review the history of girls in the American juvenile justice system,
the current state of girls in juvenile justice in the Central Valley of California, and
the growing problem of girls who turn to crime in a society where their needs are
unmet. A theoretical framework for the study is proposed, along with key
definitions.

**Background**

*One girl, I call her my second favorite child, has been here with us for 3
years. Forty days out, she runs off, and ends up back here. This is her
home. Girls are needy. We have these little forms called ‘request to
see’s’. For every one ‘request to see’ I get from a boy, I get 10 from
girls. Girls are more apt to ask for help, once they fill in the trust issue.
(Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)*

MacDonald and Chesney-Lind (2001) found that girls have been locked
away in juvenile justice facilities since the 1890s, in reformatories for crimes such
as immorality, evidence of sexual intercourse, and waywardness. Boys were never
locked away for these same charges (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001). Girls
were twice as likely as boys to be detained, overwhelmingly for status offenses in
the 1920s and 1950s, and their detentions were 5 times longer (MacDonald &
Chesney-Lind, 2001). Status offenses include actions or activities, such as
running away, truancy, curfew violations, or general unruliness, and are not
considered a crime if engaged in by an adult (Carr, Hudson, Hanks, & Hunt,
2008). Half of those who were charged with sexual misconduct were found to
have had only one partner, so prostitution was not an issue.

Since many of the girls were turned over for arrest by their parents (Bloom,
Owen, Deschenes, & Rosenbaum, 2002), status offenses could easily be called
*bad daughter crimes*. Some parents turn to the family or juvenile court to enforce
their authority. Another case of a double standard, boys are not usually
incarcerated for disobeying parents, but girls are (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001).

In 1974, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act was passed. Among other issues, it sought to deinstitutionalize girls for status crimes. Diversion is one method, which seeks to keep a young person out of the legal system, by having them do community service and make restitution for crimes. The immediate effect was a drop in the numbers of girls in training schools and detention centers. However, juvenile justice administrators have adjusted the results by criminalizing the violation of a court order. While the JJDP initially aimed at gender inequity, they still punish girls disproportionately. If law enforcement diverts girls instead of incarcerating them, but then they run away from an abusive situation, they return to a locked facility (Spivak, Wagner, Whitmer & Charish, 2014). Penalties are more stringent for contempt, and so they incarcerate girls who may end up with a longer sentence than before.

This act of finding a way around an initial rule is called “bootstrapping,” and it was so prevalent in the 1980s that the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 1992, to make bootstrapping more difficult (Carr et al., 2008). The reauthorization also called for counties to develop more gender-specific programming, but programs designed for boys continue to be used with the girls, merely in isolation from the boys (Watson & Edelman, 2012).

When punishment for girls becomes more punitive, it is legitimized in the courts as protection (Chesney-Lind, 1977). While restrictions on status offenders were loosened with the first JJDP Act in 1974, in 1992 judges pushed for a re-criminalization of status offenses (Spivak et al., 2014).

In the mid-1990s, administrators finally decided that they must address the 101% increase in juvenile female offenses, so they offered Challenge Grants
through the Department of Justice to identify and address gaps in girls’ services (Garcia & Lane, 2009). The grants were for innovation in services to abused children, for educational or supportive services, for expansion in the use of probation officers, for counseling and mentoring, and for community-based projects, which work with juvenile offenders and potential juvenile offenders and their families (Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, 2002). However, in 1999 Judge David Grossman expressed the mood of the times when he said, “Deinstitutionalization was a ‘movement’ whose time has passed. All too often, it left the intended young beneficiaries of its advocacy adrift on the streets, fallen between the cracks” (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001, p. 177). Judge Grossman and the entire juvenile justice system wanted to make sure that the increased number of juvenile female offenders could not fall between the cracks.

There had been increasing decentralization of California Juvenile Justice, in each of the 58 counties receiving state funding to address the needs of juvenile justice youth. This created growth in the number of facilities, since California commits juveniles into local custody in greater numbers than in most other states (Bloom et al., 2002).

In 2003 there was landmark litigation alleging unconstitutional and inhumane treatment of youth in custody of the Division of Juvenile Justice, which at that time was the California Youth Authority. Not only was there abuse occurring, but minors were being prosecuted as adults. In 2006, Raise the Age (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006) removed 16- and 17-year-olds from automatic prosecution in adult courts. Automatic prosecution for thousands of youth, including girls, no longer happened in adult criminal court. However, while the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 prohibits detaining status offenders, the Valid Court Order exception enacted by Congress in 1980
created an enormous loophole in this prohibition. Under that exception, status offenses for girls are still routine (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2015a; Watson & Edelman, 2014).

**Context**

*My girl that I call my second favorite child is a RAD kid (Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment). Abandoned by her biological parent, abandoned by her adopted parent, she has been through 45 different group homes. We have placed her in a group home, and have given her opportunities. I have gone to bat to help her, even though she probably did not deserve it because she has been here so long. How long can I keep her in here? She ran off, within a week, and now she is back.* (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Fresno County is a mix of urban and rural, wealthy and impoverished, citizen and immigrant, youthful and mature. With 955,000 inhabitants, 30% of those under the age of 18, the county might assume that energy, youth and motivation would fuel the county. However, with 25% of inhabitants living below the poverty level, 43% speaking a language other than English, only 72% graduating from high school, 13.6% unemployed adults and 34% unemployed teens 16-19, many families struggle to survive (United States Census Bureau, 2014).

Amidst these challenges, teens often turn to gangs and other lives of crime. Fresno County’s Gang & Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Initiative found that 15,000 young people in the county have been identified as gang members (Gonzalez, Immekus, & Joubert, 2011). Interestingly enough, this 6-year study of Fresno County gangs found that 55% of the members are female, and yet none of the services offered in the study to ameliorate teen challenges have anything to do with females. In fact, data do not include gender as a demographic in the study, other than the aforementioned percentage. Prostitution, status crimes and drug
trafficking are major gang activities in which females are participants, and for which they become incarcerated, but a cursory look at the literature finds no mention of female gang involvement. We must talk about a problem, if we are to find a solution. Therein lays the problem leading to this study.

There was no juvenile justice facility for girls in Fresno County until 2006. The original facility used for juveniles was the San Francisco Industrial School, founded in 1859, where the school opened with 48 boys and girls between the ages of 3-18 years, and a staff of six (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2014). Management could accept children from parents, police or courts, and children went to school for a 6-hr day and worked a 4-hr day. Boys soon dominated the facility, and girls moved to the Magdalen Asylum in San Francisco. Finally, the legislature enacted a law establishing two State reform schools. These schools included both trade training and academic classes. Girls moved to the Whittier State Reformatory, which opened with 300 youth. The primary responsibility of the school was to re-socialize girls to their proper place in society, or to ignore their needs altogether. Girls became invisible in a system designed for boys (Carr et al., 2008). It was not until 1909 that counties were to open their own juvenile halls; however, with such a small number of female offenders in Fresno County, they moved to the Ventura School for Girls. So, while boys could be visited by family and maintain relationships, girls continued to be isolated from the very relationships they needed to rehabilitate.

In 1942 the Ventura school, along with the Preston School of Industry in Ione, and the Fred C. Nelles School for Boys in Whittier, were separated from the Division of Institutions and became part of the new California Youth Authority. The Ventura School for Girls moved to Camarillo in 1962, and by 1970, a change
in the law meant fewer female commitments, so Ventura School for Girls became co-educational.

There was increased activity for incarcerated girls in the 1980s, with the opening of the El Centro Drug Program for Girls, and the Ventura School opened a camp program and instituted the department’s first female fire-fighting crew. Numbers of female offenders kept growing until 2004, when the Ventura facility again became for females only. By 2007, legislation (SB81 and AB 191) required that most youthful offenders be committed to county facilities, with the state prisons reserved for only the most serious felonies. Fresno County had been using an outmoded 46-year-old Juvenile Hall for the boys, with a 265-bed capacity (Little Hoover Commission, 2008). The County constructed a new 240 bed juvenile hall, with an additional 240-bed commitment facility attached in 2006 (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2014). This allowed the girls return to Fresno County. Like the boys, who stayed in Fresno almost from the beginning, the girls could now receive family visitors, and maintain relationships, which are so important to their development.

**Significance**

*I have to remind myself sometimes. It gets frustrating because, you know, many of the girls will violate their probation. On and off, on and off, but I remember if I go back and look at all the names that I have worked with over the past 3 years, there’s a lot of them I have never seen again. There are the chronic ones that really struggle. You know, those types of situations where there are five kids, no transportation, substance abuse and drugs and gangs. You know those are the most difficult cases.* (Therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility)

Delinquent incarceration costs the public approximately $88,000 per juvenile inmate per year (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2011). Many girls are arrested and detained for the first time, but some also recidivate every 12-24
months. However, there are hidden costs as well. There are costs in the lost potential of incarcerated young women. When we label and keep them from healthy functioning in mainstream society, taxpayers will be responsible for a lifetime of support.

Placing a girl in a juvenile justice facility creates a myriad of problems within not only the facility, but back on the outside as well. There has been a rise in the portrayal of violent juveniles in the media (Vidal & Skeem, 2007), which fosters public fear, and makes today’s youth appear to be a dangerous generation. Probation officers absorb this, much like the average citizen, but they are in a position to act upon it, and that mindset often makes itself evident in the treatment of juveniles (Vidal & Skeem, 2007).

Today’s juvenile justice is tougher and more difficult to distinguish from adult criminal justice. Add to this the perception that “incarceration of juveniles will increase negative labeling, decrease access to conventional social roles, increase feelings of alienation and decrease youth’s self-esteem, thus leading to repeat offending” (Hamilton, Sullivan, Veysey, & Grillo, 2007, p. 138). In addition, when girls violate perceived traditional gender roles, they actually receive harsher punishments than boys do. This treatment falls under the guise of the “evil woman” hypothesis, punishing *unladylike girls* twice. They are punished for the actual act, but again for violating gender norms (Crew, 1991). Spivak et al. (2014) predicted that the following will occur: “Girls will continue to outnumber boys among status offenders. Girls will be more likely to have their cases formally filed. And finally, girls will be more likely to be sentenced to custody as opposed to probation” (p. 8). Hoge (2008) explained that the current system throughout the world derives from Classicism. Some see acts as willful, moral transgressions, and incarceration has no concern for rehabilitation, no matter what
the gender. However, others maintain that incarceration moves girls toward rehabilitation (Hamilton et al., 2007).

When the girls get to the juvenile justice facility, staff is not equipped to work with them. Gaarder, Rodriguez, and Zatz (2004) said that juvenile justice lacks training to identify girls’ needs. There are few groups to help with sexual abuse, if any, and there are limited recreational, educational and work opportunities. Cauffman (2008) concurred, saying that there is a short supply of risk assessment tools for girls, which will lead to inaccurate predictions. Girls should be diverted to community-based treatment, but they often receive secure confinement (Cauffman, 2008; Gaarder et al., 2004).

Girls in juvenile justice facilities bring many challenges into the system. Sixty percent of girls report living in an out-of-home, non-Division of Juvenile Justice, placement including foster care. A majority of them have parents who have been involved in juvenile justice, as well as substance abuse. Thirty percent of the girls say they have moved more than 10 times in their lifetimes. Such movement keeps a child from experiencing compensatory education or Head start type programs, which help them to deal with antisocial behavior, and ultimately helps with staying in school and employment success (Hoge, 2008). Sixty-four percent of them report past abuse by a parent, or someone other than a parent (Gaarder et al., 2004). They often enter detention and are able to get medical attention for pressing problems that previously went unattended. Eighty eight percent have a serious mental or physical health problem. Twenty nine percent of them report that they have been pregnant at least once, while 16 % were pregnant while incarcerated (Watson & Edelman, 2012). When girls give birth while incarcerated, they are outside the facility only during the birth process, and custody of their babies goes to their parents, or to child protective services. While
it is possible for girls to re-claim their babies, it is usually a laborious process involving many obstacles.

Girls with the highest individual, family and neighborhood risk factors are getting the least consideration through the juvenile court system. Services are not being targeted for those in the greatest need, and consequently these girls are more likely to return to custody as children, and continue to be incarcerated throughout young adulthood (Bright, Kohl, & Jonson-Reid, 2014). In 1997, only 5% of federal, local and private funds went to girls (Gaarder et al., 2004). Funding for Juvenile Justice, overall, has declined by 50%, and funding is easily cut from girls because they are lower risk and fewer are incarcerated (Watson & Edelman, 2012).

A fresh approach needs to be taken to help the girls and their parents. Burke, Mulvey, Schubert and Garbin (2014) surmised that parents are exhausted by the time their daughters are teens. They are exhausted from fighting the schools, social services and now the juvenile justice and the courts. They are unaware of services available for support and education (Burke et al., 2014).

It is not enough to keep girls out of juvenile justice facilities. They need to learn how to access education, community support, and adult figures they can depend on. Current structures in place are not sufficient (McClure, 2014). Girls get a community packet when they leave the facility, and they are told how to access the services that they offer. However, the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (2009) reported that, in 2009, 43% of girls were re-arrested within 24 months. In fact, 29% of those returned within as little as 12 months. Watkins and Edelman (2012) advised that gender responsive programming is necessary. A definition of gender responsive would include a program that is comprehensive, and weaves family, community, and systems together. It would also be safe and
empowering. In addition, it would be community and family-focused and would emphasize relational activities. This need set the stage for a Challenge Grant reform effort, which began, in Stanislaus County in 2009. Working with a grant from the State Bar of California and the Prison Law Office in Berkeley, California wanted to set up a model for improving the services for girls in the system. Many youth development organizations have programs to work with juvenile offenders on parole, but girls are not using these programs. When asked why girls do not attend the Boys & Girls Club after incarceration, the girls say they have changed, but no one at home has.

The purpose of this study was to examine mental health and drug rehabilitation programming used with girls both in the seven county juvenile justice facilities in the Central Valley of California, and in six community benefit organizations during probation. Gender responsiveness in each program was the focus. It has been 5 years since Stanislaus County began collaborating with the Prison Law Office, the National Center for Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) and the Youth Justice Institute to implement what would become known as the Girls Juvenile Justice Initiative (GJJI) in an effort to evaluate the unmet needs of justice-involved girls in the Central Valley. The original intent of the Initiative was to serve at-risk and detained young women in Stanislaus County by providing evidence-based gender responsive programming, but also to develop and document the process, to assist other counties in the Central Valley. This study will serve as a progress report, to survey programming used by the Stanislaus County facility, and to see whether their involvement in gender-responsive programming has influenced other counties in the Central Valley of California (Stanislaus County Probation Department, 2013). Research will answer the following questions: is programming in the Juvenile Justice facilities and the
Community Benefit Organizations (CBOs) of the Central Valley of California gender-responsive? Are the physical facilities gender-responsive? Have staff adapted to gender-responsiveness? Our first task is to look at existing programming in the county juvenile justice facilities and community benefit organizations (CBO) of the Central Valley.

Girls need continued support and extensive services to be able to break free from old patterns. Hoge (2008) explained that community interventions are better than institutional interventions. Risk of criminal activity exists in the home, school and neighborhood, so we need to look at that activity in the same settings. Wrap-around programs such as Multisystemic Family Therapy work best, and are evidence based. Family therapies, like this, treat youth and parents in the community, and address the entire range of interacting problems of the youth (Hoge, 2008).

This dissertation will examine programs used with girls, both in and outside the facility, and the level to which these programs are gender-responsive. Leadership at each of the Central Valley facilities will be questioned about the delivery of the program, and facilities will be examined to determine how inviting and validating they are.

**Theoretical Framework**

_I was working with an Aftercare program, where I met with a young woman every Thursday. She ended up coming back to Juvenile Hall. There was a young woman who was extremely distraught, and she was assaulting peers, and staff. She has injured people. They were going to send her to Stockton, to California Youth Authority. I asked to work with her, since I had before. I told them that she just needed consistency, structure, hope, a routine...she needs an outlet. (Therapist at Montalvo Juvenile Facility)
If girls are going to return to normalcy after incarceration, they need to nurture them in a manner that is comfortable for them. They need to learn skills, which will help them to combat the world, and to stay out of trouble. In addition, they need to build their self-esteem and confidence, their refusal skills and a clear sense of right and wrong. Often, these are not skills, which we learn in a schoolroom, but rather we internalize in the community. The past 50 years have seen changes in the ways that girls learn to function in their world.

The Need for Gender Responsive Services

One of our girls is more concerned about the arrest of who prostituted her out, than she is herself, at times. She is 17 and we are working with her. We try to pull out the information and work with her on a one-on-one basis with some of our New Freedom Preparation for Treatment stuff about relationships and codependency. There is nobody home for her, no parent, nothing that is going to take care of her. Even when she gets out, she will probably end up in another group home and I hate to say it, but she is probably going to run and then we go from there. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Multiple works have identified that a problem with juvenile justice for girls is that the programs designed, are for boys. Upon a deeper examination, implications are staggering. Jean Baker Miller (1976) addressed this issue in her Toward a New Psychology of Women. Miller asserted that parents raise children to grow from dependence to mature independence, and the goal is to become the self-sufficient, differentiated self. However, Miller found that girls are more interested in building a sense of connection with others. Their sense of self-worth comes from that connectedness, which is often seen as a deficiency. The extent to which a girl conforms to male norms identifies her worth. In fact, Carol Gilligan (1982) in her book In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development pointed out that women were not really failing to develop, but
instead were failing to fit existing models of human growth as set forth by the male-dominated society at the time. Historically the control of girls often had sexuality at its center. The assumption was that female delinquency was biological and psychological, and that girls were inferior. Girls’ sexuality was the main motivating factor causing delinquency, and to defy social norms and break the law was *masculinized*.

Miller went on to create the Stone Center at Wellesley College, where she and other researchers developed Relational-Cultural Theory. Thinking about the relationships that foster healthy growth in women, Miller, along with Judith V. Jordan, PhD, Irene Stiver, PhD., and Janet Surrey, PhD wanted to help women to find a voice, and to counter the dominance of the white, male, middle-class, heterosexual culture. Male emphasis was on competitive achievement, and the ability to separate the self. Female traits of interconnectedness, growth-fostering relationships and community are a sign of weakness by the dominant society and a deterrent to mutuality. In a secure facility, it is difficult to build mutuality, which involves mutual respect, openness to change and responsiveness. Girls do not need equal treatment, but rather authentic connection which tolerates uncertainty, complexity, and the inevitable vulnerability involved in real change (Miller, 1976).

A part of the Relational-Cultural Theory is recognizing the importance of cultural context to human development and the impact of culture on daily life. Thomas and Sillen (1972) examined 19th century “personality traits” ascribed to African slaves that made them “prone to be rascals who run away with a lack of regard for the owner’s property” (pp. 13-14). This is similar to the way that girls in juvenile justice seem needy, overly emotional, and dependent. When personality traits of a subordinate group are *pathologized*, psychological theories
help to justify and preserve the culture’s power stratifications (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkranz, & Vogel, 1970; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976).

Having heard juvenile justice girls referred to by staff as difficult to handle, too emotional, and dealing with mental health issues, I question the validity of the charges. In a culture where separation, autonomy and cultural privilege are revered as signs of self-sufficiency and health, those who enjoy less cultural privilege will be viewed as deficient and needy. In addition, we give others too much power to define another’s value, or to distribute resources. When the relationship between program staff and participant is to protect the level of power between those who hold privilege and those who do not, it is unlikely that authentic gender-responsiveness can exist. In fact, some programs might find connectedness and openness to be dangerous practices. A gender-responsive program based on relational theory creates an empowerment model, which increases energy and excitement, the will to act, learn about others, build a sense of self-worth, and seeks more connection. These traits can be frightening in a system that strives to control (Bloom & Covington, 2001).

Jean Baker Miller’s Relational Cultural Theory has been operationalized by Marcia Morgan and Pam Patton (2002) in their Gender –Responsive Programming in the Justice System—Oregon’s Guidelines for Effective Programming for Girls. Using their guidelines for administration and management, as well as their guidelines for program content, this dissertation will analyze the programming used currently in the Central Valley of California, to ascertain whether it fits Miller’s ideal of gender-responsiveness.

The Need for Connectedness and Transformation

*The supervisor at the kitchen just contacted me and they want to start a food-handling program that certifies the girls for safe foods. I think they need many places to work, like McDonalds or*
whatever. We are going to try to get the girls who work in the kitchen certified so they can get jobs. (Therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility)

Paulo Freire’s (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* had a considerable impact on the development of educational practice and on the type of informal and popular education, the girls would experience in the community. First, he emphasized that informal education is a dialogical (or conversational) rather than a curricula form, but more importantly he emphasized that dialogue involves respect. It should not involve one person acting upon another, but rather people working with each other. Too much education, Freire argued, involves *banking*—the educator making *deposits* in the student. Instead, girls need to seek their own truth, in connectedness with others. These types of relationships may develop in youth development organizations, mentoring programs, youth groups, and many other opportunities throughout the community.

Second, Freire (1970) was concerned with praxis—informative and value based. Dialogue is not just about deepening understanding—but is part of making a difference in the world. Dialogue, in itself, is a co-operative activity involving respect. The process is important and can enhance the community and building social capital, and to leading us to act in ways that make for justice and equal rights for all people, not just males. Feminist theory joins with Freire on this point. “Humanization is the goal of liberation; it has not yet been achieved, nor can it be achieved so long as the oppressors oppress the oppressed. If humanization is to be realized, new relationships among human beings must be created” (Freire, 1921, p. 28). Informal and popular educators have had a long-standing orientation to action—so the emphasis on change in the world is a key. Several of the innovations in gender-responsive programming have begun to organize the girls into advocacy groups, and restorative justice programs, found
later in chapter two. However, any time that the girls engage each other in dialogue, or in therapeutic groups, they are taking part in the healing of others, as well as themselves.

Third, Freire’s attention to naming the world has been of great significance to those educators who have traditionally worked with those who do not have a voice, and suffer oppression. The idea of building *pedagogy of the oppressed* or a *pedagogy of hope* will resonate with the girls. An important element of this is his concern with *conscientization* – developing consciousness, but consciousness that is understood to have the power to transform reality. This, combined with his insistence on situating educational activity in the lived experience of participants, has opened up a series of possibilities for the way informal educators can approach practice (Freire, 1970). Educating girls in juvenile facilities, as well as Community Benefit Organizations, in a gender-responsive way, can be seen as *conscientization*, and can invigorate them when they return to the community.

It is through the lens of the Relational-Cultural Theory, operationalized by Morgan and Patton (2004), and Paulo Freire’s theories of informal education, praxis, and *conscientization*, that this dissertation will examine female programming and facilities to determine their level of gender-responsiveness. Analysis of programs in both the juvenile justice facilities, as well as in the community benefit organizations, follows.

**Definitions**

Some terminology surrounding juvenile justice practices may seem foreign to the layperson. Terms are quite broad, and it is important to understand the precise juvenile justice context within which they are used. Most important is to first define juvenile justice itself.
Juvenile Justice - Juvenile justice is the area of criminal law applicable to persons not old enough to hold responsible for criminal acts. In most states, juvenile justice law is applicable to those under 18 years old. Juvenile law governs by the juvenile justice codes of states. The main goal of the juvenile justice system is rehabilitation rather than punishment. Juvenile justice administers through a juvenile or family court; however, juvenile court does not have jurisdiction for minors charged as adults. Where parental neglect or loss of control is a problem, the juvenile court may seek out foster homes for the juvenile, treating the child as a ward of the court.

Commitment Facility - Facility, which holds youth who are committed to the state or county. They hold pre-commitment youths in a Juvenile Hall, however after sentencing youth are committed to serving a sentence in a commitment facility.

Diversion – A case is “diverted” out of the criminal justice system for a period (usually 1 year), during which time the defendant must undergo treatment, counseling, make restitution to the persons harmed or perform community service. If the defendant meets these conditions, pays all fines and court costs, and does not get into any additional trouble with the law during this time. They drop the case and this person does not have a criminal record. Usually, defendants must plead guilty in order to obtain diversion. Therefore, if during the time of the diversion, they fail to comply 100% with the terms of their diversion, or if they get into any other trouble, the courts will automatically find them guilty based on their guilty plea.

Gender-Responsive Services – Programs that comprehensively address the needs of a specific gender group, and intentionally allow gender identity and development to guide services. It involves activities that create an environment
that reflects an understanding of the realities of girls’ lives, and are responsive to the issues and needs of the girls served.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (1974) – One of the most influential pieces of legislation in juvenile justice, sets forth rules by which state laws must comply with regard to juvenile court procedures and punishments. The purpose of the act is to assist states and local communities with funding and standards to provide community-based preventative services to youths in danger of becoming delinquent, training individuals in occupations providing such services, and providing technical assistance in the field. It has undergone changes periodically. There were three guarantees in the Act, which included deinstitutionalization of status offenders, avoiding putting minors in adult prisons, and vigilance to avoid over representation of youth of color. In 2008, they reauthorized the law, reversing the deinstitutionalization of status criminals, but continuing its emphasis on keeping minors out of adult jails, fighting religious and cultural disparities, and rewarding justice facilities that tried data driven new programs.

Recidivism - Refers to a person’s relapse into criminal behavior, often after the person receives sanctions or undergoes intervention for a previous crime. Recidivism results when criminal acts result in re-arrest, reconviction or return to jail with or without a new sentence during a 3-year period, or less, following the prisoner’s release.

Status Crimes - Juvenile status offenders are distinguished from juvenile delinquent offenders in that status offenders have not committed an act that would be considered a crime if it were committed by an adult, whereas delinquent youths have committed such an act.
Outline of Dissertation Chapters

The purpose of this study is to examine the mental health and substance abuse programming used with girls, in juvenile facilities, as well as in community benefit organizations. Analysis of programs determines whether they are gender-responsive. Examination of programs will determine gender-responsive surroundings. Interviews with staff facilitating the programs, informs us about philosophy and values in the programs.

Chapter 1 - created a context within which juvenile justice for girls has been developing for the past 40-50 years. A historical look at the beginnings of justice for girls shows very little consideration of gender, until the 1980s. Even though gender is now considered, there are still gaps in implementation, and there needs to be more consistency. A theoretical framework looks at gender responsive programming, and the transformation that takes place when girls are able to connect personally, as well as with their communities. Innovation in community, as well as regional resources and programming is a key to this transformation.

Chapter 2 examines the literature, starting with the beginnings of female juvenile justice programming, and advancing to the more recent attention given to gender-responsive programming and its connection to recidivism. Following an examination of arguments against gender-responsive programming tracks the changing laws that allow more and more gender consideration, and should be instructive to any who are considering program design.

Chapter 3 surveys the methods used in the study. Qualitative methods gain the broadest sampling, without sacrificing depth. A qualitative model was the goal of the research design. I analyzed the Gender-Informed Practices Assessment (Van Voorhis, 2013, pp. 11-12), by doing a walk-through of seven different Juvenile Facilities and six CBOs. I also used Gender-Responsive Programming in
the Justice System (Morgan & Patton, 2002) to operationalize the analysis of Juvenile Justice programming for girls. Using a questioning protocol, developed by Amy Goodkind (2005) I asked administrative staff about management at each facility. I examined my own motives for the study, my choice of the designated subjects, and my own unique place in the outcome.

Chapter 4 follows the methodology outlined in chapter 3. An analysis of forty-one mental health and drug rehabilitation programs looks at actual programming, brochures and websites about the programming, studies conducted on the programming, and interviews of staff who are involved in delivering the programming. I conducted a walk-through of each facility, using the Gender-Informed Practices Assessment (GIPA), to determine gender responsive environment.

Chapter 5 highlights limitations of the study, concerns, a list of recommendations, as well as directions for future study.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

*If you go to the meetings at the Directors Assoc. for Behavioral Health, you will see that services for youth are really at the bottom of the barrel, to say it frankly. You know, there’s more focus placed on adult services, recovery assistance for perinatal for older adults, you know, but when it comes to youth and children for drugs and alcohol...there is no money.* (Program manager at Donner CBO)

In order to understand the juvenile justice situation as it pertains to girls, we need to look at the history of the juvenile justice system, so that we can see where the programming for girls originated. We then need to search the literature for different types of programs that developed for girls, and the ways that these programs are still being improved and expanded upon. Chapter 3 will lay out the methodology for a qualitative study of juvenile justice and community based programming for girls, and the environment where those programs take place. Ultimately, in Chapter 4, different types of programs currently used in the Central Valley of California will be analyzed, and staff will be interviewed concerning the presentation of, and acceptance of these programs. An examination will be conducted of the environments within which these programs are delivered.

Specifically, this chapter will look at the early programs developed for use with juvenile offenders, both nationally and within California, and then will discuss the beginning of juvenile justice for girls. Finally, we will advance to the current state of programs used with girls, to include gender-responsive programming, diversion, mental health, restorative justice, relational group therapy, group advocacy, and transitional services and mentoring. Since these are the most frequent ways to treat girls in the system, we need to inform ourselves of the theories and practices in use in juvenile justice currently.
Early Background and Theory

There is an old school and an old train of thought about substance abuse. There has been a paradigm shift in agencies and in providers who are innovative, who are about evidence-based therapy and about best practice. However, that requires, first of all, there has to be a leader who has vision and who is not stuck in an old school train of thought. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

At first examination, the juvenile justice system has been inconsistent, and based upon questionable goals and values. Binder (1979) described a system that punished both ruthless murderers and mildly unruly youth in the same way in the 1970s. Children were incarcerated for idleness, wandering the streets at night, smoking cigarettes, begging and making indecent proposals. He traced these beginning conditions back to a Biblical reference in Deuteronomy (21:18-21) that charges parents to “take hold of a rebellious child and bring him out to the elders of the city to be stoned.” Binder further linked British common law to the treatment of delinquents, prescribing that there be no special provision for children. Children under 7 could not have a guilty mind, but between 7 and 14 years of age, if knowledge of wrongfulness could be proven, they were to be tried as an adult. Punishment was according to the nature of the offence, and little attention was paid to the age of the offender. Children could be hanged or imprisoned ("Report of the committee on children and young persons," 1960).

Thus was the case in the colonies before American independence. At this time the king could practice parens patriae, meaning that he could take power over the persons and property of children. This practice continued after independence, in the form of the court system, where a judge could assume parental responsibility for a child, and examples can be seen in case law starting in 1838 (Binder, 1979; Rendleman, 1971). Sherman (2013) provided an example of Mary Ann Crouse, who in 1839 was committed by a justice of the peace to the House of Refuge for
being an “incorrigible or vicious female under the age of 18 years” (“Ex parte Crouse,” 1839). The state of Pennsylvania used its \textit{parens patriae} authority to stand in for an unfit parent and place the girl in secure detention (Sherman, 2013).

Binder (1979) offered a timeline of events leading to the creation of juvenile justice, based upon programming for boys, and starting with the opening of the first separate detention facility for youth, the New York House of Refuge in 1825. Each state, in turn began to make special arrangements for youthful criminals, turning away from due process in favor of rehabilitation and improved behavior. Chesney-Lind and Shelden (2004) described how much of the earliest treatment of juveniles was an effort by wealthy women of the late 1800s, called the Child Saving Movement. Girls’ sexuality was often blamed as the main factor causing their delinquency. Freedman (1981) added that true criminal behavior was unusual and, when it did happen, \textit{masculinized girls/women} committed it. Girls simply needed to be re-socialized so that they could fit into society. Instruction focused solely on males, while girls were expected to obey, and to disappear into the system (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Freedman, 1981).

In 1876, the Supreme Court ruled in \textit{Ex parte Ah Peen} (“Ex parte Ah Peen,” 1876) that a 16-year-old child “leading an idle and dissolute life” in San Francisco, without parental control—parents unknown—could be committed to the Industrial School without a jury trial. The purpose was not to punish for any criminal behavior but to reform and train “with a view to future usefulness when child shall have been reclaimed to society, or shall have attained majority” (“Ex parte Ah Peen,” 1876, p. 280). The court emphasized that because Ah Peen had been abandoned, “the State, as \textit{parens patriae}, has succeeded to control, and stands \textit{in loco parentis}” (“Ex parte Ah Peen,” 1876, p. 281). In effect, the State stood in the shoes of the child’s parents and made the kind of decisions that one
would expect parents to make for a child who was incapable of proper control. Ah Peen was a boy, but this shows the attitude that the courts had against all minors at the time.

Sherman (2013) told of a juvenile justice system, in the late 1800s and early 1900s, that frequently used *parens patriae* to step in and save unruly girls from unfortunate futures in prostitution, and to redirect them towards marriage, motherhood, and home life (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001). Gaarder et al. (2004) found that judges had few legal guidelines and many fell back on a Puritan ethic, whereby they routinely maintained parental demands. Some were even more progressive, whereby they took the role of the parent. Girls often found that not much had changed since juvenile justice started in the 1890s. Girls were more closely watched by their parents/courts than boys were, and their sexuality was believed to be at the core of their behavior. In addition, class and ethnicity were often used as a standard for doling out sanctions (Gaarder et al., 2004). All of these steps led eventually to 1899, with the first Juvenile Court of Law, in the state of Illinois. By 1925 only two states did not have juvenile courts (Binder, 1979).

Palmer, Van Voorhis, Taxman, and MacKenzie (2012) emphasized that in the 1940s the focus of juvenile justice was on rehabilitation, but the concept was quite debatable. With the creation of the California Youth Authority in 1942, director Herman Stark designated large sums of research monies to study the results gained by the efforts to rehabilitate, and to justify state investment. At the state juvenile facility in Ventura, boys and girls were both housed and they received the same treatment. High quality researchers were brought in, some funded through outside agencies, and all supported by the governors at the time, Edmund G. Brown, followed by Ronald Reagan. In this time of great confidence concerning the possibilities for rehabilitation, 231 studies on delinquent youth
were completed. Robert Martinson of New York was among the researchers, and after several experiments, he asserted that *nothing works* toward rehabilitation or recidivism. According to Palmer et al. (2012),

Martinson’s interpretations were faulty, having gone beyond the data to claims. His assumption was that correctional treatment was defective, and he wrongly believed that no correctional intervention would work. The public adopted his words as the ‘Nothing Works Doctrine,’ and much of the funding was withdrawn. (Palmer et al., 2012, p. 107)

James Q. Wilson (1975) concurred with Martinson in his book, entitled *Thinking about Crime*. He felt that it was naive to believe that a youth who had spent life in trouble, would suddenly decide to change, based upon working with a particular counselor or taking a particular drug (Wilson, 1975).

In 1952, Binder noted a spirit that led to an important change in juvenile court law (“In re CONTRERAS,” 1952). In the Contreras case, an appeals court stated that children could not be denied the rights guaranteed to adults, since a judgment could have serious consequences on their lives. However, enforcement was uneven. Not all states followed the same path, and 15 years later the federal court had to become involved in a case where a minor was not notified of the charges against him, was not allowed to talk to or see his parents, was not able to face his witnesses, etc. Gerald Gault was sentenced to 6 years in prison for making a lewd phone call, a charge that would have only resulted in 60 days in jail for an adult. Since appeals were not possible in juvenile court, it required a federal court to become involved, in order to help him acquire his constitutional rights (“In re GAULT,” 1967). Fox (1970) was amazed at how widely standard propaganda was accepted in the case, and the acceptance of the premise that a youth had to give up their constitutional rights in order to get rehabilitation and humane treatment. However, he felt that the Court created its own myth that
“children were being brought back to a Golden Age of constitutional rights that they lost at the turn of the century” (p. 1202).

California governor Goodwin Knight created the Special Study Commission on Juvenile Justice, to study matters related to delinquency and dependency (Arredondo, 2004). The study led to legislation in 1961, which ensured minors of the right to legal representation in delinquency cases. Most notable, in the case of girls in the system, three classes of minors were created, to include dependent children, status offenders, and criminal code violators. The majority of status offenders, since that time, have been girls. Before this legislation, all minors were combined as wards of the court.

Palmer et al. (2012) discussed the origin of the California Youth Authority, which was created with the express desire to rehabilitate, but the public had now begun to change its focus in favor of punitive sentences and treatment. Researchers had found that particular interventions worked with particular offenders in a given situation, but it was the late 60s and youth crime was on the rise. It would take years before the public began to accept rehabilitation as a purpose of juvenile justice again (Palmer et al., 2012). And during that time, the California Youth Authority (CYA) made matters worse when they were caught in a variety of abusive situations, which led to a Consent Decree and a demand for many reforms (“Farrell v. Cate,” 2004; Little Hoover Commission, 2008). A frightened public was not willing to give up power, in deference to rehabilitation efforts that had not been proven to be successful.

Binder’s (1979) analysis of the juvenile court system was skeptical by the 1970s. He disagreed that the court is a friendly, informal setting, intent on helping the child. He continued to advise that due process is important, since the judge
and the system interpret laws inconsistently. Secondly, the court is mostly concerned with whether or not the child is guilty as charged. For example:

Legality is what determines whether a child needs socio-psychological treatment. Third, the courts do not like to talk about punishment, and yet punishment is primary in the public mind, as well as the minds of judges, and police officers. I did an analysis of various state codes, and most of them include language that talks about imposing a “sense of responsibility,” or advocating “significant punishment.” (Binder, 1979, p. 635)

Binder (1979) also saw an emphasis on fair judicial treatment or due process in juvenile hearings. He perceived a consistent theme, including the handling of truants, runaways, incorrigibles, and other status offenders. He also saw a trend toward shifting the treatment of status offenders and non-serious offenders of criminal laws from the courts to community based agencies. Youth Services Bureaus are community centers established to provide services for young people referred by police and juvenile court. Diversion is another method (which will be mentioned later in this chapter) used to redirect youth outside the juvenile justice jurisdiction. The President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, in their 1967 report, recommended:

There should be expanded use of community agencies for dealing with delinquents non-judicially and close to where they live. Use of community agencies has several advantages. It avoids the stigma of being processed by an official agency regarded by the public as an arm of crime control. It substitutes for official agencies and organizations better suited for redirecting conduct. (President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967)

In addition, the President’s Commission recommended moving status offenders out of the delinquent category, because it stigmatizes children for offenses only illegal for a child.

Sherman (2013) established that the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, prohibited states from detaining status offenders
in locked facilities such as those used for youth convicted of more serious crimes, however it was soon circumvented. She charged that they had tainted social and adjustment problems, and criminalized the status offenders, most of them female, by making them live side by side with more toughened criminals. However, by 1977 many status offenders were still incarcerated because they had violated a valid court order (VCO). Facilities were now making it an infraction of a VCO when girls violated their probation, adding onto their time. The cost of keeping these girls incarcerated was using money that could help chaotic families and youth who are struggling in their homes and schools (Sherman, 2013).

Carter and Klein (1976) extolled the benefits of juvenile diversion, as a hot item in juvenile justice. Meeting with police officers and community members immediately after the crime, youth fashion a program which includes restitution toward the victim, programming to work out socio-psychological issues, and community service. Diversion is a responsive, cost-effective service for children-in-trouble and their families. The comprehensive, community-based services offered by the local diversion team, keep youth at home where they can maintain healing relationships, close to their families (Carter & Klein, 1976).

Macallair, Males, and McCracken (2009) painted a disturbing picture of the California Youth- Authority (CYA) for both boys and girls, during the 1990s, until 2005. The Ventura school housed both boys and girls, but juvenile justice still emphasized programs for the boys. The staff used abusive and militaristic approaches, rather than rehabilitation. The prison guard union also had the power to delay recommended reforms. Solitary confinement and mace were used for discipline, and offenders were often verbally abused, using information in their files to humiliate them. There was a grievance procedure, but it was not decided on site, and had to be sent off to Sacramento for review. Girls often did not grieve
because they did not think that anyone was listening, which led to more abuse. Since the Ventura school was far from home, they had no advocates in the form of family or attorneys nearby, and this isolation rendered them helpless in the system (Macallair et al., 2009; Yllana, 2005).

Yllana (2005) interviewed girls in the CYA during some of those scandalous years. She reported that girls were released after years of institutionalized living, without notice to their families:

The girls were sent home on a bus with no counseling or plan from CYA, other than parole restrictions. Girls were disoriented, and unready to make their way in a new world of choices. Due to the distance from their home areas, most had lost touch with their families, and had not seen their own children either. (Yllana, 2005, p. 257)

Conditions like these in Connecticut led them to pilot respite care in two cities, with 6 beds each in 2004-2005 (Watson & Edelman, 2012). Girls needed a place to explore their options and make plans for the future.

Bright et al. (2014) explained that the Farrell decision (2004), a class action suit against the CYA, was the beginning of change for incarcerated girls, because it opened eyes to conditions in the facility. Farrell demanded equal access to education, among other things. There was a shortage of teachers, causing 25% of the classes to be cancelled each day. Consequently, this led to 90% of the girls failing to complete high school (Yllana, 2005). Farrell also called for adequate medical, dental, and mental health care. However, the CYA had no training programs for medical staff, and no supervision of physicians. The waiting lists were long, and an emergency would usually get an appointment within a week. Girls who entered CYA pregnant received little, if any, medical services, and they often miscarried. Likewise, Yllana described a lack of mental health appointments, leaving girls to resort to self-mutilation, eating disorders, and suicide attempts.
When the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation examined improvements made to the Farrell Act, and provided a legislative briefing, the entire brief of 33 pages only mentioned its female population twice. They had consulted national experts regarding gender-specific programs, and had released a Request for Proposals on two different occasions, in April and December of 2007, but attracted no viable bidders. They had also ordered training for staff in order to run a cognitive behavioral intervention, in a gender-responsive manner. Nineteen staff members were trained in 2009, in the methods of using relationships, emotions and personal histories to work with the girls (Department of Juvenile Justice, 2009).

SB 81 was passed in 2007, and has been renowned as a complete overhaul of the Juvenile Justice system in California (Dawood, 2009). However, Dawood pointed out that even in this landmark bill, the only mention of girls is in the last recommendation, which says:

Counties should provide services and programs to justice-involved girls, which are at least equal to those available to boys in the juvenile justice system. At the same time, girls should not be lumped into commitment programs designed for boys without consideration to disparate characteristics of the populations. (Dawood, 2009, p. iv)

California was not the only state with dire juvenile justice conditions for girls. Watson and Edelman (2012) explained that, in Connecticut, in the early 1990s, the conditions were described as horrendous. There was little rehabilitative programming or medical care, leading to the “Emily J” lawsuit (Watson & Edelman, 2012). This lawsuit was the first effort by the Center for Children’s Advocacy to address the cross-system issues of abused and neglected children, many of whom were simply runaways from child welfare programs and placed in juvenile detention facilities for lack of alternative placements. The suit sought to remedy the serious problem of children in overcrowded detention centers where
sexual and other assaults were prevalent; medical, mental health, educational services, and recreational opportunities were inadequate; and housing conditions were deplorable (Emily J. v. Weicker, 1944). The girls lived in fear of their yearly evaluations because they could get time added for bad behavior, such as refusing to go to school or trying to commit suicide. Sometimes girls would arrive with short sentences, but then had years added because of bad behavior (Yllana, 2005).

Acker (1990) contended that the undervaluing of women in organizations, such as a juvenile justice facility, is not necessarily deliberate, but occurs because our social institutions, including our educational, legal, and justice systems, focus primarily on the needs of men and boys, placing women and girls in a substandard category:

Exclusion and devaluation are evident in an organizational context. Work rules, norms, expectations, job definitions, the provision of training, and reward structures are all constructed by people who experienced gender socialization and operate in an institutional context that reflects a gendered social order. These acts preserve gender inequality. (Acker, 1990, p. 145)

Jean Baker Miller’s Cultural-Relational theory (mentioned in chapter 1) would agree. She would explain that the problem with girls exists in the fact that they do not fit into a male dominated facility. Since girls represent roughly 20% of the total incarcerated population, if girls do not cooperate, is it because of the system? Or perhaps it is because of something inherent in the girls (Miller, 1976).

While boys and girls share many of the same risk factors for offending, these risk factors may affect boys and girls differently. For example, victimization—such as child abuse—is a risk factor for later offending among both boys and girls. However, delinquent girls report being exposed to child abuse at a much higher rate than boys—92% versus 10 to 47%, respectively—and may have more serious reactions to child abuse due to differences in the way that they cope with stress (Cauffman, 2008; Grisso, 2008).
There should be expanded use of community agencies for dealing with delinquents non-judicially and close to where they live. Use of community agencies has several advantages. It avoids the stigma of being processed by an official agency regarded by the public as an arm of crime control. It substitutes for official agencies and organizations better suited for redirecting conduct. In addition, the Task Force recommended moving status offenders out of the delinquent category, because it stigmatizes children for offenses only illegal for a child (President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967).

Sherman (2013) also claimed that, historically, juvenile justice had been remarkably disconnected from the research on child development. In 2005, the U.S. Supreme Court claimed that the death penalty was unconstitutional for any child under age 18, based in part on developmental differences between juveniles and adults. Therefore, no juvenile could ever be held as responsible as an adult. In 2010, the Supreme Court made the same decision about life in prison, except in the case of murder, since children’s brains are continuing to develop throughout adolescence and it would be wrong to make a lifelong judgment. In addition, there has been much recent developmental research applied to juvenile competency to stand trial, waive counsel, and confess when interrogated. Some even wonder if a child is able to understand Miranda Rights. In J.D.B. v. North Carolina (2011), the Court indicated that history is “replete with laws and judicial recognition that children cannot be viewed simply as miniature adults.” The most recent case was Miller vs. Alabama (2012) which forbids life imprisonment for juveniles, without parole, even in the case of murder.

Binder (1979) asserted that juvenile justice is headed back to pre-nineteenth century standards. Young criminal offenders will be treated exactly as adult
criminal offenders, with due process intact. Status criminals will be removed from court jurisdiction altogether, and the community will work to solve their socio-psychological problems. Children will be forced to take responsibility for their criminal acts, and the justice system will not interfere in the lives of behavioral-control status offenders. Binder has not been entirely correct. We still protect youth, under the age of 18, in the juvenile justice system, however it is possible to be tried and punished as an adult, if the crime is significant and the perpetrator shows no remorse. Likewise, while status crimes have been largely assigned to early intervention programs in the community, several states are still incarcerating girls for these crimes (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2015b). A new bipartisan juvenile justice bill was introduced in the Senate in April 2015, and is slowly making its way through the Committee on the Judiciary. Once again, this bill will be an attempt to phase out detention of status offenders on a national basis (Gately, 2015). It is appropriate for us to look at programs being tried with female juveniles currently in the Central Valley of California, to see if there is room for future improvement.

**Gender Responsive Programming**

*One of my Probation Officers has a mom who is an avid sewer. They bring in squares and we use plastic paperclips to put the squares together, and then they go out and the women use the sewing machine and sew them together and then they come back in here and we put them together, to make quilts for Valley Children’s Hospital. We have a little loom for making hats, and we make those for Valley Children’s too. A local bank collects them. We have a girl, who has a baby, and we have had pregnant girls and they have sewn for their babies, or made hats for their babies. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)*

When Jean Baker Miller and the Stone Center study group at Wellesley created Relational Cultural Theory, they identified the fact that women, distinctly
different from men, craved relational connection with others in order to develop in a healthy manner. Being isolated from family members and friends, in a juvenile justice facility, makes it difficult to make sense of thoughts and emotions that happen to them throughout the day. Then, when they are placed into boys’ programming, which emphasizes separateness, it increases their loneliness and lack of connection. Therefore, secure facilities, as well as community services available during probation, need to address the mental health of girls, both in and out of the facility. They need ways to connect with others, to seek their own solutions to life situations, and to feel whole. Current programming does not feed these needs, and assessments are not asking the right questions, which is one purpose of this study.

In an effort to remedy these issues, the 1992 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was the force behind significant state-level reform. Sections 112 (a) (7) (A) and (B) of the Act required states to assess how their juvenile justice programs were serving girls, and take steps to implement gender-responsive plans to better serve them. Watson and Edelman (2012) clarified that the Act also included significant funding for gender-responsive programming through a Challenge Grant program, which allowed states to receive federal funding to implement reforms in particular areas of concern identified by the federal government. Twenty-three states applied for and received funding under this program—more states than applied for any other individual Challenge Grant activity. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) set guidelines for the gender-responsive reform efforts:

- Programs should be all female whenever possible.
- Girls should be treated in the least restrictive environment, whenever possible.
- Programs should be close to girls’ homes in order to maintain family relationships.
- Programs should be consistent with female development and stress the role of relationships between staff members and girls.
- Programs should address the needs of parenting and pregnant teens. (Watson & Edelman, 2012, p. 4)

The real key to designing programs for girls is not in giving them identical treatment to boys. Having an all-girl program allows girls to participate in the programming, instead of fearing involvement, which might cause bullying by boys. It allows them to discuss the issues that are on their minds, involving body and sexuality issues that might be too personal to discuss in a mixed audience. To force them to do so is to repeat the original trauma. Since girls are generally non-violent offenders, they do not need to be as closely controlled and monitored as boys. Programs should also allow visits from families, and the maintenance of close relationships, since girls are relational, and require connectedness for healing. Staff should serve as mentors and build relationships with girls. In addition, pregnant and parenting teens require knowledge, and role models, and nurturing so that they may become successful mothers. Bloom and Covington (2001) felt that we need to integrate relational and trauma theories as the foundation for gender-responsive program development. These should include:

- incorporate girls’ pathways into the criminal justice system
- be based on relational theory, trauma theory, substance abuse theory
- be based on theories that are congruent, consistent and integrated
- be based on girls’ competencies and strengths and promote self-reliance
• fully address the needs of girls
• use homogeneous groupings
• address needs of girls – family, transportation, childcare, school, vocational training and job placement
• foster non-traditional vocational skills
• Staff reflects the members of the group
• Incorporate strong female role models
• Encourage cultural awareness and sensitivity
• Use gender-responsive assessment tools and treatment plans.  
  (Bloom & Covington, 2001)

In 2004, OJJDP convened a Girls Study Group consisting of researchers and practitioners to develop a research foundation that would enable communities to make sound decisions about how best to prevent and reduce delinquency and violence by girls (Zahn et al., 2004). Federal or state authorities had evaluated only 7 years after Bloom and Covington set the standard. In 2008, the Girls Study Group reviewed 61 gender-responsive programs across the United States and found only 17 of these, with none meeting the OJJDP’s criteria for effectiveness. There was so little information on what works, that OJJDP issued grants in 2011 for the evaluation of the effectiveness of delinquency prevention, intervention, and/or treatment programs in preventing and reducing girls’ risk behavior and offending (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2010). This was an important step in the right direction, and the present study takes that a step further, localizing the search to the Central Valley of California.

Van Voorhis (2013, p. 7) listed six gender-responsive principles for women, written by the National Institute of Corrections, that have guided many of the practices in the U.S.:

• Gender makes a difference
• Environments must be based on safety, respect, and dignity
• Relationships are central to Women
• Services must be comprehensive, integrated, and culturally relevant
• Provide opportunities to improve women’s socio-economic status
• Collaborate with community resources. (Bloom, Covington, & Owen, 2003; Watson & Edelman, 2012)

While it is true that these ideas and programs are designed for women, and we are discussing juvenile girls, Bloom and Covington would answer the issue in this way:

When the profile of girl offenders is compared to the profiles of adult women offenders, both in prison and in community corrections, it becomes clear that they are essentially the same females moving along the system from juvenile detention to jail or community corrections to state prison. (Bloom & Covington, 2001)

Out of these principles, Van Voorhis highlighted a number of innovations that have been created:

**The Women’s Risk Needs Assessment (WRNA)**

As will be seen in chapter 4, one of the needs that has become evident is an assessment tool that can be used to check girls into a locked facility. Girls have more of a need to talk and to ask questions, to the point where it takes twice as long to check them in, as it does to admit boys. This needs assessment is one example of the type of assessment that is needed:

The document contains 150 questions pertaining to criminal history, antisocial thinking, educational needs, employment/financial, housing, safety, antisocial friends, anger/hostility, mental health history, current symptoms of depression, current symptoms of psychosis, abuse/trauma, PTSD, substance abuse, relationship dysfunction, parent stress, and family conflict. It also taps the following strengths: family support, self-efficacy, relationship support, educational assets, and parental involvement. The assessment is designed to assist in the development of an individualized treatment plan. It identifies a girl’s risk factors so that she can be linked to appropriate programs and services. The instrument is so lengthy and asks
so many personal questions, that extensive training must precede its use. (Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman, 2010, pp. 7-8)

Women Offender Case Management Model  
(WOCMM):

Once the WRNA is used to check girls into the facility, there needs to be a way to plan for their successful treatment. This document is one way to accomplish that. The National Institute of Corrections used Women Offender Case Management Model (Van Dieten, 2008) in 2010 at the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch: Court Support Services Division. Four hundred and eighty-seven women were exposed to gender-responsive programs, with the following results:

Overall, the evaluation provides evidence that exposure to this gender informed model results in better outcomes for women probationers who are at risk of negative outcomes. A large number of measures were employed to address the major questions raised in the evaluation framework for WOCMM. The findings offer evidence that the WOCMM principles were being followed by the teams delivering the model and that positive intermediate changes were produced in a number of relevant outcome measures. Finally, the evaluation yielded results to support the conclusion that WOCMM was successful in reducing recidivism for women who were exposed to the model. (National Institute of Corrections, 2010)

Motivated interviewing is also embedded within the WOCMM. Correctional staff is trained to use strength-based and relationship-focused approaches with female offenders. This is in keeping with research on positive psychology, which is finding many advocates among feminist criminologists (Seligman, 2002; van Wormer, 2001). The strength-based models remind counselors that they should not always be dwelling on an offender’s deficits, but should be building from strengths as well. A girl may have a supportive family and a good education, and this should be remembered in her counseling session.

The WOCMM requires the development of a network of community services. The need to collaborate with mental health agencies is obvious, though
not always successful. WOCMM sites are required to collaborate with educational, employment, child welfare, substance abuse and social service agencies.

**Gender-responsive Programs**

A number of specific programs have been developed to address some of the gender responsive risk factors. Evaluation research has found that girls in these programs had lower post-program recidivism because they are highly structured, and have structured curricula detailed in staff manuals, with rigorous staff training requirements. Van Voorhis (2013) listed the following programs as examples: (a) Beyond Trauma, (b) Dialectical Behavioral Therapy, (c) Forever Free-substance abuse, (d) Helping Women Recover, (e) Moving On, (f) Seeking Safety (Voorhis, 2013, pp. 9-10). Two of these programs are currently being used with girls in the Central Valley.

**Gender-informed Practices Assessment (GIPA)**

The GIPA was developed to evaluate facilities. Outside experts come in for a week and evaluate facilities, administrators, staff, programs and inmates. They prepare comprehensive reports, with recommendations about all the domains. When used to its full potential, the GIPA is the starting point for strategic planning of a wide range of improvements to the evaluated agencies and facilities:

However, even with the gender-responsive, evidence-based approaches, it is still difficult to secure the interest of policy makers and practitioners to bring forward meaningful change to female offenders. (Van Voorhis, 2013, pp. 11-12)

The tool examines multiple aspects of a facility’s location, physical design, and conditions with regard to their gender-appropriateness for women. Among the primary considerations are:
• The geographic location affords accessibility to critical community services (e.g., medical, mental health and social services) and to the families of the women.

• Housing, showers and restrooms, and booking and admission areas are adequate for the number of women in the facility and designed to provide essential privacy and safety for women. Privacy considerations include the assignment of female staff persons to each shift and housing unit, and written policies that require female staff to conduct pat and strip searches except in emergencies.

• Attention is paid to the adequacy and appropriateness of basic living conditions (cleanliness, heating, cooling, comfortable furnishings, and visual environment). Further, the facility design and operation match the demonstrated security requirements of the women (not a higher security environment than warranted by women’s behaviors).

• There is sufficient program space for confidential assessment and treatment and for a variety of group programs, including space for physical exercise and for spiritual expression.

• Because relationships are so important to women’s well-being in prison and success after release, the facility provides user-friendly and adequate visitation space. It treats children and families with respect, and promotes efforts to assist families who need it with transportation to the facility. (Buell, 2010, p. 1; Van Voorhis, 2013, pp. 11-12)

I used these guidelines when I did my walk-through of the seven juvenile facilities, and the six CBOs. Since I was only in each facility for a few hours, and there were restrictions on certain parts of the facilities, I was only able to follow a portion of the instrument.

Even though policies were changed and assessments were ordered, Watson and Edelman (2012) revealed that in Connecticut in 2002 it was found that

The staff needed more training in gender-specific approaches, and that the detention centers did not have a safe program for girls. Restraints and isolation were used at a very high rate. In 2003, they initiated a multi-year project, which measured program components, staff training on gender responsive, and trauma informed programmatic changes. Restraints were abolished, along with isolation room time as punishments. According to surveys that were later taken, these changes reduced worker compensation
claims and increased safety for staff and girls. (Watson & Edelman, 2012, p. 10)

An outgrowth of this increased concern for girls has caused a number of innovations. The Probation Department in Connecticut has installed resource racks in all juvenile hall units so that youth can learn about available services before they leave custody. There are now improved assessments, a probation officer with an all-girl caseload, a girls’ mentoring program, and an in-county girls’ group home. The Juvenile Law Center of Philadelphia and Philadelphia Children’s Hospital has also collaborated to produce a Girl’s Health Screen for those 11-17 in detention (Watson & Edelman, 2012).

Secure Facilities

So then we go to court.... all of the kids come in with their parents, and the judge brings them up one at a time, in front of him. The judge says, “OK, you have done X, Y, Z this week.” If they need a sanction, the judge may say, “OK, you are going to go into custody for 3 days. After 3 days you will be released,” or it can be a week. Alternatively, they can put them on the drug fit monitor, which is a GPS monitor, and you have to follow the rules. He explains to the kids what the sanction is, and why they are getting that sanction. (Probation Officer at Drake Juvenile Facility)

The public has every reason not to want juveniles to go to a secure facility. Gladys Carrion, commissioner of New York City Administration for Children’s Services noted that it costs $362,000 per year for each youth, and that it is a “training ground for criminality” (McClure, 2014, p. 3). Hamilton et al. (2007) explained that the effectiveness of a juvenile justice program is identified by its ability to prevent out-of-community placement. Out-of-community means moving the youth into a secure facility, further stigmatizing the youth, as is described in Lemert’s labelling theory (Lemert, 1994). Multi-problem youth with mental health and substance abuse issues are more likely to be placed out-of-community because the services needed may be quite costly or unavailable. However, out-of-
community placement isolates the youth from family, school, sports, and church. These may be the main factors that could help to rehabilitate the youth (Hamilton et al., 2007, pp. 424-445).

Hamilton et al. (2007) continued to say that when judges make decisions about youth placement, they make a decision between troubled and untroubled cases. Will a case need special handling, such as placement in adult court, or can it be let go? Behavior is used to determine the kind of handling that is required. If a case is flagged hostile, sometimes youth are labeled as disturbed and court officials describe the problem as pointless. Prosecutors have the option to petition for waiver hearings if they believe the youth is not a fit and proper subject to deal with under juvenile court law. During the hearing, judges determine whether youth are either fit to remain in the juvenile justice system, or are unfit to stay in the juvenile system and will be transferred to the criminal system to be treated as adults (Hamilton et al., 2007).

Harris, Lockwood, and Mangers (2009) said that the juvenile court waiver hearing identifies chronic and serious offenders who are a threat to society and cannot be rehabilitated. In 1966, the Supreme Court established a set of legal criteria to guide a waiver hearing. Judges were to focus on social and legal factors, including seriousness, nature, extent of offense, sophistication and maturity of the youth, record and previous history of the youth, prospects of protection of the public and the reasonable rehabilitation of the youth. In a study of 29 hearings in three courthouses, with charges of molestation, armed robbery, assault, attempted murder, and murder, all were waived to adult court. Youth were of color, 14-21 years old, and only two were female (Harris et al., 2009). While the public might feel safer with these out-of-community placements, Hoge (2008) interjected that incarceration, shock incarceration, and boot camps do not
have positive effects on reoffending rates. Hoge (2008) showed us a cost benefit, in that

Money spent on appropriate interventions saves money in reduced criminal activity, improved school and employment performance, and better mental health. For every $1.00 spent on interventions, the public yields an average of $28.34 in results. (p. 4)

The child welfare and rehabilitative model addresses deficits and needs in young people. The situation does not require harsh punishments, close supervision, limiting privileges and restoration.

Carr et al. (2008) explained that girls who commit a new offense are much more likely than similar boys to be returned to a residential situation, out-of-community, no matter how serious their re-offense. Little is known about the risk and protective factors provided by juvenile court to incarcerated females (Bright et al., 2014). Services are not yet targeting those females with the greatest need, which is one reason for this present study.

**Treatment in Community**

*We have new positions and we are going to have a navigator. Once girls are released, we want them to have someone to hold their hands and take them to the appointments. Make sure that they are following through with the appointments that we try to link them up to while they are in custody. We have a reintegration meeting every Monday for the kids that are due to be released that upcoming week. We tell them, “Well, here are some services, and this is what you need to be successful.” Then we will have a navigator to make sure that they are following through with what was recommended.* (Behavioral health specialist at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

Freire (1970) said that our young people would gain their literacy by reading the world, or their own experiences. Reading the world will lead to collective knowledge and action. Freire agreed with feminists when he denied that men are abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the world. He believed that the oppressed could transform their world by acting together. He also extolled
the idea of conscientization, or coming to consciousness of oppression and a commitment to end that oppression. Conscientization is based on this common experience of oppression. Staff and students were to work to know the world, and to act as worldly participants. In the spirit of Freire, we will look at ways that members of the community are working to eradicate crime, and to aid the rehabilitation of young people in the Central Valley. An examination of diversion, mental health, restorative justice, relational group therapy, self-expression and advocacy, transitional services and mentoring will seek the theory behind the praxis.

**Diversion**

*You got a kid for disturbing the peace? Take them home. You got a kid for shoplifting? Take them home. I do not want a 12 year old in here. I do not need to make a 12-year-old worse. It has to be significant, with some injury or something, for me to say, yes, because I am going to make them worse.* (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Wilson and Hoge (2012) described locales that want to adopt a rehabilitative approach, and often will prescribe diversion. There are two types of diversion programs:

One is for lower risk youth, which is implemented at pre-charge. Known as True Diversion, youth are diverted from the system with no further police or judicial processing. This is referred to as a Caution program, and is the least intrusive, as it serves to divert youth, aside from a warning or formal caution. Formal diversion happens at post-charge, and involves some conditions. Youth must admit guilt and agree to participate in programming, either within the diversion program, or by referral to outside agencies. At post-charge, if a youth will accept responsibility for his or her actions and agree to participate in recommended programming, they will undergo no further judicial processing. If they are successful in the program, charges are dismissed. If they are unsuccessful, they will be incarcerated, since they have already admitted guilt. (Wilson & Hoge, 2012, p. 498)
Youth in community-based treatment do better than youth whose treatment is provided in institutions. The potential benefits are improved health and well-being, decreased stigma, and increased overall functioning, which may ultimately prevent future delinquency (Hamilton et al., 2007).

In addition, Hoge (2008) described the Modified Justice Model, which advocates that priorities should be prevention and intervention programs. The model began in 2003, when the Youth Criminal Justice Act was enacted, protecting the legal rights of youth. While the Act insisted that the punishment fit the crime, no matter how serious, facilities emphasized diversion and rehabilitative services. The Justice Model, however, was quite harsh:

> It generally involved debate about the differences between individual deterrence, group deterrence, or punishment as the primary purpose of sentencing. There is also a debate over the extent to which diversion, probation, or custody sanctions should be employed. (pp. 2-3)

Unfortunately, far too often, the decision for girls involved custody in a locked facility.

Hoge (2008) went on to focus on two other models. The Crime Control Model ascribes legal punishments to offenders for the protection of society. There is, then, less concern with the individual offender. It is a model that guides the treatment of juveniles in many jurisdictions throughout the world (Winterdyk, 2002):

> This model comes from the Classical Theory of Crime. Criminal acts are viewed as willful, representing moral transgressions, and the only recourse is to impose criminal sanctions involving incarceration. The last of the models is the Preferred Model, which supports child welfare and rehabilitation orientation as the best practice for addressing antisocial behavior in youth. (Hoge, 2008, p. 3)

Theory and practice both support the need for diversion. In his Labeling theory, Becker (1963) emphasized that there are negative consequences of labeling
youth as delinquent. There is an expectation of continued negative behavior, which might later keep youth on the fringe of society and limit their opportunities (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1994; Morris, 1964). In Differential Association Theory, Cressey (1952) and Sutherland (1974) also supported diversion. The fear is that antisocial attitudes and behaviors are learned from other incarcerated youth. Associating with others exhibiting poor attitudes and behaviors encourages their adoption by the youth. Both pre and post-charge diversion can help to reduce the impact of labeling and association with antisocial peers by reducing the youth’s exposure to the locked facility (Cressey, 1952; Sutherland, 1974).

In a meta-analysis performed by Wilson and Hoge (2012) there was strong support for both types of diversion programs, cautioning and direct interventions. In nearly all cases, youth re-offended less often than those who had been placed in a locked facility. A growing body of research shows that involvement with the judicial system has negative impact. The earlier youth can be diverted from the juvenile justice system, the better. Another reason for the use of diversion is that it is cost effective. The meta-analysis also says that assessments should be used to ascertain the risk and needs level of youth entering the system. Diversion is effective when used with youth with lower levels of risk and needs, however moderate to higher levels should have more active interventions.

Most diversion programs focus on first time offenders who have committed misdemeanor crimes. Andrew Fois, deputy attorney general for the District of Columbia explained:

They were developed to give young people a second chance, in the belief that, though people may mess up once, they may not mess up again. It prevents people from becoming chronic recidivists by giving them an incentive to leave the destructive path they may be on and get back on a law-abiding path. (Prince, 2013, p. 1)
Standard conditions of diversion participation include drug testing, restitution, community service and counseling.

Hamilton et al. (2007) explained that diversion may include various types of therapy. Functional family therapy (FFT) may be used to treat high-risk youth, and help them to work toward increased self-sufficiency and functionality within the family. Multisystemic therapy (MST) is another treatment that has empirically validated success with juvenile justice populations. This therapy addresses youth problem behaviors in the context of their daily lives, with family, peers, school and vocational interventions. Youth who are treated by MST are proven to have fewer arrests, fewer criminal offenses, and spend fewer weeks in detention than youth who are incarcerated in a secure facility. Hamilton et al. also proved that the service-delivery skills of therapists in the outer community influence the effectiveness of a diversion program (Hamilton et al., 2007).

Conversely, Schwalbe, Gearing, MacKenzie, Brewer, and Ibrahim (2012) examined 20 youth diversion studies, resulting in 45 recidivism comparisons, and concluded that:

- The effects of youth diversion were not significantly different from those of transitional processing or warn and release programs. In transitional processing and warn and release, juvenile parole officers maintain close contact with the juveniles under their charge, assisting them to mainstream back into high school, find employment and connect with appropriate counseling and related services. When breaking the analysis down by type of intervention provided, they found that diversion programs that provide family treatment were the only effective approach (of five) in reducing recidivism, with youth courts demonstrating the least effectiveness. (Schwalbe et al., 2012, p. 30)

Wilson and Hoge (2012) utilized 45 studies to examine 73 diversion programs and found that the diversion of youth offenders did result in lower recidivism rates than traditional processing. They found that
Both caution programs and intervention diversion programs were significantly more effective than traditional means of addressing youth crime. They noted that studies did not report their treatment approach consistently enough to use specific types of moderating variables (such as family stability). This variation in results can likely be attributed to methodological differences between the meta-analyses. (Wilson & Hoge, 2012, p. 510)

Alder (1984) explained that most diversion programs have typically used such methods as individual counseling, casework, and work experience as their major treatment modes, unsuccessfully. None of these types of treatment has worked notably well in other settings, so it is no surprise that they have done poorly in diversion programs. Results of evaluations of diversion programs have consistently been mixed. Additional concerns about diversion programs have surfaced in connection with girls’ experiences with them. Specifically, Alder (1984), and Chesney-Lind and Shelden (2004), who reviewed these efforts believe that rather than serving as an alternative to formal processing, they have actually served to widen the net. Widening the net merely takes in more girls to supervise, rather than putting existing girls into some type of alternative program. Alder made the point that this was more directly a problem for girls than for boys. She noted that girls constituted 40 % of the participants in diversion programs but only about 25 % of offense cases in the courts. Girls are also referred for less serious offenses or, in some instances, no offense at all. Diversion programs may be monitoring girls who have not committed crimes but are simply having problems with their parents or their schools (Alder, 1984; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004).

Baltimore State’s Attorney Gregg Bernstein is particularly proud of their diversion program for teen girls and women charged with prostitution and solicitation. Such offenders “are likely not doing this by choice. Those who qualify get wraparound services to help break that cycle” (Prince, 2013, p. 2). Baltimore State’s Attorney’s Office has been successful. The numbers of
participants in the marijuana diversion program has doubled from 700 in 2010, to 1,400 in 2012. More than half of the juveniles, whom they referred to diversion programs, successfully completed them.

**Model Community Diversion Programs**

**Detention Diversion Advocacy Program (DDAP):**

The Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ) (2015a) describes the development of DDAP in 1993, as a way to reduce unnecessary youth detention and lengths of stay, and to increase community engagement with youth offenders. DDAP was the first evidence-based pre-adjudication diversion program for high-risk youth in the nation. By targeting the highest risk youth in San Francisco’s juvenile detention center, the program was able to avoid the common problem of “net-widening” that commonly undermines traditional diversion programs. Once a youth is released to CJCJ custody, DDAP employs an intensive case management strategy to implement the designated case plan. DDAP staff connects their clients to a range of community-based services.

DDAP staff conducts face-to-face visits three times a day (during the first week after referral) to three times a week (in the second and third months). Staff act as role models and mentors, providing stable and encouraging support structures for their clients, and never carry caseloads higher than 12 youth.

According to a United States Department of Justice study in 1999:

DDAP participants were 26% less likely to recidivate when compared to detained youth. In 2002, the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management of George Washington University, evaluated the Philadelphia Detention Diversion Advocacy Program (DDAP), finding that only 6% of DDAP clients were rearrested. Additionally, four percent of the DDAP clients were reported to have missed a court date during their time under DDAP supervision. (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2015a)

**Ottawa Community Youth Diversion Program (OCYDP):**

The OCYDP provides diversion services to youth according to risk level and need areas. It is a designated pre-charge and post-charge program and accepts referrals from police as well as the prosecutor’s office at the pre-adjudication level. It primarily targets medium-risk youth in an attempt to avoid those who would have normally been counseled and released. Youth are required to be between the ages of 12 and 17, accept responsibility for
the index offense, and consent to participate to be accepted into the program.

The OCYDP is based on a case management, brokerage model. Assigned caseworkers assess the youth using the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory and make referrals to community agencies based on their identified criminogenic risk/need areas. Referrals to one of the 25 agencies include, but are not limited to, one-on-one counseling, peer mediation, education/information sessions, or restorative justice projects. The youth must agree to the plan to continue in the program; otherwise, their file is returned to the police or prosecution, who retain full discretion over the case. Youth who successfully complete the OCYDP have fully completed each treatment referral according to their assigned caseworker or the independent agency. Youth are considered partial completers if they complete at least one of their referrals and non-completers if they fail to follow through with all referrals or only completed a portion of each referral (Ottawa, 2014).

While results initially demonstrated that diversion was overall more effective than youth probation in reducing reconvictions, examining the diversion group by program completion level suggests that mere diversion itself is not effective. These results demonstrated that, contrary to the overall findings, youth who failed to complete the OCYDP had significantly higher recidivism rates than youth on probation. Previous studies have shown that youth who fail to complete treatment programs are at a higher risk of recidivating compared to those who remain untreated. Successful completers had significantly lower recidivism rates than matched youth on probation (Wilson & Hoge, 2013).

Mental Health

*I have a small youth treatment contract with the county to provide for anyone who does not qualify for Medi-Cal. Therefore, any adolescent, whatever the background of a family, can come here and receive treatment free of charge.* (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

Feminist theorists (Broverman et al., 1970; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976) point out that the traditional theories of psychological maturity tend to over-
pathologize women as needy, emotional, and dependent. Rarely was there any attention to the social structures and power arrangements that created the solitary roles assigned to women in a gender-class culture. “When personality traits are attributed to a lesser group and pathologized psychological theories help to justify and preserve the culture’s power classes” (Broverman et al., 1970, p.2). Miller (1976) explained that

In a culture which upholds separation and autonomy, boys with cultural privilege can wrongly appear more self-sufficient and so will be judged as healthier, more mature, more worthy of society’s benefits. Girls, who enjoy less cultural privilege, will more likely be viewed as needy and mentally ill. It is assumed that something is wrong with girls. (Miller, 1976, p. 52)

So often, girls in the juvenile justice system are treated as if they are either homogenous (Cauffman, 2008) or the same as boys, and yet Van Voorhis (2013) emphasized that offenders need to be tested immediately upon entering a facility. Providing intensive services to low risk clients actually can be harmful, so it is essential to target the risk factors for future offending, before prescribing treatment (Hoge, 2008; Van Voorhis, 2013). Bright et al. (2014) lamented that policies and services designed to improve the lives of girls and young women are largely unknown, due to our lack of knowledge. The Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (Watson & Edelman, 2012) told how to use individual interviews to create an overall profile of the needs of girls in the system and to develop interventions for individual girls. The assessment classifies girls as low, medium, high and maximum high risk, and then identifies girls’ pathways into the system and strategies for improving outcomes for each girl.

Some statistical measures have been developed to help to evaluate female offenders when they arrive at a facility. Espelage et al. (2003) described the use of
the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) to provide psychological profiles of new arrivals:

The MMPI is one of the most extensively used psychological tests. It is used to identify psychological characteristics, and other adolescent problem behaviors. In looking at differences between boys and girls, it was found that female offenders are more likely to report having been physically or sexually abused. (Espelage et al., 2003, pp. 770-771)

In addition, a review of 20 studies on the adult outcomes of antisocial adolescent girls found that:

They have higher mortality rates, a wider variety of psychiatric problems, more dysfunctional and violent relationships, poorer educational achievement, and less stable work histories compared with non-antisocial females. Using the MMPI it was found that delinquent adolescent girls have the most problems with family conflict, authority figures, delinquency, poor school achievement, risk taking, and impulsivity. (Espelage et al., 2003, p. 771)

Another test used as a triage instrument upon first arrival to a facility is the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument for Mental Health Needs of Juvenile Justice Youths (MAYSI) (Grisso, 2008). The test screens in-coming youth for mania, any substance abuse (i.e., alcohol, marijuana, and any other substance abuse), OCD, ODD, specific phobia, and conduct disorder (Hahn, 2013).

Van Voorhis (2013) explained that girls often arrive with very little confidence that outsiders, professionals, or other members of the system would have much that could be useful. Underneath many of girls’ early expressions of disinterest in change, lay portions of labelling theory which expressed a belief that change simply was not possible for them (Sowards, O’Boyle, & Weissman, 2006). Girls’ pathways to crime include depression and anxiety, coupled with self-medication. Others arrive with self-worth and identity issues, coupled with lack of self-esteem, or quality relationships. Hoge (2008) and Van Voorhis (2013) added that limited family support, unhealthy intimate relationships, limited education and
poverty, lead to devastating levels of self-worth. In addition, Garcia and Lane (2009) found that abandonment, neglect, abuse, and lack of trust lead to eating disorders, depression, substance abuse, self-mutilation, and personality disorders (Garcia & Lane, 2009). Gaarder et al. (2004) stated that 40% of girl offenders are victims of sexual abuse, and substance abuse is linked to multiple incidents of sex abuse. This type of victimization and lack of appropriate treatment makes it appear that there is no solution for delinquent girls (Holsinger & Ayers, 2004).

Hoge (2008) offered several types of treatment that are being used in facilities at this time. The Child Welfare and Rehabilitation Model accepts controlling antisocial behavior in young people as its goal, and treats deficits within their environment. There is less emphasis on legal processing and more concern with providing restorative interventions. The Corporate Model is a variation on the Child Welfare Model (Corrado, 1992). The difference exists in the importance of integrating all services for children, whether they originate in the judicial or child welfare system. This is a difficult model to find, with working examples only in Scotland and Quebec.

Psychoanalysis is a therapeutic approach, which requires specialized training. Ravoira, Graziano, Glesman, and Baker (2012) noted that in girls’ relationships, trauma and mental health are areas that require an experienced therapist. Particularly in rural and tribal areas, there is a huge need, and staff must be highly responsive. Girls must be taught to trust, to listen and to communicate with parents. The therapist needs to understand the background of those involved, and their life history, as well as present circumstances and problems. Staff must reserve any type of judgment, if they are to be effective (Ravoira et al., 2012).

However, while staff is expected to reserve judgement during therapy, Vidal and Skeem (2007) found that judges recommend longer sentences for
offenders with these psychopathic traits. Even so, judges see them as no less accepting of treatment, nor more appropriate for transfer to adult court, so receiving psychopathic treatment can have positive and negative outcomes (Vidal & Skeem, 2007). Gaarder et al. (2004) asserted that we still lack adequate knowledge of how probation officers and court officials view girls’ pathways to crime, personal attributes and future possibilities. Most states are still very behind on understanding the needs of girls. Early Challenge grant money was being spent on gathering data on basic needs. Only 38% of the states funded specific new programs for girls as expanded or existing programs (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001).

Hoge (2008) observed that there are practical barriers to implementing effective programs. First, the range of options may be limited by economic and resource considerations. All state and local programs have limited resources, and sometimes-difficult choices must be made. The only response is to observe, as closely as possible, the principles of best practice. This study found that too many participating groups can have a negative impact on a girl’s treatment. “This also applies to those cases where the juvenile justice system contracts out services: efforts must be made to monitor the quality of services being delivered, as inappropriate actions have been recorded” (Hoge, 2008, p. 12).

Hoge (2008) continued that another practical obstacle we encounter is caused by the fragmented nature of many human service systems. Our youth often exhibit special needs in many areas and may have contacts outside the juvenile justice system, including special services in the schools, treatment in the mental health system, and services from child protection and other such service agencies. If services do not work together, treatment can be rendered useless. This study
examined agency cooperation, and found that a lack of communication between agencies can get in the way of service delivery.

**Restorative Justice**

*Giving them leadership, that is important. Our drug core group is 98% male most of the time. Then we will have a couple of females rotate in, letting this one particular girl in our group just shine. She has reached a higher level and she is sitting up there as a leader in a group full of men. You can see the change in her; you can see the pride that she has gained and that she has not had a strong male role model in her home, and the man in her home does not give her a sense of accomplishment. For her to be sitting there in a room full of boys, to be asked questions, and to give sound advice... she has been praised for that.* (Mental health clinician at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

Juvenile delinquency affects more than just the offender, so all of the components must be dealt with. The failing of juvenile justice systems aimed solely at the offender, regardless of how successful, does not ease the impact of crime on victims and communities. Acts of criminal activity upset the balance in victims’ lives and within communities (Ryals, 2004). Zehr (1997), in different words, presented restorative justice as an alternative to current criminal justice models:

a quiet, grassroots, seemingly inconspicuous, but truly revolutionary movement that is changing the nature, the very substance of juvenile justice. The changes extend far beyond most reforms in the history of criminal justice, to a truly inventive paradigm shift. (p. 68)

Morris (1998) spoke in favor of Transformative Justice, which places healing and empowerment of all those affected as its central goal, as does restorative justice. It includes victims, offenders, their families and friends, and the effected community, and finds safe places where they can all explore the meaning of the crime, and the root causes. There is an interaction among the participants, and together they come up with new solutions to the crimes. Using
collaboration, they heal community wounds, so that new communities may be built. In the process, they recognize the context of the crime, and the role that social class and race may play in defining who is the victim and who is the criminal. She believes that court officials, police, and legal officials are all given too much power, refusing to allow the parties to communicate and to tell their stories. Her remedy is to empower the community to create new ways to aid one another (Morris, 1998).

Morris (1998) also cautioned against labelling which does much to stigmatize youth in the juvenile system. She cited Edwin Lemert (1994) who warns of the power of the labeling process. While many of us break rules of all types (traffic violations, as an example), these are considered primary deviance, and most of us rationalize our behavior. However, if official representatives of society (such as school, or the police) single us out for our deviance, we are much more likely to enter the realm of secondary deviance. We react to two aspects of secondary deviance. We are affected by the societal reaction, but we also reorganize our own self-concept. Lemert (1994) said that “Self-definitions or self-realizations are likely to be the result of sudden perceptions, and they are especially significant when they are followed immediately by overt demonstrations of the new role they symbolize” (p. 300). Therefore, Lemert (1994) found girls referring to themselves as taking part in “survival sex” (p. 300). Chesney-Lind (1989) found that 79% of girls in the juvenile justice system had been subjected to physical abuse that resulted in some form of injury, and a parent or someone else close to their family had sexually abused 32%. In a study of adult women in prison, she found that over 60% had been sexually abused as youngsters. Therefore, often girls would run away from home, and once on the streets they began engaging in prostitution and petty property crimes. They often
began a lifetime problem with drugs. The overall result is that laws that were created to protect young people have, in the case of girls’ delinquency, *criminalized their survival strategies*.

Restorative justice views crime, first, as harm done to people and communities. The legal system often loses sight of this reality; consequently, a concern for victims’ needs and roles should be immediate. It involves repairing the harm as much as possible, both concretely and symbolically. Zehr (1997) further defined restorative justice by contrasting it against punitive justice.

Punitive justice involves crime defined as a violation of law, the state was crime’s victim, the aim of justice is to establish blame and administer punishment, with a clear winner and loser. Restorative justice differs in that:

It involves crime as a violation or harm to people and relationships. The aim of justice is to identify obligations and to meet needs and to promote healing. The process of justice involves victims, offenders and the community, and aims to promote healing among the parties involved. (p. 69-70)

Zehr and Mika (1998) feared that punitive programs were simply being repackaged as *restorative justice* initiatives, a reflex of the growing popularity of the concept, and/or the availability of financial resources. The steps of the program were outlined as:

1. Victims and the community have been harmed and are in need of restoration. 2. Offenders and the affected communities are the key stakeholders in justice 3. Offenders’ obligations are to make things right as much as possible, 4. The community’s obligations are to victims and to offenders and for the general welfare of its members, 5. The needs of victims for information, validation, vindication, restitution, testimony, safety and support are the starting points of justice, 6. The process of justice maximizes opportunities for exchange of information, participation, dialogue and mutual consent between victim and offender, 7. Offenders’ needs and competencies are addressed, 8. The justice process belongs to the community, 9. Justice is mindful of the outcomes, intended and
In addition, the focus should be on the harms of the offense more than the rules that have been broken. There should be equal concern and commitment to victims and offenders. Offenders should work toward the restoration of victims, empowering them. However, offenders should also be supported to accept and carry out their obligations:

The true challenge of restorative justice is the struggle of sustaining restorative justice principles and ethics in a punitive justice setting. Serious issues of credibility, legitimacy, program discernibility, and financial reliability are other issues that must be considered. An expanded role of the community as a focal point of trouble and justice will mean redefining community liability to both victims and offenders, with a local role in preventing and intervening in those conditions that advance conflict and hamper its productive resolution. (Zehr & Mika, 1998, p. 55)

One example of how this works is the Fresno Unified School District, which passed a restorative justice plan in 2013. Recent newspaper coverage told about a District Budget meeting, held in the Fresno community. Parents and students were concerned that the district was spending a lot of money on security cameras, and other security personnel and punitive measures, and not the promised money to develop the restorative justice program of discipline (Furfaro, 2014). Ruth Morris foretold that it is the “transformative requisite of restorative justice that is surely its stiffest test” (Morris, 1995, p. 287).

Ryals (2004) explained that participation in restorative justice practice is voluntary and must be agreed upon by both the offender and the victim. Common practices are circle sentencing, victim/offender conferencing, family group conferencing, victim-offender mediation, and reparation boards. Bazemore and Umbreit (2001) outlined a five-step procedure of circle sentencing that included:

(a) application of the offender to participate in the process, (b) participation of the victim in a healing circle, (c) participation of the offender in a
healing circle, (d) a sentencing plan developed by the sentencing circle members, and (e) follow-up circles to ensure compliance to the plan. (Bazemore & Umbreit, 2001, p. 56)

Another example of this model, which is currently being used, is the Community Conferencing Center in Baltimore, Maryland. The center holds community conferences where young offenders are held accountable for their actions, victims have a voice, and everyone decides how to best repair the harm and prevent future occurrences. Re-offending rates for young offenders who go through Community Conferencing are 60% lower than for those who went through the juvenile justice system. Over 7,000 young offenders, victims and supporters have safely and successfully resolved their own crimes and conflicts through Community Conferencing. Since everyone affected by the incident is included in deciding how to repair the harm, compliance with Community Conferencing agreements is over 95% (Community Conferencing Center, 2014).

Ryals (2004) commented on the recent finding regarding restorative justice. Qualitative data suggest restorative justice practices are more effective at restoring community balance. Both the philosophical and practical basis of restorative justice support involvement by the three key components of those most affected by delinquent activity: (1) the victim, (2) the offender, and (3) the community. In quantitative terms, studies have demonstrated the efficient use of restorative justice. Regarding the satisfaction of victims with the process, 75% of the victims who engaged in restorative justice methods expressed satisfaction with the process. Offenders were more likely to complete reparation agreements than other more traditional sanctions. Restorative justice methods have also shown mostly positive results in reducing recidivism. In addition, Ryals (2004) spoke about barriers to the program:

The main barrier is in creating a philosophical model shift. The current correctional philosophy of the juvenile justice system is offender focused.
Successful implementation requires a change in focus to a restorative philosophy. The actual costs associated with implementing restorative justice are negligible. Most jurisdictions utilize a restorative justice coordinator to coordinate activities within the jurisdiction. Cost benefits are reductions in recidivism and increased satisfaction of victims and communities with the juvenile justice process. (Ryals, 2004, pp. 21-22)

The outcomes of studies have been inconsistent. Rodriguez (2007) revealed that the impact on recidivism has not consistently shown a significant reduction in crime among program participants. Initial studies of programs, including a study of four victim-offender mediation programs on multiple sites in the United States, revealed lower recidivism rates among juveniles who took part in restorative justice programs than among offenders in comparison groups. However, the lower rates reported in these studies were not statistically significant. Studies that are more recent have found restorative justice to be effective in considering offender recidivism. Among these studies is a meta-analysis of 35 restorative justice programs, which showed that these programs were more effective than traditional correctional supervision programs in reducing recidivism, especially among girls, first time offenders, and offenders with one prior offense (Latimer, Dowden, & Music, 2005). Consistent with other findings on gender, the lower rate of recidivism for girls in this restorative justice program provides evidence that restorative justice programs may have a different impact on girls and boys.

Girls’ cases within the restorative justice program are more of a wraparound system with support, which is more akin to that needed by girls. For example, restoration processes that treat the whole girl, include family involvement, drug and alcohol treatment, sexual and physical abuse counseling, and community involvement are likely to be effective for girls. These findings lend support to studies that stress the importance in recognizing girls’ and boys’
differences and ensuring that prevention programs address their unique needs (Bloom et al., 2002; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004).

Bergseth and Bouffard (2013) indicated that most studies including girls tend to have small samples:

If research with larger samples indicates that restorative justice participation does not provide benefits for females, female researchers will then need to examine whether females might experience restorative justice-type interventions differently than males and whether those programs might best be altered to address gender differences. (Bergseth & Bouffard, 2013, p. 1072)

In addition, studies on girls’ delinquency have found that effective treatments of girls should be able to respond to their histories of neglect and abuse, focus on relationship building, and involve family based treatment. Involvement of the offender, as well as members of a supportive community, would enable that support (Rodriguez, 2007).

Rodriguez (2007) advised that the possibility for differential treatment of offenders hurts restorative justice programs. Researchers argue that community members may recommend more severe sanctions for particular types of offenders (e.g. minorities, young offenders), resulting in increased harm and future delinquency. Thus, the community members who aim to be far more responsive to offenders than the juvenile court may respond harshly to certain offenders.

Just as Ryals and the Community Conferencing Center discussed the use of circles, Gaarder and Hesselton (2012) also advised using these techniques with girls. Girls are very relational, and working in a common group (a circle), on a regular basis, becomes like a family. Gaarder and Hesselton believe that restorative justice fits very well with gender-responsive programming. Working in circles has unique qualities, such as forming a ceremony to make the opening and closing of the circle, use of a talking piece to create safety and regulate
discussion, relationship building between participants before dialog on combative issues occurs, and addressing underlying causes of problem behavior rather than focusing on a single incident. Restorative justice principles are effective for the needs of girls. For instance, research on incarcerated girls indicates that many hold deep shame about their crimes and wish for opportunities to express regret (Gaarder & Hesselton, 2012). Alder (2000) suggested that a restorative approach is ideally suited for female offenders because it provides an opportunity for offenders to express their feelings, to be treated with dignity, and to participate meaningfully in decision-making processes. Furthermore, the confusion between victimization and offending for delinquent girls, so often ignored in the traditional legal process, is considered relevant in restorative processes like circles (Alder, 2000).

**Relational Group Therapy**

Many times what we see in girls is that they are getting into trouble when it is their first time trying to come out and address the trauma that they have experienced...the abandonment. Maybe there was abuse in the home, they witnessed domestic violence in their home, or maybe they come from a broken home and really have not had the opportunity to process those feelings with someone. We had a woman out at Juvenile Hall who would use Voices, and would touch on specific areas of coping, relapse prevention, boundary setting with the girl. But that gal was moved from Juvenile Hall and I do not think we are providing gender-responsive groups at this point. (Program manager at Donner CBO)

Often, in juvenile justice programs, the suppression of feelings is viewed as appropriate when it allows the adolescent to better adapt to her program. Her history is neglected and her voice is stifled when, what she needs is to speak and be heard, especially because she is female. Pepi (1998) explained that

[a]n adolescent is counseled in ways that will best adapt her to the juvenile justice program, even if that includes avoidance of real issues. Without any of her key issues being addressed, her obedience almost enables her return
to an environment where her self-worth and her voice were originally lost. (p. 95)

Gilligan (1991) went on to add that counseling provides an opportunity for women to reclaim their voice. She discussed the trend in which adolescent girls lose their ability to speak of what they know from their own experiences of similarity. The disparagement of this intuitive voice occurs to women during adolescence and early adulthood. Gilligan asserted that a “revision washes away the grounds of girls’ feelings and thoughts and undermines the transformational potential which lies in women’s development” (p. 7). The cost to both themselves and society, according to Gilligan, is enormous. However, Gilligan exhorted counselors to “strengthen healthy resistance and courage, to help women recover lost voices and tell lost stories and to provide safe houses for the underground” (p. 27). Women come to counseling often as a result of their struggle to take on a role they feel is expected of them. During their counseling, women can be assisted to rediscover their voice by a counselor who values connectedness (Gilligan, 1991).

Mendelsohn, Zachary, and Harney (2007) focused upon a huge segment of the female population in the juvenile justice system, which has experienced trauma:

Deep isolation results from broken trust, shame, fear or future violence, and the wide range of protective or defensive measures that victims develop because of trauma, particularly under conditions of ongoing contact. In isolation, victims are prevented from fully functioning. Their personal power and competence are reduced by post-traumatic symptoms, crushed sensibilities, and disrupted sense of self. Additionally, in the context of abusive relationships characterized by power and weakness, survivors are taught to undervalue themselves and their physical and emotional safety, frequently placing them at risk for further trauma. (Mendelsohn et al., 2007, p. 228)

Mendelsohn et al. (2007) went on to relate that group therapy provides survivors with experiences of community that counteract their isolation and enable
them to connect with sources of adaptation within themselves and others. Groups also offer a model of mutual relationships marked by caring and compassion:

They serve as a small-scale version of the problem in which survivors can revise problems associated with their traumatic past within a safe and structured collaborating network. Groups can also provide a framework within which survivors can learn to value themselves and their safety. They are empowered to seek out supporting and compassionate relationships in their lives outside of group; it is in this way that groups serve as a bridge to a new community. (p. 228)

Herman (1992) described a model based on the assumption that helplessness, meaninglessness, and disconnection from oneself and others are central to the experience of interpersonal trauma. Consent and the creation of new meanings and connections are thus key aspects of the recovery process, which is made known over three stages:

First, safety must be established. This would include regulation over basic functions such as sleep and eating, and control over self-destructive behaviors. Once in control of safety, the group may move on to the next stage, which includes remembrance, integration, and mourning. This stage inevitably involves a period of intense grief and mourning, during which the victim is sustained by her connections to the therapist and peers. The third stage of recovery involves reconnecting with others through the process of establishing mutual, non-exploitative relationships. (p. 26)

Mendelsohn et al. (2007) added that the interpersonal process among group members is not the focus of these groups, but they rely heavily on the interpersonal framework to facilitate the progress of individual group members. A key aspect of these groups involves giving and receiving feedback about feelings, and time is specifically allotted for this purpose after each member shares her goal-oriented work: “Negative and self-blaming statements, that slow recovery, are actively confronted by others who have had similar experiences” (p. 235).

**Self-Expression and Advocacy**

*They have the idea that they have committed something so wrong that they cannot recover from it, so they wear it as a badge of*
shame. A lot of them do not think that they are going to graduate from high school, and our biggest challenge is reminding them that, yes, we have all done things in our past that we are not proud of, but to look past that. Let us see how we can build a future here. How are we going to get you from here to there? How are we going to graduate you? ‘I’m not going to graduate.’ Yes you are. We will make sure of it. We are going to work with you. In addition, well, we have got 16 right now that will graduate with their diplomas in June. We tell them how impressed we are, and we tell them to be sure to walk with their group. How often have we heard, ‘Do you realize that this is the only time in my life that anyone has ever said they were proud of me?’ (Administrator at Ferrelo Juvenile Facility)

Just as therapeutic groups use women’s experiences, so can women’s consciousness raising or advocacy groups. Weiler (1991) talked about Paulo Freire’s interest in groups that could change the world. The common sharing of experiences in a collective, leaderless group and the sharing of stories, showed a unity among women. She continued, “Girls are afraid to assert authority and power because, as women, they have been taught that taking power is wrong. Becoming one’s own advocate helps a girl to claim authority and personal value.” (p. 461)

Lorde (1984) was keenly aware of the ways in which the dominant society shapes our sense of who we are and what we feel. As she pointed out, “Within living structures defined by profit, by linear power, by institutional de-humanization, our feelings were not meant to survive” (p. 34). Most importantly for young girls, she continued:

As we begin to recognize our deepest feelings, we begin to give up, of necessity, being satisfied with suffering and self-negation, and with the numbness, which so often seems like their only alternative in society. Our acts against oppression become integral, with self-motivation and are empowered from within. (p. 58)
Both Freire and Lorde aspire toward an idealized world in which human beings will create new ways of being, out of collective struggle.

Freire and Lorde would also approve of the activity happening at the Storycatcher’s Theatre in Chicago. Artistic Director Meade Palidofsky has helped young people to find their voices for over 30 years, but in 1990, she started working in prisons. Biddle (2009) said that Palidofsky refers to this experience as a real turning point for her because she felt that she had finally met the population that she was meant to work with. Since that time, she has helped hundreds of incarcerated youth heal from past traumas and pave the way for a brighter future.

Many of the stories that the girls tell are being told for the first time. Palidofsky told Biddle that it is not just telling a story, it is like telling a secret:

> These kids have been sexually abused and assaulted, and that in particular is often an unspeakable trauma. What we do is provide a safe way for the girls to tell their stories. If they have held on to something forever, it just festers and you do not heal. However, once you tell the story, then you let it go. By sharing stories, you also hear about other people in the room who have had similar experiences. This is strengthening and empowering. (Biddle, 2009, pp. 1-2)

Palidofsky explained to Biddle (2009) that it is important to formalize the story, so the girls can then let it go. It is universalized and other people can relate to it. Then it becomes a story that exists in the world outside of yourself and so, you can walk away from it. She also believes in getting others involved, including staff and administration. This helps to support the youth, because they need help when the theatre program has gone home for the night. She surmised, when people think of the kids that are locked up, they think of them as bad kids, or dysfunctional kids. Palidofsky went on to say that they think that anyone who is locked up has something wrong with them:

> People discover that when they come in to work with the girls, that it is the system that is dysfunctional. What is dysfunctional is that we do not have
many programs that are working for kids on the outside. They learn that kids are kids, and they are really likeable and smart, and all they need is a break. (Biddle, 2009, p. 3)

Watson and Edelman (2012) explain how The Georgetown Center for Poverty and Law created exemplary programs in several states, and advocacy is included in each of those programs. They began by implementing a needs assessment, and found that girls were in search of a voice. Hearing from girls about their needs and current gaps in services is critical to ensuring that a reform effort focuses its efforts on the correct targets. Each of the reform efforts prioritized learning firsthand from girls about their needs and engaging girls in public advocacy efforts on their own behalf. Focus groups, which affected girls, were a key element of the reform efforts. In Stanislaus County, girls in the juvenile justice facility were encouraged to form their own advocacy organization. Young Women United for a Better Cause meets weekly and has been successful in advocating for some policy changes. Just as important, the girls are learning leadership skills in the process. In Florida, girls spoke at community briefings, legislative hearings and other public events. Analyzing and reporting on the results of girls’ collective needs assessments form an overall profile of their treatment in the system, as National Council on Crime and Delinquency did, and it is another way of including girls’ perspectives (Watson & Edelman, 2012).

Recently, while presenting a college preparation program at the Boys & Girls Club of Fresno County’s juvenile justice club, girls were freely talking about their futures and the inclusion of college in their plans. Since we culminate each of these 5-week sessions with graduation festivities, complete with cap and gown, we had recently applied for additional funding from the National office, to pay for party supplies and incentives. When the grant period was over, we were told that we did not get the funding, but that they had created an honorable mention award
for us, because they were so impressed with the program that we offer in a locked facility. With four Boys & Girls Club staff members, we are able to present the program to 15 different girls every 5 weeks. The student/staff ratio is such that it allows us to talk to each girl personally about her college plans, on top of the other activities we have her do. We even brought in college counselors to register the girls in the facility. We were told that the only reason we did not get the extra funding is that we were unable to complete the pre-requisite of taking the girls on a college field trip. When I checked into the possibilities for such a trip, I was told that they take the boys on a college trip once per year. Finding this unacceptable, we are now planning our first trip to a major university for the girls.

**Transitional Services**

*It is a Catch 22 but we can, if the child is in a dangerous situation, we can then go the next steps. Many minors, we have connected to the transitional living services where adolescents can live independently in apartments that they operate, and continue with their education, working and living in a setting where they are monitored, and overseen by case managers. We also have short term, homeless situations where a minor will come in here and say, “I’m in trouble, and I’m homeless.”*  
*(Program manager at Vallejo CBO)*

It is often apparent that returning a child home, after incarceration, is not a healthy circumstance. With drug abuse in many of the homes, as well as other toxic influences, 58% of female probationary teens return to a secure facility within 3 years (Buell, 2010). Many communities throughout the United States are experimenting with transitional living, to provide support and a safer, crime free environment for probationary offenders while they rehabilitate.

Barman (2005) was explicit about the types of programs that are effective for re-entry juveniles. She said that
social development programs that focus on managing anger, modifying behavior, adopting a social perspective, developing moral judgment, building social skills, solving social problems, and resolving conflicts can be effective in reducing youth violence. She added that programs are effective if they increase education; provide vocational skills, and academic enrichment. Likewise, family relationship building programs, family therapy, and systemic therapy are shown to be effective in studies reducing antisocial behavior in juveniles. Mentors or other adults that youth have positive relationships with are effective in reducing delinquent behavior. (Barman, 2005, p. 30)

Multisystemic therapy (MST) is another treatment that has empirically validated success with juvenile justice populations. This therapy addresses youth problem behaviors in the context of their daily lives, with family, peers, school and vocational interventions. Youth who are treated by MST are proven to have fewer arrests, fewer criminal offenses, and spend fewer weeks in detention than youth who are incarcerated in a secure facility. Barman (2005) went on to extol the merits of court supervised community treatment, which was the most effective method in preventing recidivism in a study of 2000 juvenile offenders. Longer community programs provide the best results, whereas longer detention was negatively correlated with recidivism.

Bouffard and Bergseth (2008) indicated that there were two primary aftercare or reentry models. Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994) has demonstration programs in three states. The Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI) (Winterfield & Brumbaugh, 2005) includes both juvenile and adult offender reintegration programs with 37 programs specifically targeting juvenile offenders. Each model calls for the coordination of case management and rehabilitative services such as (a) an institutional or prerelease planning and services phase, (b) a reentry preparation or short term post-release phase, and (c) a community-based services phase after release from
placement. Client assessment allows for the development of individualized case plans and the identification of services both during placement and in the community to address the unique needs of the offender. While they admit that community restraint alone is largely ineffective at reducing recidivism in intensive supervision probation/parole, there are indications that supervision, combined with increased treatment services, can reduce recidivism (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008).

To handle the need for programs, which emphasize both increased supervision and increased treatment services, Meisel (2001) used examples to illustrate these types of programs. Secure confinement is often overcrowded, posing a grave risk to juveniles and caregivers alike. In addition, secure confinement is very expensive compared with alternative placement options. The IAP (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994) mandates smaller caseload sizes for juvenile parole officers:

- Preparing youth for progressively increased responsibility and freedom in the community
- Facilitating interaction and involvement between juveniles and the community
- Working with offenders and targeted community support systems (families, peers, schools, and employers) on those qualities needed for constructive interactions that advance the juveniles’ reintegration into the community
Developing new resources and support services as needed, and
Monitoring and testing the capacity of juvenile offenders to receive—and the community to provide—services and support. (p. 10)

Consistent with this principle, a case manager would visit a youth more frequently and perhaps for longer periods at the beginning of the institutional and aftercare phases. Once a youth has become accustomed to his or her new placement, the frequency and length of case manager contacts decrease. Meisel (2001) described his study in which offenders were removed to Lookout Mountain Youth Services Center in Golden, Colorado. He had identified youth at the greatest risk of reoffending. During their time there, offenders were exposed to:

- a multifamily counseling group,
- periodic specialized groups run by the case manager,
- experimental learning opportunities that, among other activities, included rafting trips, a “ropes course,” and horseback riding,
- additional individual counseling provided by university graduate interns and community providers,
- a vocational skills workshop; and,
- increased contact with their case managers. (Meisel, 2001, p. 215)

Another important feature of the IAP model was smaller case manager caseloads. IAP case managers were limited to a caseload of 18 youth. No more than 12 of those youth could be in the community at any one time. In contrast, the average caseload size for non-IAP case managers in the Denver metropolitan area during the demonstration and evaluation period (1995-1999) was approximately 35 youth (Meisel, 2001).

Cobaleda-Kegler (2006) described another interesting transitional housing program. While large, congregate-care facilities have proven to be ineffective in rehabilitating chronic offenders, small community-based facilities that provide intensive services in a secure environment offer positive treatment outcomes. One
type of residential placement option found to be effective in treating youthful offenders is community confinement (Cobaleda-Kegler, 2006; Howell, 2003).

Howell (2003) described community confinement, and how it involves secure confinement in small, community based facilities, which offer intensive treatment and rehabilitation services including individual and group therapy, educational programs, medical services and intensive staff supervision. The cognitive-behavioral programs used in a social learning approach involve aiding youth in thinking through and practicing solutions to specific interpersonal problems that are targeted for change. Stumphauzer (1986) continued to discuss how through modeling, role-playing, and practicing, youth replace old, delinquent antisocial behaviors with new, pro-social ones. A social learning approach includes the use of token economies, points and systems which reward positive behaviors, social skills training, interpersonal skills training, problem solving, street inoculation, anger management training, and behavioral family contracting (Howell, 2003; Stumphauzer, 1986).

Cobaleda-Kegler (2006) took 20 girls, in residential placement because attempts to rehabilitate them in the community in diversion programs had failed, and put them in her animal-assisted therapy program. They were chronic, serious, and often violent offenders. The program was entitled Teaching Loving Care (TLC). Collaborating with the Chris Adams Girls Center and Tony LaRussa’s Animal Rescue Foundation (ARF), the Center took a large space in the rear of the facility and converted it into a kennel called the Terry Starr Kennel. Terry Starr was a former probation chief who helped found the girls’ program and who was a great advocate of the powerful healing effects of the human-animal bond and the development of animal-assisted therapy. The use of animal-assisted therapy or ATT, with emotionally disturbed children in school and residential settings, is a
fast growing field. Therefore, the purpose of the Cobaleda-Kegler study was to
determine if animal-assisted therapy is a viable, effective, and useful treatment
intervention with the female juvenile offender within a residential treatment
setting. She found that it was highly successful with their small sample. Further
study needs to be done, using larger samples.

Boys Town USA, Staff-secure Detention Program for Female Offenders is
an unusual program, designed for high risk/need girls detained prior to trial. Hoge
(2008) explained that although girls remain in the program for relatively short
periods, an intensive assessment is conducted at intake, and the plan developed on
the basis of that assessment is designed to follow the client through subsequent
placements. They provide short and long-term goals, and the majority of girls
accepted for the program are members of minority groups, come from high-risk
family environments, and exhibit a range of academic, social, behavioral, and
emotional needs.

Altschuler (2008) commented on the mobility of youth, after they are
released from a secure facility. Not only do families move frequently, but also just
the sheer act of movement between state care and juvenile justice programs creates
several challenges for school districts and youth offenders. The transience of
these students between state agencies often results in gaps in service delivery to
highly at-risk students. Incarcerated youth face many challenges upon their
release from the structured confines of detention facilities to a less rigid school
setting (Altschuler, 2008).

Gordon (2013) emphasized that without proper support, students re-
entering the educational mainstream after release from juvenile detention facilities
often find it difficult to achieve educational success. For many youth, this leads to
school dropout and/or recidivism, making it crucial for schools to take
responsibility, not only for the youth at risk of entering the juvenile justice system, but also, those who are already involved:

The U.S. Department of Education has provided funding to improve transition services for neglected and delinquent youth, authorized by Title I Part D of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, but the transitional help has not been effective. A lack of awareness of some state agencies of the funds and other tools available for improving transition services, were not maximizing their capacity. Gordon surmised that the NCLB accountability measures made educators reluctant to accept delinquent youth as they re-enter the public school setting. (Gordon, 2013)

Gordon (2013) lamented that miscommunication between residential care and after care services has been an ongoing battle for youth corrections (Altschuler, 2008). She emphasized the importance of having the JJS facilitate relationships with schools to help to limit recidivism. She also indicated that,” each of the key agencies that provide services for delinquent youth has set goals within their strategic plans to provide transitional services for at-risk youth, but that strategic planning does not ensure that strategy transforms into action” (Gordon, 2013, p. 117). She pointed to Kotter (2007) who indicated that 70% of business strategic plans are never implemented. Although the need for transitional services has been recognized by various agencies, appropriate implementation of these practices has been stalled by the lack of interagency coordination and collaboration (Altschuler, 2008; Kotter, 2007).

Mentoring

Bouffard and Bergseth (2008) have found positive effects with community-based mentoring programs. Some attempts have been made to incorporate mentoring into juvenile justice interventions, both as a diversionary option and in the form of aftercare for juveniles released from detention or correctional facilities. These mentoring programs differ from other community-based
mentoring programs in both structure and stated goals. Two large-scale mentoring programs are aimed at system-involved youth. The first is the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998), a federal initiative that began in 1996 and provides funding for individual projects targeting youth involved with the juvenile justice system. The second is Advocate, Intervene, Monitor (AIM), a comprehensive aftercare program including life skills training, service provision, and the establishment of mentoring relationships between youth placed at correctional facilities with college student mentors (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008).

Research involving the impact of mentoring programs for system-involved youth is mixed. A national evaluation of Juvenile Mentoring Program sites found significant results in several risk categories, such as aggressive behavior/delinquency and peer relationships. Although these findings are encouraging, the study had design flaws and did not include a comparison group. Barnoski (2002) reported a positive but non-significant impact of mentoring as a form of aftercare for institutionalized youth, and Blechman, Maurice, Buecker, & Helberg (2000) found worse outcomes for youth receiving diversion and volunteer mentoring services than for youth receiving diversion and skills trainings, or diversion alone (Barnoski, 2002; Blechman et al., 2000; Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008).

Bouffard and Bergseth (2008) remind us that, although the impact of community-based mentoring on risk factors for delinquency is fairly well established, less is known about the effects of mentoring on delinquency or antisocial behavior and the impact of mentoring on justice system-involved youth. Some program evaluations have begun to provide positive results and there are indications that mentoring services may help improve compliance with
community-based interventions for court-involved youth; however the existing research on this issue is far from conclusive.

Holsinger and Ayers (2004) told about a course they created at University of Missouri-Kansas City, called “New Dimensions in Criminal Justice: Applied Correctional Interventions for Delinquent Girls”:

It was primarily directed toward criminal justice majors. One profound effect was that students had the opportunity to see firsthand that the accepted image of incarcerated girls in society does not match reality. They found that they needed to form a relationship built on respect and trust in order for the girls to open up to them. Some of them even emphasized the need to include girls in the planning of the program, which is an important part of running a gender-responsive program. One barrier to the program was the transient nature of the girls in the system, making it more difficult to form lasting relationships. One student said, ‘I think that programs such as this make a huge difference in the lives of the juveniles who participate. This class has been a small step towards improving programming for the juvenile justice system and for a brighter future. Future classes have the potential to enhance the program and to provide the girls with the tools they need to succeed.’ (Holsinger & Ayers, 2004, p. 371)

It is difficult to tell from the aforementioned evidence how effective mentoring is with girls, both incarcerated or on probation. The Holsinger and Ayers class illustrates that one result may be increased awareness of mentors who, otherwise, have not experienced juvenile justice. That awareness may lead to action, and ultimately an improved system for these girls.

Conclusion

After surveying the uneven growth of effective juvenile justice policy for girls in California, it is evident that there have been ambitious starts, leading to devastating stops. Hopeful forward movement was often followed by a loss of ground. Juvenile justice for girls has followed the ebbs and flows of societal
change and the personalities in leadership. However, it is time to ask new questions, and discover whether programming has changed in 2015. Have we changed enough to get these girls back to their high school lunch tables again? Chapter 3 will outline the intent of my study and the methodology.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Having identified in chapter 2 the fact that many different types of treatment have existed since the 1830s, and how those treatments became a part of a juvenile court system by the 1920s, we now look at treatment used with girls in the current system. We know that, historically, girls have been treated with the same programming as boys, but that girls need gender-responsive programming if they are to learn to function in the world outside of the locked facility. Covington, Calhoon, and Young (2004) stated it simply:

Acknowledging to girls that their experiences as young women are different – that gender makes a difference – is an essential step toward creating a safe space in which they can share their voices. Often, particularly in the juvenile justice system, programs that are designed for and based on the experiences of boys or young men are used for girls and young women. This serves to disregard the unique experiences of girls and to further silence their voices. (p. 9)

A research design was created to ascertain whether gender-responsiveness of programming for incarcerated and probationary girls has improved in the Central Valley of California in the past 5 years.

Research Design

Statement of Purpose

This study examined the different mental health and drug rehabilitation programs available to Central Valley incarcerated girls, both in the juvenile facilities, as well as in the community benefit organizations (CBOs) when they returned home. The programs were examined for gender-responsiveness. Twenty-six facility leaders from seven counties were interviewed about the administration of their overall programs, the program content, purpose, delivery and gender adaptations. Seven county juvenile facilities and six community
benefit organizations (CBOs) were asked for program materials that they are currently using. Each program and facility was inspected for evidence of a gender-responsive environment.

**Formalized Research Questions**

1. Are the mental health and drug rehabilitation programs that are available to incarcerated girls in the Central Valley of California gender-responsive?
2. Is the leadership and administration of those same facilities gender-responsive?
3. Is the overall environment of those same facilities gender-responsive?

**Methods**

The first step of the study was to gain approval of the California State University, Fresno Institutional Review Board. After that was accomplished, facilities and organizations were contacted to obtain a designee from each for interview purposes. Once names were obtained, interview appointments were set. Designees at each of the juvenile facilities in seven counties in the Central Valley of California were interviewed about mental health and drug rehabilitation programs currently used with girls in their facilities. A set of questions, used by Goodkind in her dissertation, *From delinquent daughters to independent mothers: Gendered expectations in juvenile justice and alternative programs for girls*, was identified as appropriate (Goodkind, 2005). Goodkind is a professor of social work and sociology at the University of Pittsburgh, specializing in gender-responsive programs for young women. She is a qualitative researcher and her dissertation research included interviewing administrators at juvenile facilities. Using her questions as a model, 26 interviews were recorded in Central Valley
facilities, with the permission of the subjects. Recordings were transcribed by the researcher, with support from a professional transcribing company.

Information about each of the programs offered was gathered and analyzed using *Oregon’s Guidelines for Effective Gender-Specific Programming for Girls* (Morgan & Patton, 2002).

Qualitative methods can identify and explain local sociocultural information relevant to this study (Kelle, 2006). For example, as a part of the study I examined 41 programs used with girls in the Central Valley, but I also talked to practitioners who implemented the programs. From the program materials themselves, I could learn what the intent and subject matter of the programming was. However, by walking through the facilities, I learned about the environment within which the programs were taught. By interviewing staff, I learned about the methods that were used, and about the philosophy of the overall program.

Using a variety of qualitative methods allows researchers to triangulate the data, and to be sure that they are seeing the *rich, close, individual character* of the evidence (Greene & Caracelli, 2003).

Applied researchers have the most to gain from combining qualitative methods into a mixed methods approach:

Mixed-methods offer five unique benefits to applied research: (a) triangulation assessing the degree of convergence and justification between the results of different methods; (b) complementarity – using the results of one method to elaborate the other, and clarify the results of another; (c) initiation – using the results of one method to identify concepts and variables that would have gone unnoticed in a mono-method study; (d) development – using the results of one method to guide the creation of instruments, the selection of cases, and the analytic strategies of another, and (e) expansion – using multiple methods to answer different components of a singular research project. (Trahan & Stewart, 2013, p. 61)
Narratives, images, texts, and the use of the GIPA instrument (explained below) to examine the environment in the facilities, all provided useful data to develop impressions of the overall program (Hanson, Creswell, Plano-Clark, Petska, & Creswell, 2005; Trahan & Stewart, 2013) However, it was difficult to get data on the results of programming. I wanted to know what the recidivism rate was after girls went through particular programs. The program manager at Donner CBO explained that the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), protects identifiable health information, and also protects mental health information. 42CFR Part 2, (Confidentiality of Alcohol, and Drug Abuse Patient Records) protects offenders involved in substance abuse: “It’s like going into a vault and it stays and the only time that information is divulged is if there is a need to disclose for purposes of ensuring someone’s safety or if there are concerns about abuse” (program manager at Donner CBO).

Instrumentation

- Appendix A: Framework for Analysis of Programs used:
  *Gender-Responsive programming in the justice system- Oregon’s guidelines for effective programming for girls.*
  (Morgan & Patton, 2002)
- Appendix B: Gender-Informed Practice Assessment (GIPA)
  (Van Voorhis, 2013)
- Appendix C: Staff/Administration Interview Protocol
  (Goodkind, 2005) Questions 7-13

*The Gender-Responsive Program Assessment* (Covington & Bloom, 2008) is a tool with which program administrators, program evaluators, and agency monitors may evaluate the gender-responsiveness of programs for women and girls, and obtain feedback that may be used to improve the quality of a program’s
services. For the purposes of this study, this assessment was operationalized by Morgan and Patton (2002) *Gender-Responsive Programming in the Justice System—Oregon’s Guidelines for Effective Programming for Girls*. This assessment uses the following definition of gender-responsive:

> Being gender-responsive means creating an environment through site selection, staff selection, program development, content and material that reflects an understanding of the lives of women and girls and responds to their strengths and challenges. (Covington & Bloom, 2008, p. 1)

Morgan and Patton’s (2002) guidelines were conceptualized in 1993 by an organization called the Coalition of Advocates for Equal Access for Girls. They passed a unique gender-responsive bill in Oregon, making Oregon the only state with a law that requires state agencies that serve children under 18 years to ensure that girls and boys have *equal access* to appropriate services. One of its charges was to make sure that girls received *equity*. The State Commission on Children and Families and the State Criminal Justice Commission in Oregon funded the development of guidelines and an accompanying manual on implementing gender-responsive programming. I used this set of guidelines to analyze the programs currently in use in the Central Valley of California, because of their historic value, plus the fact that the guidelines come closest to matching Jean Baker Miller’s Relational Cultural Theory, while at the same time being transferable to community education and Paulo Freire’s theory of praxis.

The guidelines were divided into two different sections: *Administration and Management of Gender-Responsive Programs* and *Gender-Responsive Program Content* (Morgan & Patton, 2002) and I used both. Pseudonyms for each county and CBO were used in this analysis, to protect the privacy of the representatives that I interviewed, and to encourage them to speak freely. They were assured of anonymity, in writing, when they consented to speak with me. Counties were
referred to by the names of early California explorers, since (in this case) these counties are *exploring* the world of gender-responsive programming. The CBOs were referred to by the names of significant women in early California history.

*The Gender-Informed Practice Assessment (GIPA)* is a protocol, which may be used by an administrator who walks through a facility, in order to gauge whether the environment is gender-responsive (Buell, 2010). I used the instrument in each of the seven juvenile facilities, as well as the six community benefit organizations. Some of the facilities were restricted due to the presence of students in classes. I was not able to examine shower areas or food areas. I specialized in Domain 3, which covered the facility; Domain 5, which covered staffing and training; Domain 6, which covered facility culture; and Domain 11, which covered services (Van Voorhis, 2013).

*The Staff/Administration Interview Protocol* is a list of questions created by Goodkind (2005) for her dissertation on delinquent girls (described above).

**Data Analysis**

Data came from three different sources. The first source was the programming material. I was unable to get copies of many of the programs, as the companies that create the programs require every staff member to sign a waiver refusing to share materials with anyone outside the facility. Some of the programs were available on-line, and some of the facilities use older programs and were able to give me past renditions of their current programs. So, beyond those materials, I was relegated to gathering brochures, website materials, and scholarly articles, which reviewed or did their own studies on the effectiveness of these programs. The National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) is a searchable online database of mental health and substance abuse interventions, so I was able to find some of the programs there, with the results of studies that have
been conducted on their use. These studies were not specific to girls, so they served as background information. I was also able to interview staff members who are using the programs. When I was able to get the programs, I examined them using the Morgan & Patton guidelines (see Appendix A).

I used the Gender-Informed Practice Assessment (GIPA) to walk through the facilities and organizations, and took notes on Domains 3, 5, 6, 11 (see Appendix B). The notes from the walk-through were combined with the transcriptions from the interviews, and were color coded to fit the main outline (see Appendix A). Most of the GIPA items fit with point II; Program Content of the main outline. An example would be II.A, Environment. Looking for aspects such as physical safety, emotional safety, surroundings that value females, and addressing the whole girl with a Holistic approach are all touched upon in GIPA items such as (a) a safe site near the communities that girls come from, (b) facility is clean and well maintained, (c) interior is comfortable and welcoming for clients and staff, plus family members and children, (d) materials for relaxation and therapeutic activities, such as art, dance, music, reading, meditation, and exercise, (e) décor that includes empowering images of females, including diverse ethnic and cultural programs. Main headings of the outline, segments of the interview transcriptions, and notes from the GIPA that matched were all given the same color code.

In addition, the interviews that I conducted at the facilities and organizations were transcribed, and then I looked for common themes in the responses to the Goodkind questions. These responses were color coded according to themes such as program goals, girls’ needs, improvements, program helpfulness, staff helpfulness, group therapy, activities, concerns, innovations, etc.
The color-coded assignments coincided with an outline I had created for the dissertation (see Appendix A).

**The Researcher’s Place and Access**

I served as Education Coordinator for The Boys & Girls Clubs of Fresno County for over 2 years. As a part of my position, I was asked to conduct classes in a program called Diplomas to Degrees, for the members in our juvenile justice club. The program is designed to guide and prepare teen members for post-secondary education so that they can gain knowledge and skills needed to develop and maintain successful careers. This is not a program designed for students in a juvenile justice facility, but rather for overall Boys & Girls Club members.

The Boys & Girls Clubs of Fresno County maintain a club on-site at the Fresno County Juvenile Justice campus. It is a single large room, connected to the gymnasium. There are two restrooms attached, as well as a storage area surrounded by a wire cage with a locking door for storing equipment. The teens may use a pool table, foosball, air hockey, ping-pong, and two large screen TVs (used only for video games with no outside access to networks). There is a long table with benches, and this is used for playing cards, doing artwork, and playing a selection of board games. Another table is covered with jigsaw puzzles and another is covered with completed artwork on display. The two TVs have comfortable couches in front of them. There is also a bookcase with age appropriate, high interest reading material, and another cabinet with a stereo and a selection of CDs.

There are posters on the walls espousing the importance of an education, as well as posters warning about deceptive messages from friends (Example: “They said if I sold this drug to a couple of kids at school, nothing would happen. They
lied!”). The club also runs baseball and basketball leagues, where groups play against one another.

Membership is voluntary, and the girls are able to come twice per week, for 1 to 2 hr visits. Not all girls take advantage of the club. The numbers vary from 8 to 15 at any given time, since sometimes the girls get into trouble and they are not privileged to attend. There are a total of 30 girls in the committed facility, and 120 boys, but they take classes separately, and eat separately. The rule at the facility is that girls may not look at members of the opposite sex during the regular facility routines. Even when girls play sports against boy’s teams, there is no fraternization allowed.

Uncertain what to expect when working with the girls, I was pleasantly surprised. I felt comfortable working with girls who were not unlike any of the teens I had worked with in the public schools, except for the standard issue clothing they were wearing. I looked forward to each class, planning activities that would get the girls to talk about their futures in a positive way. Most of the girls participated fully, sharing stories about home and their lives before incarceration.

After running the program in the facility for a year, I noticed that girls that were released often showed up in class again, a few months later. I began to wonder about the pressures exerted at home, and what kind of programming they were getting in the facility that would prepare them to meet those pressures, and withstand getting into trouble again. What type of an environment was used for conducting these programs? In addition, once they get home, what kind of programs and support are available to keep them from getting into trouble again?
Conclusion

Perhaps Paulo Freire (1970) offered us the best solution when he said that we need to look for programming and relationships in the community to end the revolving door of girls moving from locked facility, to community and back again. Chapter 4 will combine my research findings to answer the question, “How gender-responsive are the programs offered to incarcerated girls in the Central Valley?” I will use my 26 interviews of administrators and staff, my analysis of 41 programs that are currently used in the Valley, and the notes I took during my Gender-Informed Practice Assessment (GIPA) of the environment surrounding the girls to answer that question. Chapter 5 will discuss limitations to the study, and concerns that were raised during the study. Last will be a discussion of the research that still needs to be done to further answer questions about California’s incarcerated girls.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS/OUTCOMES

Winifred King (my 9th great grandmother), was accused of witchcraft in Connecticut in 1697, twice, and thrown into the river to drown. Jean Baker Miller said that girls are incarcerated because they do not fit society’s norms, and neither did Winifred King. She survived to run away to New York. In today’s juvenile justice system, she would be incarcerated as a status offender, for running away. That was 1697, and we have all been taught that the hunt for witches is over. (Nancy Fraleigh)

In order to assess the degree to which gender-responsiveness has changed for justice-involved girls in the Central Valley, over the past 5 years, the programming used with girls both in locked facilities, as well as in community benefit organizations, must first be examined for overall administration and management of the programs. To do this, 26 interviews were conducted with program administrators and facilitators in a seven-county area in the center of the Central Valley. Transcripts of the interviews were color coded, using the Morgan and Patton criteria for administration and management. Next, the programs themselves had to be examined and analyzed using Morgan and Patton’s (2002) program criteria, and matched with the interview data. Last, the facilities were examined and evaluated, using the GIPA format, and matched with the previous two sets of data. Once all of the components were gathered, generalizations could be made about the gender-responsiveness of programming for girls in the Central Valley.

Chapter 4 will begin with a discussion of the Morgan and Patton (2002) guidelines which inform gender-responsive administration and management. Table 1 will illustrate the degree to which each county satisfies the guidelines, and will be followed by a discussion of innovative programs which are being piloted in
given facilities and CBOs. The number ‘1’ is used to indicate where a gender-responsive condition is met. Included will be Table 2 which will show the results from a *Gender Responsive Services Program Assessment Form* taken at the Montalvo Juvenile Justice Facility in 2007. It indicates the level to which girls living in their system see the overall facility as effective.

Next will be an accounting of Program Content A, beginning with the first 10 Morgan and Patton (20002) guidelines which represent methodology. Following will be a consideration of the final eight Morgan and Patton (2002) guidelines, which represent subject matter. Again there will be an examination of exemplars currently used by facilities. Each program will receive a gender-responsive score, followed by the number of facilities or CBOs using that program. In turn, each facility will be rated by how many of the gender-responsive programs they are using, and a more global look at the overall gender-responsiveness of facilities or CBOS in the Central Valley. Finally there will be a description of the walk-thru evaluation of the environment within the facilities and CBOS, to look for gender-responsive qualities, as stipulated by the Covington and Bloom (2008) Gender-Informed Practice Assessment.

**Administration and Management of Gender-Responsive Programs**

The Gender-Responsive Programming guidelines written by Morgan and Patton (2002) are used to analyze the programming of each facility or organization in the study. The guidelines are not intended to be all-inclusive, but to encourage professionals to look critically at how services are provided to girls. The reader may notice that the measures are interconnected and combine to create an overall evaluation of the gender-responsive experience for the girls. Since each of the
Table 1

Administration and Management of Gender Responsive Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Guidelines</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Community Benefit Organizations (CBOs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montalvo Ullo Cabrillo Ferrelo Drake Vizcaino Portola Allensworth Quan Gooch Vallejo Bidwell Donner Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written policies and values</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>6 4 7 4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection on girls</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design (includes girls’ issues)</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>7 8 4 8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive assessments</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes girls want</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff hiring</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff diversity</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 6 3 3 1 6 7 3 3 3 5 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
items is considered critical, when one is skipped, it can change the effectiveness of the others.

Table 1 displays the degree to which each of the counties and CBOs follow the Morgan and Patton (2002) criteria for administration and management of gender-responsive programs. The number ‘1’ is used to indicate where a gender-responsive condition is met. In examining the table, it is evident that Ulloa, Cabrillo and Ferrelo counties do not collect data on girls, do not use a program design which includes girls’ issues, do not use responsive assessments, and do not promote outcomes that girls want. Table 1 clearly illustrates a hole in the research, as there is a blank spot where numbers should be indicated. Likewise, CBOs Allensworth, Quan and Gooch do not collect data on girls, or use responsive assessments. The guidelines are listed in the left column, and each county is listed above the guidelines it utilizes. For example, in reading the chart, County number 1 is Montalvo and they supplied a detailed set of Program Policies and Values; however, we can also see that they do not collect data on the girls. Vallejo CBO, in Montalvo County, simply stated the fact that they do not keep data on the girls either. This was echoed by other counties, who have not yet formulated a plan for data collection.

When using the overall table the reader might ask, if a facility does not have written policies and values, will that affect facility plans to collect data on girls? If they do not collect data on the girls, how will that affect their choice of programming? The reader will notice that several counties do not collect data on girls. The first guideline to consider, in depth, is Written Policies and Values.

**Written Policies and Values**

It is important that gender-responsive policies be a part of the treatment program or the facility as a whole. Four of the county justice facilities and two of
the CBOs have detailed handbooks listing their policies, values and expectations. To illustrate the importance of policies and values, consider the fact that these policies include lists of incentives and penalties. These can range from elaborate family picnics earned by the girls in Ulloa Juvenile Facility, the club recreation time earned in Montalvo and Portola Juvenile Facilities, or they can be as small as a candy bar. Vizcaino Juvenile Facility explains:

Half way through the program, the girls get a certificate to keep their motivation going. At the end they get a value meal and some of the girls say, “Oh my gosh! I am going to get McDonalds. I am going to do this program right.” Once they start doing it, their attitude changes. They are doing it for them and not for the McDonalds anymore. That same girl says, “Oh my gosh! This is why I am here.” Then she focuses on positive goals for her future. They really get into it. (Behavioral health specialist at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

Having benchmark rewards to aspire to is an excellent gender-responsive technique. Policies should guide, understand, empower or rehabilitate. However, to confine, punish or sanction is not gender-responsive. For example, in the Donner CBO, a girl who tests positive for a controlled substance, or shows lack of motivation for education can lose break privileges or extra-curricular activities, whereas a clean drug test or improved grades can net her a pizza party or a reduced curfew. The overall value of the program is to provide the resources and tools for making successful choices free of the influence of drugs and alcohol. Since girls are relational, losing a break or an activity with others can be a severe punishment, and can be quite defeating. A physical addiction may prompt a temporary relapse, but girls need to know that they can be forgiven and re-earn their relational time. That is not to say that they should never be punished, but denying them contact with others should be avoided.

Girls should be involved in the development of policies, but only Vallejo CBO and Montalvo Juvenile facility include girls in policy development. In their
Therapeutic Communities, their motto is *each one teaches one*, and *you are your sister’s keeper*. The whole community is taught that they are a family:

If a member sees someone doing something wrong, she needs to be held accountable. It is a peer–led intervention, and a peer-led support group. Evidence based incentives are used in this context, as well. When members ask, ‘what am I going to get out of this?’ in Juvenile Drug Court they are going to get their record expunged. Whenever a member reaches 30 days clean, the judge is going to compliment them in front of the whole courtroom. Everyone is going to clap for them and they are going to get a pizza and a gift card. When they graduate, they are going to get a gift card, a cake, a ceremony and a certificate. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO and Montalvo Juvenile Facility)

**Data Collection on Girls**

Everywhere I looked for data, I was told these data were not available. Facilities and organizations indicated that data existed and was turned in on a quarterly basis, but that the data was not readily available to the public. In addition, sometimes the data is not separated by gender, and is not useful for learning about the girls. Some counties provided limited data, but much is confidential. Vallejo CBO, in Montalvo County, simply stated the fact that they do not keep data on the girls any more. This was echoed by other counties, who have not yet formulated a plan for data collection. During the interviews, administrators admitted that data collection and analysis should be a priority. Sometimes it takes extensive training to help staff to find a way to include an important new component, such as data collection, into their routine.

Vallejo CBO shared the data in Table 2, which shows the results of a Gender-Specific Services Program Assessment which was run by the program manager of Vallejo CBO in 2007. The reader can see that the questions very closely align with Bloom and Covington (2001), Jean Baker Miller (1976), and the Morgan and Patton Guidelines (2002) used in this study. While the results
informed the CBO in 2007, regular data collection has been discontinued by that organization. Also, looking at the data they provided, something that has become apparent in every part of this study is that, what needs the most improvement are relational types of items, such as role models, staff that reflects the group, and emphasis on female development.

One thing that became apparent during this study is that key aspects of gender-responsive treatment, such as data collection, are missing, and yet are often met with a shrug.

Some staff kept their own statistics. A parole officer at Drake Juvenile Facility said, “For the Behavioral Court side of it, we’ve been running for about 3 years now. None of the kids who have graduated from it have committed any new offences.” She was not aware of data kept by the department, concerning girls.

Vizcaino Juvenile Facility was in the process of switching over to a new evidence-based system, and I was unable to get any data after several calls. They admitted, “We keep records of the attendance, participation and those who graduate and those who get released, but we, personally, have only been here for 2 years, so we are trying to get the evidence-based part up and running. The graduations from JJC are very few and far between, so I wouldn’t even know where to begin” (behavioral health specialist at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility).

Ulloa Juvenile Facility does keep data, and was kind enough to generate some numbers for this study, based upon their data, which indicate the reasons for recidivism (see Figure 1). The Figure shows the numbers of violations in their unit. Girls get into trouble for Furlough violations (FV), Parole violations (PV) or New Charges (602). It is interesting to note that it is broken down by the amount of time that the girls have been out of the facility. They are much more likely to violate when they first go home. An example would be furlough violations. Out
Table 2

*Gender Responsive Services Program Assessment Form, Vallejo Girls, 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Improve</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender-responsive program policy in place</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding principles and program values</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments reviewed &amp; updated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program outcomes meaningful to girls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes free from gender bias</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative &amp; quantitative used to determine outcomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative &amp; quantitative feedback regularly gathered</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented demographics on females being served</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on risk/needs and protective factors/strengths/assets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design includes female development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program created to meet the needs of girls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program offers aftercare and follow-up specific to females</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females safe from violence during programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive behavior is addressed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room is safe and nurturing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values females and female achievements with books, materials, &amp; posters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts work with girls where they are in life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program uses diverse talents &amp; contributions of staff members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring includes focus on gender issues &amp; an interest in gender-specific delivery of program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff reflects the population of females being served</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular, on-going, gender specific training is given to staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy relationships, boundaries and parenting skills are taught</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive female role models from the community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, empowering female only programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength based programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program encourages girls to develop self-respect</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to express own power &amp; opinions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff encourages girls to be involved in program planning</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program addresses sexual abuse, physical abuse, neglect, trauma</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program addresses physical &amp; sexual health</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program addresses mental &amp; emotional health</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program addresses substance abuse</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages spiritual health and personal reflection</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program prepares girls for transition back into the community</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of 61 total girls, 50 would violate within 3 months, 17 within 6 months, 0 within 12 months, 0 within 18 months. The longer they have been on furlough, the more they get used to the system of reporting and following the rules, and are less likely to violate. New charges are the very smallest area of violation. It is much more common for a girl to get into trouble for violation of furlough or parole, than it is for her to break a new law. These data can inform the facility about areas that they should emphasize before girls go home on furlough or parole.

![PATHWAYS RECIDIVISM 2014](image)

*Figure 1.* Pathways Program recidivism rates in Ulloa County.
Program Design

Gender-responsive programming should also include an understanding of a girl’s development, including risk/protective factors, resiliency, strengths/assets, independence, self-esteem, life skills, and how girls are socialized within the context of their society and culture (Morgan & Patton, 2004). Vallejo CBO works within the community to get girls the help that they need. If they are on probation and they cannot get to groups, they have a van that picks them up, or they provide bus tokens. If a girl has gained weight, now that she is off methamphetamine, and has no clothes to wear to school, and her family has no money for clothes, they purchase clothing, or make selections from a clothing closet that they maintain:

We cannot expect her to come out, be successful, and go to school with nothing to wear, no shoes, no clothes. We have done backpacks, school supplies, and have families with no furniture, no bed, no bedding.

We have provided them. We have a family support person whose full time job is to engage the parents and say privately, ‘Between you and me, what are the barriers that are keeping your family from being successful? What is it that you don’t have, because we’re here to help?’ (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

A behavioral health specialist, at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility, described her ideas for new programs. One is a group on healthy relationships:

Many of the girls are from families involved in domestic violence, social abuse, or child abuse. Girls have no healthy models to follow. They have no idea how to nurture a baby or a toddler, because they were not nurtured themselves.

Since many incarcerated girls, or girls on probation, are either pregnant or parenting, this is an immediate need. A coordinator explained:

I have a curriculum that my supervisor found. It is just teaching them developmental levels. I had one girl who thought her 3-month-old baby should be walking. We need to educate them on what they should expect at certain month levels, certain ages. (Coordinator at Ferrelo Juvenile Facility)
Cabrillo Juvenile Facility’s Captain said no to a largely boys program:

I wanted to do something different with our female academy in 2000-2006. At that time, the big thing in Juvenile Corrections was the boot camp. It consisted of drilling, marching, and all of that stuff. However, I could see that the females were not getting any services. We did do the drilling and the marching, but I tried to focus on finding programs for the girls, other than building their muscles. I got the idea from talking to counselors at our women’s prison, and talking to different women who came in from the community. I focused more on the women’s health issues. The girls need to relate to an adult. They want to discuss their problems, and they want interaction. We finally ran out of funding, so it ended. (Captain at Cabrillo Juvenile Facility)

There is much creativity being used to address the problems of the girls. Often funding is the reason that programs cannot be tried or maintained. However, many of the facilities have staff that shares an understanding of what is needed, and are trying to provide what they can with limited resources.

**Assessment**

It often takes longer to complete intake assessment with girls than boys because girls have a greater need to talk, process, connect, feel safe, and build trust. Assessment instruments need to be validated, normed and timed for females (Morgan & Patton, 2004). Access to services is based upon a youth’s risk factors to re-offend. However, since boys on average commit crimes that are more violent and present a higher risk to public safety, girls get less access to services:

Classification instruments should include items that fit the female population. As an example, there should be a distinction between assault-charges based on safety reasons vs. a disciplinary infraction. (Morgan & Patton, p. 59)

Ulloa Juvenile Facility described the process this way:

There is a form that we created over time and perfected. A lot of it is based on the choices that are part of their psychiatric evaluation, so many of those questions are somewhat repetitive because we do refer them to a doctor. Many kids come in so undiagnosed with trauma, learning disabilities, and
ADHD. They are targeted very young, as just the bad kid from the bad hood and there is ADHD, ADD, depression and anxiety. (Mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility)

The Women Offender Case Management Model (WOCMM) mentioned in chapter 2, under Gender-Responsive Programming, is another excellent assessment. The strength-based model reminds counselors that they should not always dwell on an offender’s deficits, but should be building from strengths as well. A girl may have a supportive family and a good education, and this should be remembered in her counseling session (Van Voorhis, 2013). The National Research Center on Justice Involved Women has been studying this approach, since 2008, and has found that women involved have increased self-confidence, success and connection with others (Buell, Van Voorhis & Dieten, 2011).

Offenders in Ulloa Juvenile Facility use a similar system, where they have to meet with a review board, which is a collaborative of a couple of the mental health staff, a probation officer, the school counselor on campus, the Pathways supervisor, and one of the lead correctional officers:

They are going to determine if the kid is going to get 12 weeks, 18 weeks, 24 weeks, and even 36 weeks, based on their needs and severity of what they need to work on while they are in the facility. They talk about school issues, substance abuse, and prior issues. There are different criteria, like how high-risk is this kid? Is she appropriate for us? (Therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility)

The statistics in Figure 1 are very similar to the statistics that the National Center has gathered nationwide. The increased support and supervision have made a significant difference.

An administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility says that they would like a stronger pre and post-test. They have been thinking about developing their own:

I think that some of the anger management, the different components, should ask, “If you were given this situation, how would you handle it now?” rather than talking about triggers, because kids do not think about
triggers. “Someone is staring at me,” that’s a trigger. “Someone disrespected my Mom,” that is a trigger. A smell, a look, whatever…you can feel it. OK, so if they are faced with that same exact situation in the community, do they know how to deal with it? (Administrator at Portola Justice Facility)

The National Council for Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) assessed sexual identities among the JJC population in 2014-15, both nationally, and in California. It was a self-assessment, but they found that:

Initially, when kids are coming into the facility, in handcuffs, and talking about the charges against them, and now they want to know if they are gay or not, kids would not disclose. We found that we got better results if we waited a day or two, and let them be settled. We urged them to separate behaviors from identity. However [40% of the girls in juvenile justice nationally, and 50% in California] is incredibly high. So, one out of two girls in incarceration is LGBT. That includes gender non-conforming girls. (Irvine & Canfield, 2015)

This is an important piece of the assessment picture, as it will have an impact on gender-responsiveness and choice of programming.

**Meaningful Outcomes**

Assessment is only as effective as it is meaningful to the girls. Does it mean that they will get out of the facility sooner? Does it mean that they will be successful in life? Does it mean that they will get a pizza party at the end of the month? Does it mean that they will get to move into the model dorms that have been set up in Ulloa Juvenile Facility, where there is more sunlight in the room, and permission to keep more items in the room? Does it mean that they will get to participate on the running team, off site? Or that they will get to work with the animals at the zoo? There are so many incentives, and they are tied to success in their on-site participation. Numbers are meaningless unless they translate into on-site privileges, and/or off-site opportunities that the girls value. An administrator at Portola Juvenile Justice says:
I have a barbeque that I purchased and brought out, so I will barbeque for them as an incentive, my kitchen staff will make something special, or we will go out and buy pizzas. They have to have 50 days where nobody in the unit receives any consequence or any behavioral issue. They get two percent per day that is 100%, when they hit the 100% they get a party. It has reduced the number of incidents in my unit dramatically. They do not do it exactly in 50 days. It takes them about 72, 73, but still, that is significant for them. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

The staff at Allensworth and Quan CBOs works with teens that are pregnant in a juvenile justice facility:

It is part of their probation work…they have to go to their group. After about 10 weeks, they do not drop out any more. It becomes a part of their life. We do offer stipends, and incentives. We have 11 active members in that group. Our girls do attend more regularly…especially in the small towns. We think it is because there is little else to do. We believe that religion has something to do with it too. Latinos and Catholics make up the majority. (Evaluation manager at Allensworth and Quan CBOs)

Bidwell CBO had this to say about incentives:

We did a spa day for the girls because obviously girls, you know, want to have their nails done, want to get their hair done, or just, you know…so we were going to have the spa day for the girls. Then we have a barbeque. Therefore, we do many different things to get these kids engaged. We want them to buy into the program so that we can help them. (Program manager at Bidwell CBO)

Gooch CBO has organized an all-girl softball league, where the girls play against the younger boys in the facility. The main challenge is to live within the facility rules, so that they may participate. They are able to run a large enough team by combining girls in Juvenile Hall with girls on the commitment side. This can be problematic because the girls on the commitment side have nothing to lose and sometimes are emotionally hurtful to the girls from Juvenile Hall.

The Vallejo CBO is excited about recent developments, which have brought a wonderful career development opportunity to the girls. A faith-based organization called Metro Ministries, from San Diego, got a multi-million dollar
grant from the federal government to offer stipends to youth who had spent some
time in custody. It did not have to be someone who was locked up for a long time,
but rather those who had been arrested and spent at least one night in jail. All of
the youth had to be from certain zip codes that were known for high
unemployment:

They opened up a beautiful construction-training academy, for both boys
and girls. In fact, his top student was a girl. They trained for 90 days in
either construction work or installing solar energy. Licensed teachers
trained them. If they completed the class, nine different construction
companies guaranteed them a job in this area. Our kids have started at
$18.00 per hour on a full time basis, plus benefits. The last report from the
pastor who is running the program is that of 25 students, all 25 are still
employed and their families are amazed because they have young adults
who are making more money than five families could make working
together. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

The program manager at Vallejo CBO believes that the success of the
program exists in the fact that they are not just telling kids they will teach them to
write resumes, giving them a life skills class, teaching them how to interview and
then sending them off to find a job. An adolescent with a criminal background has
very little hope of getting a job at McDonalds or Taco Bell. “This program is
telling the youth, we are going to train you and then you have a job. Establishing
this kind of an environment, where there is hope for the future, and plenty to keep
them busy, has seen huge success.” (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

Staffing and Training

The last three criteria have to do with staffing, staff diversity and training.
The first concerns the hiring of staff. Yes, staff members are hired specifically for
the female population, but a therapist at Montalvo Juvenile Facility admits:

We encourage staff to do self-help. There is a lot of burn out and we have
to encourage staff not to internalize the things that they see. A gang fight
might break out, and a correctional officer is slamming kids to the ground. That is their job. (Therapist at Montalvo Juvenile Facility)

An administrator at Portola admits to problems with staff as well:

One girl assaulted staff, a nurse, about 14 months ago, and we continue to go round and round with some of the nurses. It appears to be punitive. I am not going to say it is punitive, but one nurse I talked to said ‘But she’s going to win.’ I told her, ‘How is she going to win? She is in the Hall. There is no win, there’s no lose. Do you understand? This is not personal, it is business. This is her life… this is not your life. Your life is, you get to do this, and you go home after your shift. You go eat whenever you want…. she does not get to do that. You do not know her background, but I do. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Next, does the staff mirror the ethnic makeup of the girls? Diversity is an important issue in the juvenile justice facility, as well as on the outside. Gender is an issue when dealing with the issues of girls. However, in the case of Drake Juvenile Facility, when specific program staff was changed from female to male, gender-responsive programming stopped. Conversely, in the case of the Vallejo CBO, a male staff member, working with mental health, was retained due to his understanding of female programming. The program manager at Donner CBO said:

I don’t know what Juvenile Hall is looking like at this point because they were talking about closing a certain wing, closing a building down because they were short-staffed, so I don’t know what that impact would be on the youth that are currently out there.

The results of these changes could not be ascertained at the time of this writing, but a shift in gender, age, training, or temperament of staff can have significant impact, and evidence shows that these changes need to be carefully considered.

The staffing of a program should reflect the demographics of the population being served. This reduces barriers and opens doors to understanding and trust, allowing staff and the program to authentically honor the diverse cultures represented in the group (Morgan & Patton, 2004). New employees should be
provided with a program orientation and follow-up training opportunities on gender-responsive issues. Current research on girls and young women, books on adolescent female development, female issues and needs, unique issues for girls of color, communication, staff boundary issues, sexuality, and gender identity are all subjects that should be included in training. The program manager for Vallejo CBO explains:

I think that the reason you have not encountered a great deal of people who are gender responsive and are moving in the new direction is because, like small mom-and-pops, they are still being run by the old founder of the agency who still believes in the 12-step model of treatment. They still believe in the old school practice of tear down, build up. They have not been trained, nor any of their staff, in any of the new theories, models, or research. Therefore, they are stuck in a past model that worked possibly at the time for a few individuals, and are not bringing forward the new research, the new education, and the youth into their practice. Myself, I run a training academy in my programs. I put through more interns than probably any other provider in both substance abuse and MFT, MSW, because I am looking for youth. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

Several of the counties include mentoring programs, most often with mentors from the community. Montalvo Juvenile Facility has a non-profit collaborative mentoring organization on the JJC campus. Mentors are members of the community, often times representing churches. Vizcaino and Ferrelo Juvenile Facilities have a similar set-up, but they have also found a way to use graduates of their own program:

Vizcaino Juvenile Facility is planning to create some new positions, which, while paid, will serve in mentor-like capacities. They will be called navigators. These people will hold the hand of offenders who are released, and take them to appointments. They will make sure that they are following through with the appointments that we try to link them with while they are in custody. We have a reintegration meeting every Monday for the kids that are due to be released, and we talk about available services. What are your needs? Let us help you be successful. We are having a trailer swapped out to create a drop-in center for the youth and that is going to be staffed and
maintained by juvenile justice peer navigators. We have one staff that went through our program and came out the other side a graduate. He has been hired on to do the Youth in Mind program. (Mental health clinician at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

Whether you are volunteer or staff, the program manager at Donner CBO feels that training is really a key component, and not just training to fill a requirement. She feels that:

the program can be improved by including evidence-based curriculum, and then training the staff and really practicing the model to its true fidelity, not just sending my staff to a 2-day training, and telling them that they are now experts on MRT. That is not it. Really training the staff in a certain model and then having the supervisor being trained as an expert provider so that I can facilitate the supervision on that particular model, addressing any clinical issues that come up about that model, and having ongoing support trainings for them. I think that is important. (Program manager at Donner CBO)

The club director at Gooch CBO had to go through 3 days of training with Planned Parenthood to teach their sex education materials as a part of a Gooch program, but each instructor was given free choice on how to use those materials. Often the sensitive materials are presented with a power point in lecture format, and could strive to be more gender-responsive.

In one of their gender-responsive programs, an administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility is proud of the level of training the staff has had:

My people are trained trainers on that and have used it. We facilitate the girls, give them the ability to talk amongst themselves and work through situations when they arise, and challenge them. We use it mainly because of that roundtable component. They love to talk, and sometimes we have to get them to agree to disagree. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

An administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility wants to get the probation officers involved in running courses. “They are learning, too. That is why I want
to get my line staff to do groups, to expand their perception, their understanding, and to help them grow. We all can grow.”

**Analysis of Administration and Management of Gender-Responsive Programs**

The answer to research question 2, whether or not leadership and administration of Central Valley facilities is gender responsive, is no. Progress is being made, and individual facilities are creating innovations, but the data does not indicate much progress. Looking at Table 1 (p. 91), it is clear that several counties are missing many of the most crucial guidelines for what it means to be gender-responsive. The inability to gather data on the girls leaves facilities not knowing what is working, and unable to make improvements. The lack of inclusion of girls’ issues in their programming fails to address the items that girls need for rehabilitation. The use of non-responsive assessments for in-take makes it impossible to create a meaningful plan of treatment. The lack of meaningful outcomes to motivate the girls keeps them from striving to improve. This data would certainly indicate that the administration and management of programming for girls is not developing in a gender-responsive manner. Either girls are given programs designed for boys, or they are given programs selected by staff members who are not accustomed to critically selecting materials that are designed for girls. These results make us question why a girl would try to complete her program. However, we need to remember that it has only been 5 years since the first Challenge grant was awarded to a Central Valley juvenile facility, and it takes time to change a large system. In addition, nothing of this magnitude changes by itself. It takes a lot of training and planning.

There are exceptions in the Central Valley, and those need to be considered when planning for change. Four of the juvenile facilities and one of the CBOs are
making great strides in the gender-responsiveness of their programs. Meade Palidofsky, of Storycatcher’s Theatre, in Chicago, says that there must be a champion in each facility, to start a new, innovative program. We are going to need a new table to include the variations, because we definitely have champions in the Central Valley. In addition, as programs become more and more evidence-based, there will be numbers to justify their approaches. Below is a brief summary of particularly noteworthy and commendable developments in the effort to be gender-responsive

**Ulloa Juvenile Facility Room environment** – There are brightly colored bulletin boards, maintained by the girls, with postings about hair care and room care. Residents that are more senior teach new girls how to maintain their hair and rooms so that they do not get into trouble. There is a large common room with lots of light. One Honor dorm room holds three girls, and is attached to the common room with lots of light. There are two other honor rooms where girls can share with a roommate. The running team goes off site to races. Entry fees are paid for by the proceeds from the student store. In addition, a group of girls goes to the zoo twice per month, to help with the animals. Sunday Fun Day is filled with games and team building competitions. Girls earn scrip in the games, to spend at their store. Girls take care of stray cats. Girls earn points toward a family picnic on the lawn, where parents can bring fast food. Girls interested in college are helped with registration.

**Vocational building** – Portola Juvenile Facility recently received a grant to build a vocational education building. It will have two classrooms, with two shops on each side. They are looking at subject matter, such as agricultural mechanics, where students will learn about tools and will be taught some beginning steps into
trades. On the other side, they are thinking about culinary education. The probation staff has been given the right to design what the programs will be.

**Construction Training Academy** – Vallejo CBO has a program where local construction companies employ probationary teens after 90 days of training, at $18.00 per hour.

**Reintegration meetings** – Vizcaino Juvenile Facility has implemented these opportunities. Every minor who is released will have a pre-release meeting with their parent or support person, people from the school, probation, and any other support agency that the minor would like to have present. They very clearly lay out for the minor where to go and who to see. They do not just release them. They have people to connect with, and everything is set up for them. They have also recently hired navigators to shepherd girls to their appointments. Some navigators are very easy to relate to because they were once probationary teens (Vizcaino Juvenile Facility).

**Staff collaboration** – Portola Juvenile Facility was having trouble with parents calling and *shopping around* a request for favors for their daughter. The staff came up with this solution:

The office does not have cubicles because cubicles are barriers. The desks look at each other. It is a feeding frenzy every morning, as far as what went on overnight, what is going on, what we need to attack, or where we are going to go. If a parent calls one officer, they cannot call the next officer and start shopping around, because as soon as they hang up the phone, “Hey, that was so and so’s mom,” and everybody is on the same page. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Vizcaino Juvenile Facility wanted to maintain tighter supervision over their girls, once they had been released on probation:

We are a big county, but we are small enough so that we know everyone. We call our chief Joe and I think many of the counties have never even seen their Chief or administrator. We see him all the time. We know all the
probation officers, and all of the kids know the probation officers.
(Behavioral health therapist at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

Ferrelo County has similar issues with supervision of probationary youth.
“We are a small community, but we see that it makes a huge impact on the kids because there is a lot of support from all of the officers” (Deputy Chief Probation Officer at Ferrelo Juvenile Facility).

**Motivational newsletter** – Portola Juvenile Facility has an institutional supervisor who writes four newsletters for the kids every week, using his own time. He includes little puzzles, vocabulary of the day, motivational stories, word search, Sudoku (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility).

**Focus on truancy** –
Truancy is the precursor to delinquency and if we can focus on that and get to these kids before they become wards of the court that will prevent a lot of trouble. We are trying to break the intergenerational cycle and change the thought process. We are also reducing our number of group homes, and are working to keep families intact. (Deputy Chief Probation Officer at Ferrelo Juvenile Facility)

**More time out of cell** – Portola Juvenile Facility’s Administrator believes that, “Cells are like babysitters. The more that kids are out of the cell, the more interaction with others, and the more breakthroughs. They begin to feel more comfortable with other people” (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility).

What is it that makes the difference between a gender-responsive facility or organization, and a non-responsive program? Does it require a great deal of money to buy the perfect set of materials? An important discovery emerging from the data is that innovation does not require much money. Each of these facilities uses its imagination to work with the girls in their care. What are the costs of allowing a girl’s parent to bring fast food for a picnic on the lawn? And yet, steps like these encourage the healing relationships that girls need. Alternatively, what does it cost to allow girls, who have earned a prescribed number of points, to take
part in making the rules for a Therapeutic Community? And yet, the buy-in and the self-esteem that a girl earns through participation in the overall community, does much to build her character. If an organization is well connected with the community, what does it cost to make a few calls to try to find a bed for a girl who is going home to a place where she has never had a bed? How much does it cost, in gas, to pick up families so that they can participate in family therapy with their daughters? Each of these, and so many more, are being practiced by juvenile facilities already. These changes do not require costly programming. They are administrative changes that can be accomplished by staff brainstorming and a change in focus. During this study, administrators in facilities and organizations have requested final copies of these results, so that they can know what other counties are doing. There is a desire to make change, but many do not know how to begin.

**Program Content A-Methodology**

*Girls really like art types of things...cutting and making things in a group setting. They will be doing art, and the discussions that they have with each other make them more comfortable. It really minimizes the stress, and I just sit there and listen. Males, if you have an agenda, they will get right off the topic. However, the girls will stay on the topic and discuss the issues. With girls, you can just put them in a room, and the group will run itself.* (Mental health clinician at Vallejo Juvenile Facility)

The second portion of the analysis is that of Program Content. As was indicated in chapter 1, Jean Baker Miller (1976) says that female traits of interconnectedness, growth-fostering relationships and community have been seen as a sign of weakness by the dominant society and a deterrent to mutuality, which means having the same relationship to each other. In a secure facility, it is difficult to build mutuality, which involves mutual respect, openness to change
and responsiveness. Girls do not need equal treatment, but rather authentic toleration of uncertainty, complexity, and the inevitable vulnerability involved in real change (Miller, 1976). Existing programs must be analyzed to see if they are promoting this connectedness, and are responsive to the unique learning styles of girls.

One of the biggest surprises in the research is the sheer number of programs used by organizations and facilities. It is standard practice to walk into an English classroom, at any high school in the state, and see one of about three different textbooks. However, each county in the Juvenile Justice system is free to choose whatever programs they like. There is a vast array of programming, advertised in criminal justice publications and on websites, as well as in displays at conferences held by California Probation Institution Assoc. and Chief Probation Officers of California. Each set of materials includes student learning booklets, an instructor’s manual and an expectation of at least 3 days of training, if not more. These programs are very expensive and closely guarded.

Staff are not usually educators and are not accustomed to evaluating materials, but they are tasked with choosing programs. Often times an energetic, persuasive sales pitch can sell a program, when it does not really fit the criteria that meet the needs of the clientele. This is not meant to be critical of those involved in program selection. Many times substandard reading and math programs are sold to school districts, in the same way, to educators who have been trained as program evaluators. However, no matter who is doing the choosing, historically programs have been chosen for incarcerated boys, and girls have been expected to adapt. One of the main questions we should be asking is whether or not these materials are suitable for the girls and if they are gender-responsive. That is the purpose of this analysis. It will include basic information about each
program and comments from those who are currently running the programs. When we look at the framework, which is supplied to us by Jean Baker Miller and operationalized by Morgan and Patton (2002), we see a number of guidelines, which are not usually considered when working with boys.

Table 3 answers research question number 1: Are the mental health and drug rehabilitation programs that are available to incarcerated girls in the Central Valley of California gender-responsive? This is accomplished by showing to what extent each of the 41 different programs currently used with girls in the Central Valley of California fits the Morgan and Patton (2002) gender-responsive guidelines. Some of the programs are used in juvenile facilities, and some are used in community benefit organizations. At the far left of each column are listed the names of each program. Next to each program is its gender-responsive score, based upon the number of Patton & Morgan (2002) guidelines the program fulfills (the guidelines are also listed in Table 3). Listed to the right of the gender-responsive score is the number of facilities and CBOs, out of 13 that use that program.

What is interesting about Table 3 is that some of the most gender-responsive programs are used the least. The most gender-responsive program is the Voices program (fitting 15 of the 18 criteria), and yet only two county facilities are using it. Other highly rated programs are Girls Circle and the Boys & Girls Club (fitting 11 criteria each), and Battle for Change (fitting 10 criteria). Each of these programs is only used by one facility/CBO out of 13. Conversely, we have MATRIX and Forward Thinking, which only fill 5 of the 18 gender-responsive criteria, and yet are being used by three venues.

Table 4 shows each county name, across the top, with the Morgan and Patton (2002) guidelines along the left side. Table 4 also indicates which
Table 3

*Gender Responsive Scores of Programs and Rate of Utilization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total Gender Responsive Score</th>
<th>Number Facilities Utilizing</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total Gender Responsive Score</th>
<th>Number Facilities Utilizing</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total Gender Responsive Score</th>
<th>Number Facilities Utilizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART (Aggression/Regression Therapy)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATRIX Modified Therapeutic Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shame Resilience Therapy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle for Change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modesto Pregnancy Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Steps to Freedom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers &amp; Big Sisters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moral Reconciliation Therapy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strengthening Families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Freedom Drug Abuse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Success for Teens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Living Museum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Freedom Drug Abuse Preparation for</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teen Challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U.B.E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Treatment New Freedom Returning Home PREA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teen Intervene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectical Behavioral Therapy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Prison Rape Elimination Act)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teen Success, Inc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoWith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Therapeutic Communities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd Farrow Substance Abuse Unit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proud Parenting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>radKIDS RAFT (Recovery Assistance for Teens)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VOICES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Circle</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WeCan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIP Gang Risk Intervention Program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reintegration Meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Why Try?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In their own words</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Running Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Youth in Mind</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Planning Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seeking Safety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programs fall under the categories of community juvenile facilities, or community benefit organizations). The numbers indicate how many programs that particular county or CBO has that satisfy that guideline. So, for instance, Montalvo County has 8 programs that work on building relationships with a caring adult. However, Montalvo only scores a one on gender-responsive environment, mother-daughter relationships, addresses sexual, physical, trauma & neglect, and emotional and mental health. So, Montalvo has a key relational issue covered, which is so important to girls, however, some of the more sensitive, personal issues are not being addressed. They have one of the top scores, but they probably want to think about the fact that they have six programs that teach about substance abuse. While a very important issue, they could spread some of their funding around to hit some of these other highly sensitive issues. The key issue is balance. A venue should look at their gender-responsive score, and then look at where they are spending their funding, time and effort. Montalvo is just one example, and Table 4 has a story to tell about each venue. Evaluating the overall chart, it is evident that many of the first 10 guidelines listed only have a zero or a one designation. That is because most of the first 10 guidelines are the most heavily gender-responsive and are not designed for boys. Vallejo is the top CBO, covering all of the guidelines evenly, except gender-responsive environment. They are very balanced, with their only large concentration centered upon building relationships with a caring adult.

Table 5 tallies up the number of the 41 programs that fit each Morgan and Patton guideline, so it identifies the issues that take priority in the different venues. Overall, the facilities are working on relationships with adults, and they are working on substance abuse. Also, replacing negative relationships with positive ones is key, and so is physical activity. However, many of the lower numbers are
Table 4

*Gender Responsive Criteria Met by Implemented Programs. Gender Responsive Program Content (Morgan & Patton, 2002)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Montalvo</th>
<th>Ulloa</th>
<th>Cabrillo</th>
<th>Ferrel</th>
<th>Drake</th>
<th>Vizzano</th>
<th>Portola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical &amp; emotional safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-responsive environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace harmful relationships with positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time provided to build relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single gender programming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with caring adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Daughter relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths-based-curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds personal respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses sexual, physical, trauma, neglect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional &amp; Mental Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number programs utilized</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number genders responsive criteria met (out of 18)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Benefit Organizations (CBOs)</th>
<th>Allenworth</th>
<th>Quan</th>
<th>Gooch</th>
<th>Vallejo</th>
<th>Bidwell</th>
<th>Donner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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key areas for girls. Time to build relationships is huge, but the emphasis is not just with adults, but with each other. Single gender programming is also a major area, because girls are not comfortable talking about certain personal issues with boys present. The Mother/Daughter relationship is a major area because girls get so many of their ideas about how they relate to men, to children, to other women and to themselves from their mothers. Many of the girls are incarcerated because they have sold their bodies. If they have never had a healthy relationship with their mothers, programming can try to recreate those same interactions. Strengths based programming and addressing sexual, physical, trauma and neglect issues all coincide with each other. The subsections below coincide with the first 10 categories/criteria in Table 5. These 10 represent gender-responsive methodologies.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender-responsive Criteria</th>
<th>Number Programs meeting criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical &amp; Emotional Safety</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-responsive Environment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace harmful relationships with positive</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time provided to build relationships</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single gender programming</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with caring adult</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Daughter relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths based-curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds personal respect</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses sexual, physical, trauma, neglect</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual health</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional &amp; Mental Health</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual health</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic skills</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving skills</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical and Emotional Safety

Many girls are safe for the first time in a locked facility, having been subject to sexual abuse or domestic violence in their own homes. The environment needs to be comfortable and inviting, to encourage the emotional work that goes on in these types of groups. Girls need time to talk together, and to process their thoughts. Coercion, discrimination and negativity hurt the emotional climate of group work. They also need to be kept safe from self-destructive behaviors such as suicide attempts, self-mutilation, eating disorders or drug and alcohol abuse. Girls should not be able to hurt one another emotionally, through words or through non-verbal gestures (Morgan & Patton, 2002).

Sometimes the safety measures need to take place outside the facility. The Vizcaino Juvenile Facility monitors the coming home process, and says:

Before we send them home for furloughs, we go to the family’s house and we ask to come in the home and meet with the family. First, we are trying to engage the family, but second, we are looking at the environment. If we are looking at a meth home, we want placement somewhere else. Our first attempt will be to reach the parents. ‘Let us assist you with referral and resources in this community to get you help. If we can’t get you clean, your child is not going to stay clean—we don’t want to bring your child back into this environment.’ (Program manager Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

The facility environment needs to be carefully scrutinized to ascertain the messages that are being conveyed. Is there high interest material that girls would like to read and discuss? Does their common space include posters, videos, or other wall art that shows strong girls doing independent activities? Are there inspirational posters specific to girls? Are the staff members building the right climate? The club director at Gooch CBO says of Safer Choices, that they are helping the girls by providing different relationships with adults. “They are really just kids. They want to just laugh and have fun. In our 9 years at the facility, there has never been a fight. They have to earn their stages and they learn that
their behavior is a choice” (club director at Gooch CBO). *Earning their stages* refers to a point system that exists within each facility. It requires a certain number of points to be able to visit the recreational areas, gain a later bedtime, get snacks, etc.

Twelve of the 41 programs examined have a primary focus on safety issues. I will explain a few, chosen in response to material given to me by an administrator who uses the program.

Battle for Change works to develop positive interpersonal habits to increase participation in civic life, therefore making a positive impact in the lives of offenders and their communities. The program helps at-risk youth to gain self-awareness, leadership skills and a close-knit peer group. With physical workouts, youth are taught to encourage and motivate peers, and to value mutual respect. Other ways of insuring safety include allowing teens time to talk, and to replace harmful relationships with positive ones. There is also an emphasis on building a close relationship with a mentor or a staff member. Some of their featured programs include youth mentoring, teen-to-work, life skills work or anger management, conflict resolution and teen parenting, linkages with in-home support services, troubled youth consultation and GED preparation (Deputy Chief Probation Office at Ferrelo Juvenile Facility).

Drake Juvenile Facility has created an effective drop-in center, C.U.B.E., for what they call TAY (Transitional Age Youth, 16-25). The clientele are not in a locked facility, and they include youth recovering from mental and/or emotional problems that may be emancipating from foster care, group homes, the Juvenile Justice System, and/or youth from within the community. C.U.B.E. is a one-stop drop-in center that provides a safe environment for youth to set Wellness and Recovery goals and to succeed in life. When I visited C.U.B.E., I saw teens
watching a big flat-screen TV, while sitting on comfortable couches, or playing video games on a handful of computers. Others were making cookies in a well-stocked kitchen, and still others were playing Foosball. There was an art room full of supplies, with many works-in-progress, but also many completed teen productions on the walls, with names proudly displayed. Signs advertised social skills groups, independent living skills classes, housing assistance and indoor/outdoor recreational activities. There is a laundry, tables for homework, and a quiet area to relax. This is a place where a teen can be safe from outside pressures, and just be a kid. The C.U.B.E. is a place where homeless children can do laundry and personal clean up. There is an entire wall rack of brochures referring youth to additional community resources for support (Probation Office at Drake Juvenile Facility, facilitates C.U.B.E.).

In 2014, PREA (Prison Rape Elimination Act) curriculum was created to respond to sexual abuse of youth in custody. It was found that 9.5% of adjudicated youth reported being sexually victimized by staff or other youth. A federal agency created the curriculum to increase the awareness of girls in facilities. Items on abuse, anonymous report and investigation, emergency contraception and sexually transmitted disease, collection of physical evidence, and signs of threatening behavior are all covered by the curriculum. The curriculum also covers transgender and intersex assignment to male/female facilities on a case-by-case basis, and requirements for shower facilities. A major part of the program is to make sure that girls know their rights and are confident enough to insist upon them (Captain at Cabrillo Juvenile Facility, facilitates PREA).
Gender Responsive Facility Environment

When first visiting a juvenile facility, it is striking how austere the environment is. While there are reasons for rules about items that are dangerous, such as staples, pencils, etc., it is difficult to understand why things need to be so cold and devoid of life. Stark, white brick walls, cement floors, meager uncomfortable bunks, no windows, and the list goes on. However, some facilities are beginning to incorporate light, color and even privilege, if earned.

In the common room at the Ulloa facility there are colorful bulletin boards, which the girls maintain (tacky glue, instead of staples). There is a running team (Mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility, facilitates the Running Team), which competes off site on the weekends, and groups of girls help at the California Living Museum (Mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility, facilitates California Living Museum program) to care for the animals, which are representative of native animals of the area. Incentives for good behavior include picnics where the girls’ parents can bring food and eat with them out on the lawn. There are also a number of stray cats which the girls love and maintain (Mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility). While not all facilities can manage all of these components, they can choose from other types of gender-responsive programming.

Girls Circle is a very gender-responsive program, consisting of circles that are single gender, and all meetings begin with an established ceremony, created by the girls. The program integrates relational theory, resiliency practices, and skills training in a specific format designed to increase positive connection, personal and collective strengths, and competence in girls.
Portola Juvenile Facility is one of the most brightly decorated facilities. They allow the teen offenders to paint the walls of the common areas, and they are quite artistic:

We do Halloween, and then Christmas is huge. We do this as a competition, so we buy pizza for the whole first place unit. Then the next one, we get ice cream for them, and the staff. The staff and the kids all get to eat. It is no holds barred, knock down drag out, double secret. Therefore, we have our presiding judge come down and he walks through the division module, and then we will also get another division manager or sometimes the commissioner, and they do the judging. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Portola Juvenile Facility also has an elaborate game room that the teens can use on Saturday and Sunday. They can sit there on the couch and read magazines and watch movies and play video games or just talk, listen to music, or whatever they want to do. According to staff, this game room is a main reason why the behavior has gotten so much better:

You will hear them trying to make deals. Dada, da, “I’m going to lose my game room… whatever… just don’t do it!” (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Replaces Harmful Relationships with Positive Ones

Eighteen of the 41 programs made replacing harmful relationships a key factor. Programming needs to help girls to examine negative behaviors in previous relationships that they have experienced. Staff often talks about how girls are difficult to work with because of all of the drama and divisiveness they bring. Positive behavioral programming is crucial to keeping girls from harming each other emotionally. They need to learn to have healthy and supportive relationships with other girls, and staff members need to remember that girls may not know how to interact in a positive way. They must be taught, and effective programming will help them to do that.
Two effective programs used by Portola Juvenile Facility are New Freedom Preparation for Treatment, and New Freedom Returning Home. Both of these focus on returning the girls back home. They go through a variety of scenarios that might happen when they are faced with their old groups of friends and family. However, there is also time spent on building healthy relationships, since many of the girls have never had one.

Cabrillo Juvenile Facility had a unique experience in 2000-2006, when they were able to run a female academy. They held special presentations for the girls and they invited staff members from a near-by women’s prison, probation officers, and mental health employees:

The girls needed to relate to an adult. They needed someone positive. The boys did not need it as much. The girls wanted to stay and talk. They wanted to discuss their problems. They wanted interaction. The staff members were gaining their trust. They wanted that adult female figure. It was great 15 years ago, and then they cut our budget. I am glad somebody is taking an interest in it again. I have been here for 27 years, and I have seen very little change. (Captain at Cabrillo Juvenile Facility)

The Cabrillo Captain illustrates the importance of the distribution of funding. Since girls make up a very small portion of the offender population, it is sometimes easy to cut effective programs, in deference to the larger, male group.

An administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility described a special connection that the girls had with one of their staff members. She was diagnosed with Lupus and so the staff and the girls were all fund raising for her. They called it “Probation against Lupus” and the girls’ unit painted the purple bow, which symbolizes the fight against Lupus, on the wall (administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility).

The same administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility also described how the facility was trying to get the Probation Officers to run groups. The staff is slowly
trying to train them, first getting them to co-facilitate, and then to take over. There are *food for thought* activities, which are just 10-15 min informational sheets, followed by discussion. They have 62 different *food for thought* sheets that are just for girls. This helps the POs to get to know the girls and to build rapport. So many incarcerated girls come from difficult home environments where they have not had relationships with positive adult role models. Since girls are so relational, the above gender-responsive activities can have a major impact on their ability to adapt to adults outside the facility while on parole.

**Taking time for Relationships**

Programming cannot be so tightly planned and controlled that there is no time for girls to interact in a healthy way, with staff and other girls. In building relationships, girls are able to work on problem solving collaboratively. Gender-responsive programming does not structure this, but allows this to happen. Eight of the 41 programs made this highly gender-responsive issue a priority.

The Quan CBO (Teen Success Inc.) is a program for teen mothers in custody, and they expect girls to attend for 40 weeks, but they provide a $10 stipend per meeting for attending, and they give scholarships every year. The first 30 min is spent checking in and talking about their week. When good things happen, all of the girls cheer. Just being with and around people is a plus. All of these girls are pregnant and either incarcerated or on probation, and there are 11 in the group. The teacher at Quan CBO says

> We have prescribed questions, and we discuss those. We do many games. I have been teaching these types of classes for 14 years. Before this, I worked for Focus Forward and Planned Parenthood. The classes are very engaging, with role-plays and scenarios. (Program facilitator at Quan CBO, who facilitates Teen Success Inc.)
In Drake Juvenile Facility, the probation officers see their girls quite often during the week. The Children/Family/Team meeting happens once per week, with parents and counselors. “We all sit around and talk about how their week went. They also come to me for group counselling once per week. I pretty much see my kids a lot. Or I go to their school, and sometimes I see them over there.” (Drake facility probation officer)

The Donner CBO agrees that time in groups is best:

The most effective treatment is the group. I really believe there is power in numbers, you know, having peers around the table to share their experiences, to celebrate their own milestones, and recovery is huge. Having a facilitator in the room is great. I mean, you go over this kind of stuff, but actually being around other individuals who have sobriety and a history of sobriety and what has worked and you can hear from others is powerful. (Teen Intervene manager at Donner CBO)

Often, when the program facilitator at Gooch CBO (Safer Choices, Healthy Habits or Diplomas to Degrees) meets in classes for sex education, nutrition or college prep, the sessions involve activities where the girls do things in pairs or groups. Then, after the initial time, the whole group meets back together for an overall discussion. The instructor of the college prep class is a volunteer with over 30 years of experience and holds a conversation with the girls. The main challenge is making sure that this does not take over the recreation time that the girls have worked so hard to earn in their game room.

MATRIX has several stages, each of which involves time for building relationships. Offenders start out with individual sessions with a therapist, possibly later including a significant other. The next step is the Early Recovery Group, which has a reduced size to allow individual time with each participant. The central component of the model is the Relapse Prevention Group. These are open groups run with a very specific format. Most participants will admit that
stopping using is not that difficult, but staying stopped is what makes a difference. These groups are the component where users are taught how to stay in sobriety. There are 32 relapse prevention topics which are handled in this way (a) patients are introduced if there are new members, (b) patients give an up to the moment report on their progress in recovery, (c) patients read the topic of the day and relate it to their own experience, (d) patients share their schedules, plans and commitment to recovery from the end of the group until the group meets again. Input and encouragement is solicited from other group members. Whenever possible the use of a co-leader, who has at least 6 months of recovery, is used to serve as a model (program manager at Donner CBO, who facilitates MATRIX).

Another Donner CBO program is R.A.F.T. (Recovery Assistance for Teens) – where girls go through group counseling twice per week, and family support groups. Some of the activities they would be involved with would be journaling, mindfulness activities, Mancalas (an ancient African game of stories), and art therapy. Their therapists are trained to guide girls through motivational interviewing (involving role-playing) and beyond trauma training to address triggers. Beyond Trauma is based on the principles of relational therapy; it uses cognitive-behavioral techniques (CBT), mindfulness, and expressive arts. They also encourage their girls to participate in C.U.B.E. (discussed previously) for recreation, since they are in the same town and it is a safe place to be.

**Single-Gender Programming**

We live in a system that commonly prioritizes male relationships over female relationships, causing girls to accommodate and to put their own needs aside. Unless they are separated from boys, they will not automatically highlight their own issues and priorities. They must learn to be with each other in healthy ways, rather than in competition against one another, holding grudges, gossiping,
and emotionally hurting each other. It is a surprise to find that only 5 out of the 41 programs thought that this was an important issue. The program manager at Vallejo CBO program remembers:

In the old Juvenile Hall, boys and girls were literally in the same pod. The girls were on this side, and the boys were on this side and all of our services were together. It was not until we moved to the new Juvenile Hall in 2006 that we implemented true gender-responsive services. We told them we need to have a separate substance abuse counselor, separate Masters level technicians, and we need to provide those services totally inclusive of just them. Girls are not going to open up in-group, in front of the boys, and openly disclose their history, their sexual encounters, and any possibility of prostitution, human trafficking, rape or sexual abuse. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO)

Likewise, Teen Success Inc. works with incarcerated teen moms, but not the fathers. Many of the girls are not with the baby’s father, so it is a delicate balance. The longer the program lasts, the more the moms start to see themselves as valuable and capable. The program manager at Quan CBO decided to spend their limited funding on the moms (Program manager at Quan CBO facilitates Teen Success, Inc.). The Gooch CBO also runs programs just for girls, and sometimes combines girls of different ages: “We try not to judge, so that they will feel safe to ask questions. We also let different groups of girls suggest topics. Often the older girls will work with the younger ones, on a cross-age basis, which is good for all concerned” (club director at Gooch CBO, facilitates Smart Girls).

**Relationships with Caring Adults**

Girls need the support of a continual, reliable adult female contact. In contrast to a few of the categories listed above, this is one criteria that most of the programs agree upon. Since it is often difficult to get friends and family to the facility, most often the caring adults are staff members. An administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility says:
Even bad programming, if it is given by a good facilitator, can have positive change. Good programming, given by a bad facilitator, will have negative change. I think it comes straight down to relationships. I think it comes straight down to being genuine, and teaching the kids to trust you. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Vallejo CBO agrees with Portola Juvenile Facility. Kids always want to know if therapists will see them outside, in the community. They ask if you are checking on them. Are you still concerned about them, and do you think about them every day? Recently one of the therapists ran into one of his kids working at Walmart:

She told me that she gets it…she cannot be doing that any more. She is starting to be a productive citizen. She has a job now. I run into these kids in the community and I see what they are doing…good or bad. (Program facilitator at Vallejo CBO)

Vizcaino Juvenile Facility wants its therapists to form a personal connection with the youth so that they know that someone cares about them, and they are able to develop trust:

Some of the kids have never received a certificate of completion in their whole lives. They have never had someone say, “I believe in you. You are doing a great job.” Therefore, it is important for a therapist to just plant a seed that says they are worth caring about, they know that someone believes they have a future. (Behavioral health specialist at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility)

Ulloa Juvenile Facility runs Seeking Safety, which targets high-risk behaviors and substance abuse, trauma, and coping skills the girls will need before they return home. Seeking Safety is very structured and there are many safety strategies, coping skills, and trauma oriented issues connected with substance abuse. They spend a lot of time going over boundaries, which they describe using red flags and green flags. Everyone has to make a detailed safety plan for when the girls go home on furlough: “Furlough is like probation on steroids. It is not
their regular probation, but they made it to a commitment program. They are getting more intensive probation when they leave” (therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility, who facilitates Seeking Safety).

**Mother/Daughter Relationships**

Several of the facilities have mentorship programs, often times involving community members from churches or civic action groups to come in and be paired up with particular girls. Often girls have become emotionally distanced from their mothers, and they need help to get that very important relationship working again. Unfortunately, only 3 out of 41 programs allocates any time to the mother/daughter relationship. Vallejo CBO suggests that girls need help from women and girls’ groups at churches, or possibly an older woman who can come and be a mother figure for the girls:

Girls come from a family where there has been sexual abuse, abandonment, high emotional regulation…they will love you 1 min, and hate you the next. The girls are more sexualized…they call them histrionic…crying 1 min, and the next they are laughing. They act like something they are not. (Program facilitator at Vallejo CBO)

Some mentorship programs have mentors who will work with a girl and her mother together. The mother/daughter relationship does not always come naturally, and must be taught. In the meantime, staff members often serve as role models, both in the ways that women should relate to men, as well as the ways they should relate to other women. Forward Thinking uses cross-age activities to cultivate skills that will be needed when the girls go home. Tasks include such items as keeping the cell clean, and following a hair care policy. Offenders who have been there the longest instruct the younger girls. They also write journals, to serve as an outlet, and they discuss them with the in-house staff. Finally, there is a Sunday fun day where the girls play games competitively, to win scrip to use in
the student store, as an incentive (Mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility, who facilitates Forward Thinking).

**Strength-Based Programming**

Another guideline, which is not followed by very many facilities, is Strength-Based programming. Only 5 of the 41 programs mention it in a meaningful way. Gooch CBO spends a lot of time assessing the skills of the girls, in order to recommend activities for them. Many of the kids in the facility have never joined anything, or participated in organized activities or sports. Helping girls to see their existing strengths in a positive way, as well as helping them to build new strengths, can be empowering. Often the girls are unable to see anything positive about themselves (Covington et al., 2004). VOICES advises facilitators to re-frame girls’ survival skills, to look at them not as acts of desperation, but rather as smart decisions that lead to future success. Some of their activities include celebrating cultural roots, emphasizing high expectations and hope for girls’ success, valuing girls’ opinions and teaching social, educational and vocational skills. However, when they are able to see that they have strengths that can potentially help others, they are more able to participate in collaborative problem solving. They need to tap into their life stories, to identify where the strengths came from, and how they might continue to develop them. It helps them to feel less powerless (Program managers at Montalvo and Drake Juvenile Facilities, both facilitate VOICES).

In addition, DoWith works with the strengths of families as the foundation of the planning process. The program consists of wraparound services (surrounding a girl with mental health, substance abuse, job skills, physical health, sexual health, life skills) provided to the youth, while considering the family voice in decision making (Program manager at Bidwell CBO, who facilitates DoWith).
Personal Respect

One third of the programs emphasized building personal respect: “Girls are definitely preoccupied with self-image and what the media and society define as being a young lady. That leads to depression, and that leads to self-esteem issues” (program manager at Donner CBO). Girls need to learn not to rely on others for respect. They must find it within themselves. Girls do so many negative things to hurt themselves, such as eating disorders, drugs and alcohol, using sex to manipulate situations, cutting and mutilating themselves. They must learn that they are special and that they must guard themselves against harm from the outside, and from the inside. Programs that involve positive self-talk, peer helping drama and journal writing will enhance their self-concepts. Goal setting and planning will also help girls to gain a sense of purpose, and allow them to feel that they are in control of their own destinies.

Dialectical Behavioral Therapy works to get the girl to see the therapist as an ally, as opposed to an adversary. The therapist validates and accepts the girl’s thoughts. In groups, the focus is on mindfulness, interpersonal skills, emotional regulation and distress tolerance. Uniquely, phone coaching is also used, to help generalize skills into the patient’s daily life. The program is designed to help people change patterns of behavior that are not helpful, such as self-harm, suicidal thinking, and substance abuse (Dialectical Behavioral Therapy facilitator at Montalvo Juvenile Facility).

In addition, Diplomas to Degrees focuses on making educational plans for the future. Girls work in groups to identify what an ideal life will look like, and then they use materials to search for the perfect training program or college that will help them to attain that life. Through role-plays, they examine the decisions that must be made, and the options that are available. Myths about college are
explored and debunked (Diplomas to Degrees facilitator at Montalvo Juvenile Facility).

Portola Juvenile Facility has just begun to explore the use of Life Planning Education, which combines preparing for the world of work with dealing with sexual and reproductive development, feelings and behaviors. Since a recent NCCD study showed that 40% of incarcerated girls identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans-sexual (LGBT), or gender non-conforming, there have been challenges with programming. If a girl identifies as male, she may not want to be a part of a girls group, and yet she may be harassed if she goes to a boys group. These materials are not new, having been introduced in 1985. They were revised in 1992 and have seen increasing demand as LGBT awareness has grown. The program recommends up-to-date videos and weaves issues of cultural diversity into each lesson. Through gaming, they explore sexual risks, HIV/AIDS and contraception in a high interest way. An administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility says:

You see more of the self-harm type of situation with our girls than with our boys. Therefore, we are trying to build up their self-esteem and their self-worth, and tell them that they mean something to us. When a girl hits one of those walls, where she has a little break and starts crying or gets emotional, the other girls become supportive, regardless of their gang affiliation, regardless of whether they liked each other in the field, regardless of whatever is going on in the unit. At that point, in time, they are going to be supportive of her. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility, who facilitates Life Planning Education)

**Time to Address Victimization, Trauma, Neglect,**

**Emotional and Domestic Violence and Loss**

So many girls have experienced the unthinkable, and yet have survived. They need time to reflect and to talk with girls who have had similar experiences, and yet only 7 of the 41 programs provide time to do that. Girls may have anger
issues, and will need to process what has happened to them. It is important to deal with the past, so that they can move on to the future. Sometimes these issues are so raw and fresh that they may need to discuss them one-on-one with a counselor, or in a single gender group:

We start out writing journal entries, and we get socially acceptable answers, but now it is on hard copy. They may know each other because of the way our housing works, but it is more so when we start talking in the other groups, where they will challenge each other. You will hear, “Oh, no, you are just saying that. You are going to do…” We just stand back and we just drive the bus. We steer it. The State was very impressed with my staff’s knowledge of our kids and the ability to call them out whenever they would say something that is way off base, because we know their history. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility about New Freedom Preparation and Treatment)

Seeking Safety is known as the gut kick program in the Ulloa Juvenile Facility. They choose the Probation officers for the program very carefully, and the programming materials are very intense: “There have been plenty of wrong fits and that goes badly. So, they are very careful” (mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility, who facilitates Seeking Safety). One of the main issues covered in Seeking Safety is prostitution, which has involved a number of the girls. Probation Officers are trying to be proactive on that issue, because it has direct application.

Moral Reconation Therapy, in Vizcaíno Juvenile Facility, is one that has been studied multiple times. While it was originally developed as a criminal-based drug treatment method, it has been adapted for many different purposes, such as individualized programs that work on parenting, spiritual growth, anger management, sexual and domestic violence, and job readiness. Speaking of the implementation of Moral Reconation Therapy, a behavioral health therapist at Vizcaíno Juvenile Facility said:
When I first started the group, I was resistant because it is very rigid and I am not a rigid person. However, once I saw that the girls responded to it, it began to grow on me. They like the structure and they like that each week they are moving on to new content. I think it makes them have a sense of accomplishment when they do pass each phase. I do not think they get praise at home, from family members. They really eat it up like they want to come every week and it is voluntary. It is not mandatory in custody.

(Behavioral health therapist at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility who facilitates Moral Reconation Therapy)

The Moral Reconation Therapy workbooks are formatted into sixteen steps, or units, that focus on seven basic treatment elements:

- Confrontation of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors
- Assessment of current relationships
- Reinforcement of positive behavior and habits
- Positive identity formation
- Enhancement of self-concept
- Decrease in hedonism and development of frustration tolerance
- Development of higher stages of moral reasoning

The main advantage of Moral Reconation Therapy is that girls are actively involved in the sessions by participating in drills, exercises, and self-discovery sessions. This offers a distinct advantage over other programs where girls sit passively hoping to learn something valuable. Moral Reconation Therapy model was designed to focus on the thought processes of addicted individuals with the goal of replacing these unhealthy, lifelong thought patterns with positive thoughts and proactive behaviors.

There is a distinct difference between the guidelines discussed in Program Content A – Methodology, and the remaining guidelines. The Subject Matter almost reads like a list of required units in a school curriculum. They are not
inherently relational, although they can be, and that will be the focus of the examination. Are these topics being handled in a gender-responsive manner?

**Program Content B—Subject Matter**

*I like to use visual kinds of things...like an acorn. Inside there is a seed that is going to become an acorn too. If you plant it, it is not going to be a rosebush. However, it takes fire...something bad...for a seed to pop out and reproduce itself in the forest. You are not a mistake. This happened to you, but it does not matter what happened to you...what are you going to do about it? You have to get up...you cannot sit and cry, or use those drugs to feel sorry for yourself. I am a motivator. I try to plant that seed...some kids get it, and some do not.* (Program facilitator at Vallejo CBO)

The next eight criteria of the Morgan and Patton (2002) framework have more to do with subject matter than with methodology; however, these subjects are key for girls and a gender-responsive program must include them. The programs I chose to analyze were used by the largest number of facilities/organizations. Some programs come from a male tradition, and must be carefully analyzed to be sure that the program is meeting the gender-responsive program goals.

**Physical Health**

As indicated earlier, girls deal with body image problems, so they must learn to deal with their inner self-esteem, as well as the assessment of those in their outer surroundings. The key emphasis should be on health, personal care, and changing physical conditions such as menstruation, pregnancy, sexually transmitted disease, contraception and sexuality. The VOICES program includes a unit on physical image which highlights body image, but also nutrition and how to make delicious food. Healthy Habits (Gooch CBO) also runs a program concerning food, sleep, and drug abuse. Using a group of scenarios, girls are actually able to teach each other about the choices they should make. Portola
Juvenile Facility is creative in that they use some of the group time as recreation time because Title 15 changed this year. Before, group therapy was not considered recreation time, but it is now:

Therefore, that helped us to be able to expand the amount of time we can have kids participate. Before, because of the requirement, it really hamstrung us as far as how much time we had, because you have so many minutes of school and you become very creative to make sure you can get programming shoved in. But now we can have kids play games in our outdoor rec area and it counts.” (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

**Sexual Health**

Quan CBO organization facilitates Therapeutic Communities that works with teen mothers, and has 11 incarcerated girls this year:

They funded us for this first year, to try our program with incarcerated girls, but the girls all have to be in school while they are in the program. They also have to be on birth control...any type. Many of them admit that they do not know what they are doing. We asked them if they were breast-feeding, and many of them were, but did not know why it was important. There are so many issues like that, especially child development issues. (Evaluation manager at Quan CBO, who facilitates Therapeutic Communities)

Lack of awareness of sexual health and a need for education seem to be big issues. Vizcaíno Juvenile Facility related that some of their girls are being trafficked and are not even aware of it. Their moms have prostituted some since they were 9 years old. Therefore, in class they are focusing on what is included in a healthy relationship, since they have never experienced one.

Montalvo Justice Facility’s VOICES has a whole section on Dating and Sexuality, which includes ways to protect the body, and instructs girls to create their own sexual bill of rights. Components might include (a) I have the right to feel safe; (b) I have the right to remain a virgin; (c) I have the right to say “no;” It also includes a section on sexual orientation, where girls learn the correct
terminology, so as to be conversant on the facts, and avoid abusive slang terms that hurt others.

Vallejo CBO also uses Big Brothers and Big Sisters on shame resiliency. This program, while not evidence-based, has been proven successful with the girls in the program:

Girls need to be trained to say, “I cannot change the harm that I have caused in my past. All I can do is to go forward into my future and I can ask forgiveness. But more than anything, I can forgive myself for what I have done.” An excellent example of this is when one of their therapists was working with a girl who had been gang raped. She entered into therapy with her mother, and her mom’s agenda was to say, “I am sorry I was not there to protect you.” The girl kept indicating that, “No, that is not the point.” Finally, the therapist asked her, “Are you mad at yourself for getting into that situation?” The girl finally admitted responsibility. That stopped the mom from feeling so guilty, and thinking that it was all about her. It finally allowed her to focus on her daughter and helping her to get past the event. (Mental health therapist at Vallejo CBO, who facilitates VOICES and Big Brother and Big Sisters)

**Emotional Health**

Mental health programs are not court ordered. The court will not re-violate a girl because she did not go to a therapy appointment. However, girls do need reliable information on eating disorders, body image, addiction, depression and self-care. Our society has many expectations for females to follow, and ways that girls need to conform. Very often girls are blamed for failure to be successful, and yet no one has assessed the program they are using. Has she been placed in a program that expects her to attend enough sessions to work on her needs? Has her therapist had enough training with girls her age? In addition, since many youth are now given a dual-diagnosis, has the therapist had enough training in all of her problem areas? Will treating one of the issues negate treatment with the other? A therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility explains:
We just try to encourage them, because sometimes they get here and they have never had mental health services before, or maybe they have not been compliant with their services in the past. We try hard to get all of the pieces in place so that, when they get out, they have all of the resources that they need, not only for them, but also for their families. Many times the families need that support, help and guidance too. (Therapist Ulloa Juvenile Facility)

Thinking for a Change is a collaborative treatment, with clinicians, correctional officers and probation officers - anyone who wants to participate. It is not punitive at all. They are just there to listen and to educate. The program focuses on self-change, social skills, and problem solving skills. Teens are asked to self-reflect on their antisocial thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs. An emphasis is on trying to empathize with the way that others feel when victimized by anti-social behaviors. Studies which analyze recidivism found that 23% of the teens treated by Thinking for a Change recidivated, compared to 36% of the untreated teens (National Institute of Justice, 2009) (Deputy probation officers at Montalvo and Ferrelo Juvenile Facilities, facilitate Thinking for a Change).

Drake Juvenile Facility works with a couple of different mental health programs:

If girls are lacking structure, and they can possibly go to a group home or placement out of the home, that is when DoWith would be used. WeCan is just an extension of mental health, with more intense services, but it is not as intense and involving. If we find a girl who needs to see a mental health counselor twice per week, instead of once, then DoWith would be more appropriate. We are going to wrap that girl in services, like a cocoon. (Probation officer at Drake Juvenile Facility and program manager at Bidwell CBO, who facilitates DoWith and WeCan)

Substance Abuse

Since substance abuse is one of the major reasons that girls are incarcerated, it makes sense that half of the programs feature activities to deal with drug abuse. Floyd Farrow Substance Abuse is a distinct part of a facility that
provides a 24 hr therapeutically planned living and rehabilitative intervention environment for the treatment of children with disorders in the use of drugs, alcohol, and other substances. Medical and supportive counseling services and educational services are included. The program offers a 1 to 10 ratio of certified substance abuse specialists and mental health clinicians to adolescents in delivery of these services, offering programs such as Motivational Interviewing, Recreation/Art Therapy, Family Therapy, Gang re-direction, and Relapse/Recidivism prevention.

During the 10 years that the program has been operating, they consistently deliver successful outcomes: During the fiscal year 2009-2010 73% of the juveniles who participated in the program were drug free 6 months after completion of their time in-custody. Ninety seven percent of the juveniles had no new convictions during the first 6 months after completion of in-custody program. Seventy seven percent were attending school, working, or engaged in a vocational program 6 months after completion of in-custody program. Fifty adolescents graduated with a high school diploma while in the program. When surveyed about the program, 70% of involved youth said that they would recommend the program to others. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO, who facilitates Floyd Farrow Substance Abuse)

VOICES, a program used in Drake and Montalvo Juvenile Facilities, takes a unique gender-responsive approach to drug abuse. Girls actively practice refusal strategies, and chart the biological, psychological and environmental factors of addiction. They also explore the role that substances have played in their families.

The program manager at Donner CBO is concerned about girls when they begin their probation. They are not as concerned about what they are doing, as much as concerned about what they are not doing:
Therefore, they get home and now they have to care for their five younger siblings. Then they also have, on top of that, the layers of their terms for probation and one of those terms is meeting with the P.O. Therefore, when they go in for their appointments, honestly they are supposed to be tested if there is a drug and alcohol history. Therefore, the P.O. asks them if they are using any drugs. It is a self-report. The youth will say, ‘Oh yeah, I smoked a joint yesterday.’ The P.O. writes down self-report cannabis, but there is no actual dip [using a dipstick in the urine to detect drugs] to see whether the girl could be using opiates, stimulants, or something else. Therefore, they all know that if you self-report, then you are not going to get a dip and you can continue doing what you are doing. (Program manager at Donner CBO, who facilitates R.A.F.T.)

At the time of writing, Drake Juvenile Facility is doing a needs assessment and a cost assessment, looking at the services they provide. They do not feel they have a strong enough curriculum with R.A.F.T., and they want to improve it. They have very few girls in the system, and the program manager believes that is because girls are protected by older men who are receiving benefits, or by those who are trafficking the girls. They are concerned, and want to develop better ways to find these girls.

Not many programs involve a girl’s parents, but Teen Intervene consists of three 1-hr sessions with a therapist, 10 days apart, ultimately looking into the home. Session 1 seeks information about the girl, and then helps her to set goals for behavior change. Session 2 assesses progress, discusses strategies to overcome barriers, and encourages the girl to continue to work toward her goals. Session 3 meets with the girl’s parent(s) and addresses parent-child communication and discipline practices, and ways for the parent to support the girl’s progress. (Program manager at Bidwell CBO, facilitates Teen Intervene)

**Spiritual Health**

Only eight programs highlighted the importance of developing spiritual health. An evaluation manager at Allensworth CBO observed, “Our girls in the
smaller communities attend more regularly. We think it is because there is little else to do. Religion has something to do with it too. Latino and Catholics make up the majority” (Evaluation manager at Allensworth CBO). However, spirituality is not the same as religion. Many girls are drawn to the rituals and traditions that give meaning to their lives. These rituals require a girl to take quiet time to think through the difficult issues of life. They also help to relax a girl, making it unnecessary to use drugs and alcohol for that purpose.

The VOICES program includes a chapter of activities that will help girls to identify with their spirituality. They start by identifying things that give them purpose or meaning in life. Then they progress to people, places and things that provide them with feelings of serenity. They identify people who serve as their wisdom figures and then they explore their hopes and their dreams, using their perceptions of what the wisdom figures would say about it, and imagining their guidance.

Moral Reconation Therapy (mentioned previously) espouses that, according to the spiritual model, a disconnection from God or a Higher Power prompts addiction. This separation causes people’s suffering because they fail to live according to God’s will or direction. Therefore, recovery consists of establishing or re-establishing a connection with God or a Higher Power. The most prominent example of the spiritual approach is Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and other 12-step groups, which include activities surrounding the following questions:

Questions for personal reflection from the moral model:

Are there times when I need to exert more effort and will power to stay on track? Should I use willpower to behave better and make wiser choices? Are there times when I need to exert more effort to do the things I know will help me in my recovery efforts? I know if I make the extra effort to exercise every day, I feel better. This improved my mood. It also reduced my cravings and made it easier for me to resist them. (Behavioral health
clinician at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility, facilitates Moral Reconciliation Therapy)

Another faith-based program, which is active in several facilities providing mentors to girls, is Big Brothers and Big Sisters. Just one hour per week at a local school or other community site is all the program requires. The mentor and the girl eat lunch together, play sports or board games, and make crafts, do general homework, or just talk. Mentors listen, guide, care, and have fun. The impact of mentoring shows in matches of at least a year. It is not a tutoring program, but national research shows that it definitely has an impact on schoolwork. Fifty-eight percent improved their school performance, while 65% showed higher levels of self-confidence and a better attitude about school (Big Brothers Big Sisters, 2013).

**Anger Management**

Twenty-five percent of the programs cover anger management, which is more traditionally a male topic. However, those who include it have found ways to make it gender-responsive. One example is Aggression/Regression Therapy in the Ferrelo Juvenile Facility. The Juvenile Services Division requires this program and it lasts for 10 weeks. The components include anger control and moral reasoning, and it is a cognitive behavior training which is aimed at reducing aggression. The Skill Streaming portion of the program is very gender-responsive, using modeling, role-playing, and performance feedback. The Moral Reasoning Training component promotes the development of socio-moral reasoning through social decision-making meetings. During these meetings, the group members strive to make mature decisions concerning 10 specific problem situations. The situations are designed to stimulate discussion helpful to promoting a more mature understanding of the reasons for moral values or decisions such as telling the truth, keeping promises, not stealing or cheating:
The first thing to understand is that no matter how tough, mean or strong a girl might seem, underneath all of that she is wounded and afraid. An angry adolescent girl is feeling threatened, or has been abused, abandoned or neglected in some way, or they would not be showing all of that anger. Girls’ aggression tends to be associated with conflictual interpersonal relationships. Girls are more likely to commit crimes against friends or family members, and these damaged relationships create more distress for girls. In addition, girls’ violence more often occurs at home, while boys’ violence more often occurs away from home. (Deputy Probation Office at Ferrelo Juvenile Facility, facilitates Aggression/Regression Therapy)

To help girls to curtail these behaviors, they are asked to consider how their previous behavior damaged their relationships. They take steps to heal broken relationships, such as writing formal apologies. They are encouraged to take responsibility for their actions. They are taught adaptive social skills such as initiating conversation, showing positive regard for others, being a good friend, or appropriately showing dissatisfaction with others’ behavior.

G.R.I.P. in the Drake Juvenile Facility, and New Freedom Returning Home in Portola Juvenile Facility, both emphasize anger management in gangs. The programs involve comprehensive gender-specific anti-gang strategies for female gang members. Resources address needs and risk factors underlying joining a gang, gang involvement, gang violence, leaving a gang, substance abuse, and the gang mindset. The anti-gang strategies help participants identify their personal risk factors and develop action plans to address them (Drake and Portola Juvenile Facilities, facilitates Programs G.R.I.P. and New Freedom Returning Home).

Life Planning Education in Portola Juvenile Facility also deals with anger. In a chapter on Keeping Violence Out of my Life, girls act out ways of handling their anger, and learn to negotiate ways to resolve conflict. The program also handles issues on sexual violence and date rape. They work through scenarios:

Is your heartbeat increasing? Do you clench your fists? Do you make your face? Then you start talking about how you can break them down. I think that when we look at it, our pre and post testing gives them scenarios on
how to work through it, and then we give them pre and post tests afterwards. Okay, so if they are faced with that exact same situation in the community, yay! They now know how to deal with it. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility, facilitates Life Planning Education)

Girls also harbor much anger toward family members, and Strengthening Families can help. Girls and their parents learn effective communication, understanding feelings, coping with anger and criticism, stress management, social skills, problem solving, resisting peer pressure, and compliance with parental rules (program manager at Bidwell CBO, facilitates Strengthening Families).

**Academic Skills**

A gender-responsive program should encourage girls to attend school and to equip themselves with the knowledge and skills that they will need to become successful. Too often girls are put into a situation where they are trading their bodies for survival, and they need to learn that their minds can take them much further in life. A mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility describes a climate of encouragement:

We have had a couple of girls who have actually graduated while they were here, so then the school counselor was really good about hooking them up and helping them find financial aid, getting them hooked up with the local community college, and getting them hooked up so that, when they leave they can take the assessment. We actually took them there so that they could get the assessment done, so that when they get out, they just go. They do not have the parental background to help them get into community college. Whatever they need to do, we can help them. Then there is no excuse. They are all ready to go. (Mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility)

Ulloa Juvenile Facility also provides the girls with baskets in their rooms, where they can keep books, and plastic files where they can keep their homework assignments and papers organized.
Most facilities admitted that they do not have very many low-functioning girls, but labelling hurts a teacher’s perception of a student:

They create tag teams and most of them, if they are not at grade level, are usually stunted at third or fourth grade reading level, which is pretty much a newspaper, so you can still read. Many of my girls are intelligent girls, but there is a lot of drama. Many things have gone on in their life. A lot of them are tagged by the time they are in fifth grade, as behavioral issues. My mom was a teacher and she used to talk about the ‘red dot’ kids. The red dots mean ‘behavior problems.’ I would look at her role sheet and kids would have one, two, three and even five dots by their name indicating how bad their behavior was. This would travel with them to each new class, and became an expectation. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Staff at Portola Juvenile Facility says that students have a high rate of passing the California High School Exit Exam equivalency exam, mainly because some of their kids are smart, but they just never went to school. When they are in the facility, there is no question about going to school. He explains:

We have an event next Wednesday where we are helping, and having the parents come. They are going to meet with the school officials, and then afterwards we are going to have kids and parents outside in my outside recreation area. They will put on a performance. They do Saturday school with my program kids, and one teacher is teaching guitar and bongos, while another is teaching drama. Therefore, we are doing some elective and credit recovery on that day. Part of Wednesday’s performance is some of the kids playing the guitar as part of a scene. They have a little drama. The good thing about this is that some of our kids have never, ever, ever gotten any kind of positive feedback from a school official, probably the whole time since third grade. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Diplomas-to-Degrees (Gooch CBO) uses a component that encourages girls to look ahead to college:

They start by identifying their strengths, and then narrowing those down to types of careers. From there they examine different types of colleges, and then narrow those down to the particular college that will help them to achieve their goals. Scenarios and activities help girls to get past the myth that they cannot go to college because they have a criminal record. They
Prob**lem Solving**

Emerging research in the area of assessment and classification, case management, and programming is consistently showing more successful outcomes for girls when corrections staff use gender-responsive approaches. Understanding trauma and its effects on girls, using trauma-informed strategies when interacting with female inmates, and engaging them in cognitive problem-solving has also been shown to enhance facility safety and security for staff and inmates by reducing inmate–staff and inmate–inmate assaults, misconduct, mental health referrals, and the like (Campbell, 2005).

One of the most useful things one can teach girls and their families is basic problem solving skills. Teaching problem solving is an extraordinary way to empower girls and their families. By learning these skills, they can control some of their stressors and tame some of the chaos they experience. Professionals often overlook the need to teach them these skills. Their problems tend to be solved for them. Maybe a counselor feels like one is doing one’s job if problems are solved, or it may be that it is just easier to solve the problem, than it is to teach the techniques to the girl. This approach truly needs to be reconsidered. Problem solving skills are essential if girls are going to succeed. Personnel at Portola Juvenile Facility handle this by teaching girls to play chess. While not a “purchased” program, life skills are effectively taught:

Chess is a very good way to teach life skills. I always ask them, ‘what is the most powerful piece on the board?’ Of course, they will say the queen or the rook. However, I tell them it is the pawn. They look at me as if I am
crazy. However, all the pawn has to do is run through all the trials and tribulations, and get to the other side of the board, and then they can become any piece that they want. All you have to do is be the pawn, and you can be successful. If you make a bad move in chess, you lose. Sometimes if you make one bad choice, you are finished. A stalemate means you are locked up forever. Losing the other way, the king is captured and then it is off with his head. That is the worst-case scenario. So, all you have to do is be the pawn. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile Facility)

Sometimes problem solving happens on a more informal basis, and is not always positive. Offenders are forbidden to talk to each other, and so they figure out ways. Again, an administrator at Portola shares what he sees his kids figuring out:

We have note passing, probably between boys and girls, and we find them underneath the water jug in the rec yard, or we will find them up underneath the classroom because we rotate classes. They also yell through the plumbing, or they use hand signals. On graveyard shifts, they keep the doors open so it is easy for the officers because everyone is locked down, so the officers can go in and do their checks. The kids will yell from unit to unit and they will try to communicate in that way. (Administrator at Portola Juvenile System)

Youth are so resourceful when they are met with adversity, such as wanting to communicate in a facility. However, there are other types of programs, which train girls to solve the many problems in their lives. The key is to not try to take everything on at once. Success for Teens breaks change down into small steps, and explains that 10 min per day of anything can have a huge impact on your life. Quan CBO uses this program, and organizes lessons into action steps. Girls start out by reading stories, and then answer questions such as, what first step are you afraid to take? What would help you take that step? Are you waiting for a lucky break? Are there opportunities you can take advantage of right now? In this way, they create their own unique problem solving strategy (program manager at Quan CBO, facilitates Success for Teens).
Analysis of Programs

Examining the different types of programming used with incarcerated girls in the Central Valley facilities and community benefit organizations, one is struck by the fact that, 5 years after the first grant was given to bring equity to girls and boys, there is still more programming that is oriented toward boys (Iowa Commission on Women, 2005). In addition, the biggest gap within those programs is the methodology. No matter what the claim of the program may be, the methodology is still linear and focuses on a very independent model. For this study, content areas have been separated into methodology and subject matter, because the greatest differences lie in the method. For example, if one were to offer a feminist literature class at a college, all of the students would read books written by women, but that would not make it a gender-responsive class. Students would need to talk about the feminist ideas represented in the books, the feelings discussed, the character traits which were revealed by the author, and many other topics. They might discuss the feelings that were conveyed through the writing and how those feelings are present in their own lives. Neither the subject matter, nor the author is the key to gender-responsiveness in a novel, and it is not the key in these programs either. Talking about physical health, sexual health, substance abuse, etc. is important only if, through analysis, we can tell if the focus pertains to girls and their development. However, to talk about them more generically does not make them gender-responsive. Therefore, the method makes these topics responsive. It is necessary to look at the guidelines which are least often emphasized in programming, to ascertain the importance of what is missing.

The type of programming that is mentioned least in the Central Valley is that concerning the mother-daughter relationship. This relationship is key to female development because girls learn about their body images, how to care for
themselves, their concept of femininity, and their sense of worth from their mothers. They learn about relationships with other women, and with members of the opposite sex, and they learn how to raise their children from their mothers (Morgan & Patton, 2002). This is not subject matter for boys, but it is crucial for girls. Currently, only three programs are offered in the seven counties on the subject, and that needs to change. Many girls who end up in the justice system are selling their bodies, and allowing themselves to be exploited very cheaply, and it could potentially be traced back to the loss of this very important relationship.

Another category that is absent in current programming is the offering of single gender programming. Girls will not usually speak up, in a group, and discuss sexual abuse, rape, or other personal female issues when there are boys in the room. This relegates girls to a secondary status in the group, functioning more as a guest than a participant. Girls may not assume leadership roles because girls are often intimidated by males, and studies conducted on presenters have indicated that they often call on males more frequently, adding to the secondary status of girls (Iowa Commission on Status of Women, 2005). Only 5 of the 41 programs include single gender groups.

Strengths-based is another rarely used type of programming. It comes from positive psychology which talks about seeking the good life (Seligman, 2002). To have the good life, one must use his or her most positive strengths in order to make the best life for everyone. Helping girls to identify their greatest strengths, and showing them how to use those strengths for the greater good, is a very positive type of therapy. In fairness, strengths-based techniques are incorporated into many other types of programs, but they are called by other names. There are six Valley programs labeled as strengths-based programs.
So many incarcerated girls have experienced sexual abuse, physical abuse, trauma and neglect, but there is no time set aside in the programming to talk about their experiences. Morgan and Patton (2002) explained that girls need to tell their stories, and they need to get their feelings out into the open, so that they can then examine them and begin to find coping strategies. This is not something that can be accomplished while filling out handouts in their rooms. They need to talk, and to cry, and to support one another in catharsis. Girls are relational, and they process by talking. However, currently only seven programs allow them the time to do that. This combines well with another lower scoring category, which is providing time to build relationships. Some juvenile justice facilities are wary of allowing girls time to talk to one another. Staff at Ulloa Juvenile Facility says that it never goes well, so they structure the time more tightly. However, most of the facilities and the CBOs recognize that girls need time to talk to one another, and participate in activities within which girls can form those relationships with each other, and with caring staff. Ulloa Juvenile Facility has a running team, where select girls are able to participate in races off-site. They also take girls to work with the animals at the California Living History Center. These activities allow girls to connect with each other while sharing a mutual purpose.

Two of the content subject matter categories are also infrequently used, probably because they are not popularly included in materials for boys. Girls are often referred to, in facilities, as mentally ill. To return to the framework of Jean Baker Miller’s Relational-Cultural theory (1976), she feared that when girls acted differently from boys, those differences were pathologized and used as reasons to portray girls as weak. In my hours spent in the juvenile facilities, I have often heard girls referred to as mentally ill, but have rarely heard a boy referred to in the same way. A boy will be referred to as crazy, but it is usually in an aggressive sort
of way, or sometimes as a positive trait, meaning social and energetic. When girls are referred to in this way, it usually describes a form of weakness. Only eight of the programs focus upon mental/emotional health.

The other subject matter content area, which is marginalized, is that of spiritual health. While the spiritual programs previously listed deal with strong wisdom figures, and a God that can support a youth during drug rehabilitation, spiritual health is probably less likely to be taught in a boys program:

The emphasis for boys is on independence and linear movement toward a goal. Girls are seen as circuitous, moving in many directions, and not goal oriented. It is perceived that girls need a God to take care of them, whereas boys see themselves as more independent. Historically, women often took care of the religion and spirituality for the family. While times have certainly changed, the absence of programs based upon spirituality would show that attitudes have not. (Bryant, 2007, p. 836)

So, in answer to research question 1, are the programs used in the Central Valley gender-responsive, the answer is, not yet. The majority of programs are still built around a male model, but the number of responsive programs grows every year. Awareness and training is, again, the key. Part of the problem is that many of us have been raised with the public school model. There is a sage on the stage who conducts the lesson. There has probably been a reading assignment or some homework to do at home, and the sage expounds upon that material. Because of the large numbers in classes, meaningful group work is curtailed, in deference to control. It is much like that in the juvenile justice facility, which makes it not gender-responsive. Programs like Girls Circles and VOICES have been leaders in the field for over 10 years. New programming is gradually adding units that are more gender-responsive. However, if you just quickly glance at Table 4 (p. 115), it is noticeable that few programs in the first 10 guidelines have
more than a zero or a one, because that is where the gender-responsive methodology is.

**Facility Walk-Thru—A GIPA of the Girls’ Environment**

Having discussed the first two pieces of this research plan, the program materials and the interviews with administration and staff, I will now come to the third and final piece. The Gender-Informed Practice Assessment (GIPA) was used to look at the environment where the girls live and where they receive their programming. In a true GIPA, observations are made of the facility architecture, treatment programs, staff meetings, classification procedures, disciplinary procedures, medical and mental health facilities, living quarters, educational classrooms, and other functions. When used to its full potential, the GIPA is the starting point for strategic planning of a wide range of improvements to the evaluated agency and facility. I was privileged to have the opportunity to tour most of the facilities, and can report that they are all clean and well maintained. There are no health hazards, at least no physical health hazards. I was limited in the areas that I could inspect, and have placed the questions that I used in Appendix B. Is each facility gender-responsive? Unfortunately the answer to research question three is also, no. I will begin by discussing the structure of the cells.

In most of the facilities the girls’ rooms are approximately 6 x 10 ft. with white painted brick walls. Some of them are pockmarked with scraped off paint, since the facility removes graffiti when it appears. They have concrete floors, and a stainless steel sink and toilet combination. The beds are bunks, with plastic mattresses about 2-3 inches thick, much like someone would use on a camping trip. Girls are not allowed to put anything on the walls, and they are given a small
basket within which they can keep two books, a few letters or pictures from home, and their homework assignments.

The outer areas and hallways are the same painted, white brick with concrete floors, at all facilities. Ulloa juvenile facility allows their girls to keep colorful bulletin boards, maintained by them, but with prescribed materials such as posters to illustrate room care and hair care. Portola allows girls to paint the walls of the hallways, and they decorate for the seasons and holidays. Most other facilities keep bare walls.

Group meeting rooms sometimes have comfortable couches, but no artwork or interesting reading material. There are no pictures of strong girls doing capable things. Any posters that exist are of cartoon type pictures to illustrate rules to be followed.

Three of the facilities are not on bus lines, and are so far away from town that some families cannot come for family therapy or visits. The other facilities are in town or on bus lines. Those who can get there meet their daughters in a crowded family room, with uncomfortable tables and chairs. There is no privacy from other families. There are vending machines for buying snacks. They must go through metal detectors, which can be intimidating. Ulloa County has found a way to make it more palatable for family visits. Girls can earn a family picnic, which allows family members to bring fast food to the facility, and eat on the lawn with their daughters, in privacy.

Six administrators mentioned having staff who are trained in gender-responsive methods. Some of them are proud that their staff trains other staffs.

Juvenile facility programming includes mental health, substance abuse and trauma therapy on all sites. Job skills training is only mentioned at four sites. Cultural/spiritual exploration is only mentioned at three sites. Pregnancy or
childcare is taught at four sites. All of the facilities and organizations have programs with many different types of activities, but many consist of handouts accomplished in the cell, talked about later in the overall group. There are sports and games in almost all facilities, but few avenues for just talking to others. Most time is structured. Groups are often held during recreational time because of scheduling, denying girls’ free time that they have earned through good behavior.

Community benefit organizations are similar to the juvenile facilities. Many of the meeting rooms are very austere; however, a few allow girls to make their own art. CBOs, relying on grants, have little money for comfortable furniture or artwork. The exceptions are Gooch, which maintains a wonderful teen room with comfortable furniture, pool tables, a big screen TV and snacks allowed by generous donations; Allensworth, which is able to pay girls for attending meetings; and Donner, which also has a comfortable teen room, with a stocked kitchen for baking, and a laundry. Since they are grant driven, CBOs are limited in the content that they present. The givers of grants are usually quite specific about where they want their money to go. CBOs are not able to branch into new areas, such as gender-responsive programming or mental health, on their own, unless they can find a grantor who is amenable to change.

Facilities are uncomfortable and sterile, lacking color or light. Portola and Ulloa are the exceptions. There is little relational time with other girls, staff, family or friends. Programming is filled with subject matter, but the methods are linear and solitary. Too much time is spent in the cell. There is little time for self-expression. Only one facility makes a regular effort to get the girls off the site. Only one facility works to keep girls connected with their families. The CBOs have more amenities, but are limited in scope. Several specialize in teen moms or sex education. Some are more sports oriented. When girls are on probation, they
can pick and choose the services they desire, as long as they have transportation, and are allowed free time away from family responsibilities. CBOs need to consider the mobility of girls when they plan their programs and equip their facilities. Van Voorhis (2013) reminds us that women may have been abused as children, and we need to strive for environments that will not re-traumatize them.

**Community Involvement as Framework**

Facilities are beginning to branch out into outside opportunities for girls. Paulo Freire (1970) spoke of the importance of informal education, which is a dialogical (or conversational) rather than a curricula form, but more importantly he emphasized that dialogue involves respect. It should not involve one person acting upon another, but rather people working with each other. Too much education, Freire argues, involves ‘banking’ – the educator making ‘deposits’ in the student. Instead, girls need to seek their own truth, in connectedness with others.

A Behavioral health therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility feels that they have a great relationship with their county, and they can reach out and get any information they need for a girl. However, agencies come and go, and just when they think they have a great connection to work with, it may shut down. In addition, their auxiliary program has a takeaway tattoo program so that the girls can get their tattoos removed. It is intended to help with anything gang or drug related. They have to do some community service in return for the removal (Behavioral health therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Facility).

Vallejo CBO runs programs in the Montalvo Juvenile Facility, as well as in the community, and many of the same kids, on probation, regularly attend meetings at the CBO. Relationships that they built in the facility are sustained on
the outside. There are examples of facilities who hire young people who are no longer on probation, such as the Vizcaino navigators.

When analyzing the 41 programs currently used in the Central Valley, 5 years after the gender-responsive movement formally hit the Valley, progress is moving very slowly. Several times staff members enthusiastically said that their programs were very gender-responsive, and yet a description of how the programs were used in therapeutic groups and an examination of the actual program materials, did not prove to be responsive. When I analyzed the programs in a qualitative way, combined them with facility walk-throughs and interviewed 26 staff from juvenile facilities, I could then triangulate the data to see if staff impressions proved true. Gender-responsive subject matter is definitely used, but if the booklets are worked on in isolation, or in a co-ed group, or with a facilitator who holds him or herself aloof from the girls, programming is not gender-responsive. Chapter 5 will apply all that has been learned from the research to describe a model gender-responsive county. It will also discuss concerns that were raised during the research, and will look to the future of gender-responsive programming.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The kids are treated as if they are bad kids, as opposed to kids to whom bad things happen. The students have experienced unthinkable tragedy. They have seen friends and close family members shot, been victims of physical and sexual abuse, and have jumped from foster home to foster home with little stability. Instead of being provided with counseling by the school district, the students have been suspended and pushed out of school. (Klein, 2015)

The best parts about doing a study are the new realizations that come out of the evidence. Gender-responsive programming is on the cutting edge, even though it is a very slow edge. Many of the chosen facilities and organizations admitted that gender-responsiveness is on their list of innovative ideas, which they are planning to start looking at. However, facilities are busy places, and they have not all had a chance to put effort into making this happen. And as we have discussed, the numbers of girls in the facilities are low, and facility administrators perceive that there is less of an immediate urgency. The largest population of girls was in Montalvo, with 30, and the smallest was Cabrillo, with 2. With awareness, training and focus provided by facility and organization administration, there is no doubt that girls of the Central Valley will eventually get what they need. It is important to find ways to expedite fulfilling their needs. Perhaps the reader can try to imagine what it is like for girls, away from home and in trouble, stripped of relationships, isolated in a colorless cell with nothing familiar, and expected to talk about personal issues in a room full of boys, with every minute of the day controlled.

But, putting together even some of the unique aspects of facilities found in the Central Valley, it is possible to create a much more positive picture. This hypothetical county is Buena, and their facility is on Hwy 99, with an off ramp
that makes it convenient for families to get to. In addition, a bus-line stops at Buena several times per day. Families can meet their daughters in a patio area, outside, and can bring a fast food picnic. Girls will show off their most recent artwork, on the wall next to their room, and will share the latest facility newsletter, with a story about how they did in the local 5K race. They talk animatedly about the job they are training to do, installing solar panels. In only 2 months they will be out of the facility and working. The girls have been enjoying their classes in Proud Parenting, and those with children are anxious to get home to their babies so that they can become real mommies. The family is getting along so much better, now that they have gone through Strengthening Families therapy. Soon they will be scheduling their Re-integration meeting, and will be assigned a navigator that will make sure that they make it to all of their therapy appointments. They will soon be very busy working, parenting and following a wellness program to continue to battle their addiction and get healthy.

Buena is not a dream. Evidence shows that all of those components currently exist in the Central Valley. Each facility can make this happen, and some have most of the components already.

After glimpsing what can exist in the future, now the limitations of this study will be discussed, followed by concerns about the treatment of incarcerated girls that arose during the research. Last, there will be a consideration of areas for future study.

**Limitations of the Study**

As a career educator, what interested me most about support for the girls was their programming and how it could aid them, both in the facility and afterward during probation. Since I interviewed at least one administrator or program facilitator from each facility and organization, I planned to ask for a copy
of each of their programs for my analysis. I did not realize how protected these programs are. Each staff member, experiencing the training for each program, signed an affidavit promising not to give copies of the materials to anyone outside of the facility. These materials are very expensive, and the publishers do not want to have them duplicated. While program administrators could show me the materials on site, I could not have them copied for later analysis. Since there were 8 to 10 programs per county, it was not possible to analyze them on the spot. The same was true of the CBOs. I tried to contact the publishers, to see if I could get a copy of the materials for academic review purposes, but no one would return my calls or emails. So as I explained in the methods section, in most cases I had to be satisfied with using brochures, scholarly articles, and personal interviews to ascertain program content and methodology. The National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) is a searchable online database of mental health and substance abuse interventions, and I was able to use their website to access information on many of the programs, which are evaluated interventions. In addition, my 26 interviews were extensive, lasting from 1 to 3 hr each, so I was able to glean many program details in that way.

I was not able to choose my interview subjects. I started by contacting the Chief Probation Officers, and they chose designees for me. I was provided with an array of staff members, with many different titles: Deputy Probation Officer, Probation Officer, Behavioral Health Specialist, Mental Health Clinician, Program Manager, Program Facilitator, Data and Evaluation Manager, to name a few. I believe that I was fortunate, because I was able to speak with staff members who were actually running the programs with the girls. In some cases I spoke with the supervisors of the programs. Table 1 (p. 91) emphasized administration and management, and the supervisors provided me with valuable information about
policies and philosophy. While I did not get to choose the staff that I talked to, I was pleased with the choices that were made for me. My subjects were all very active in their field, extremely knowledgeable and helpful. Each of the subjects was available at the appointed time. I only had 2 out of 26 cancel appointments, and one of those re-scheduled. All of them provided me with personal contact information, in case I had questions afterwards.

**Concerns**

As I did my research, so many concerns were expressed about the limited development of gender-responsive programming. Most of my interviewees have worked with young people in excess of 15-20 years, and frustrations were obviously very high. Many administrators genuinely appreciated my taking a focused approach to evaluate programs in the Central Valley for future planning purposes, and all requested copies of the outcome. No matter how gender-responsive the programming is, there are external forces that can harm the girls. I thought it pertinent to discuss some of these concerns in chapter 5, since they are related to programming.

Some of the biggest concerns come from a lack of funding and lack of emphasis on juveniles in the state and federal systems. Several juvenile justice facilities are concerned that there is more money spent on adults. Of course, the public sees adults as more of a threat, but providing funding to juvenile justice may potentially make it so that fewer adults will end up incarcerated. There are more adults incarcerated, so it may seem like more funding. However, there is much more spent, per person, on the juveniles. But as previously stated, since the girls are fewer in numbers, they get an even smaller portion.

A Behavioral Health Therapist at Ulloa Juvenile Justice sees the medical funding as the biggest problem:
Their medical insurance will be turned off right in the middle of their treatment. ‘You have an appointment next Thursday, but oh, your medical has been cancelled.’ It is out of our control. That prevents them from getting their prescribed medication, and the help they need. We get frustrated, but we do the best we can.

Another medical billing problem has to do with group size at CBOs in the community. A group cannot be any larger than ten, or smaller than four, to be billable. It is a struggle to get four teenage girls, needing the same type of treatment, to all show up consistently, and the groups get cancelled (Program Manager at Vallejo CBO).

In addition to that funding problem, a program manager at Donner CBO says that schools do not want to refer kids for counseling because of costs. If a girl on probation seems to need therapy, they do not want to refer her because the cost might burden her family:

Often the school system says, ‘Well we do not want to make a referral and then parents are stuck with the bill. We do not want to be responsible for adding an additional burden to the family.’

The program manager explained that families are usually Medi-Cal recipients, and they will have covered benefits anyway. It is difficult trying to get the school districts to understand. We need to continue to struggle to get the word out, as we do not want to leave a child untreated.

Government regulations concerning privacy also keep innovation from happening. The Program Manager at Donner CBO explains:

OK, so now we are moving to an integrated approach where all the systems, primary care, federally qualified health centers, mental health clinics, the schools…all working together for the good of the kids. We want to have Alcohol and Drugs integrated into all of these settings. We want to be able to collaborate but we really cannot because of privacy issues. And then the feds say, ‘Well, we do not really want to modify that because, what will be the fallout? If we lessen the restrictions, will people be more reluctant to go to therapy.'
Meanwhile Donner is trying to do what is best for the girls.

Some of the drug rehabilitation policies are difficult to work with as well.

A Program Manager at Donner CBO explains that:

Most of the drug check-in with kids who are on probation, is self-report. Randomly they will check with a urine dipstick, but they most often just rely on kids to tell them what they did that week. Marijuana use is not seen as a concern by Probation. So, the girls will just admit to smoking a joint that week, and then not admit to the use of opiates or other types of drugs. But, all that gets recorded is what the girl self-reports.

The drugs are getting more and more serious. A mental health clinician at Ulloa Juvenile Facility told me about the severity of SPICE, which is a synthetic form of marijuana, and which does a lot of brain damage. SPICE is the most frequent drug problem that they see.

Inconsistency of treatment is another concern in the facilities. A Program Manager at Vallejo CBO describes it this way:

We do not have a special modality of treatment. Our substance abuse program is based upon Therapeutic Communities, but we do not have a type of therapy that we consistently follow. In other facilities, elsewhere, they adopt a particular model, so that it does not matter which therapist a girl is working with, the model is the same. Dialectical Behavioral Therapy is databased and it has been proven to work for females. (Program manager at Vallejo CBO, facilitates Therapeutic Communities and Dialectical Behavioral Therapy)

A Mental Health Therapist in Montalvo Juvenile Facility agrees, and believes that it is due to a lack of communication between non-profits and the county system. He explains it this way:

When this girl is sitting in front of me, nodding off...is that because she had a bad night’s sleep, or is she taking something that causes it? There are no meetings with the non-profits, to share information. They just govern themselves, and it really feels compartmentalized.
About working with girls in the community, the Program Facilitator at Vallejo CBO says that all of the businesses in the community need to get together and start providing internships or apprenticeships for these girls:

They have taken so many hands-on opportunities out of the schools, because of funding, and these types of vocations are the very ones that these girls might be good at. Kids are bored, and they get into trouble when they are bored. A girl who is busy going to school and working, will not get into trouble. When kids are on probation, they do not need another drug rehab program, like the one they just completed in the facility. They need to learn a trade and begin working.

Finding girls, in order to treat them, is another challenge. The Program Manager at Vallejo CBO explains it this way:

Why is it that we have 300 boys in custody, but only 20 girls? It is not that girls do not use drugs. They have many circumstances where they are protected either by an adult male who is benefiting from them, or in human trafficking, in drug sales, in many different venues. Are the courts less harsh toward girls? Are they harder to arrest? No.

This is a quandary, and yet we need to work to solve it. There are girls out in the community that are experiencing trauma, which may ultimately get them into trouble with the law.

On a related matter, when we have so few girls, is that an excuse not to treat them with programming that is effective? Some of the facilities I visited had as few as two girls in custody. Is that a reason that they should not receive gender-responsive programming? When we have a small group of underrepresented students in the public schools, do we throw out everything we know about diverse populations, and educate them the same as everyone else?

Some juvenile facilities would disagree about the intent of gender-responsive programming. One Deputy Chief Probation Officer feels that, “These are groups, and there are males and females. To make one special over the other is
not the intent. We take a curriculum and it is male, but we apply it universally. It is just the opposite of what you are asking us about.” The program manager at Bidwell organization agrees when she says, “I do not think it differs. I think girls think they have the same needs as boys.” In the same way, a mental health therapist at Montalvo Juvenile Facility says, “There’s an overwhelming similarity between boys and girls…they all bleed the same. Eighty percent of it is the exact same. But then we also think about, how can we tailor-make this program for the other 20%?” However, a mental health clinician at Vizcaino Juvenile Facility explains that “Our program is very progressive and very supportive, unlike many programs, and they want their department to be gender responsive-trauma informed. So we get a lot of support in the things we offer. It surprises me that it is not like this everywhere.”

There is a set of issues, while not new, that is becoming more important in our current socio/political climate. That is the issue of transgender inmates. During my research, I was introduced to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency which has done a recent nationwide and statewide survey to determine the gender identity of girls in the justice system. 40% self-identified as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender (LGBT) or gender non-conforming. That is almost half. When I spoke with one of the NCCD researchers on the phone, the first question she asked me about my study was, “What is a girl?” With our increased realization of the differences among our juvenile justice population, can we afford to handle these young people in a homogenous way? During my research, I began to ask facilities and organizations about this very issue, and I found that the Portola Juvenile Facility has already met this issue, and has found Life Planning Education materials, designed by a group in Massachusetts. Portola was just starting to use the materials in groups when I visited them, and is also
very progressive toward gender-responsive materials. Facilities need to keep an open mind, and be ready to serve the needs of the girls entrusted to them.

**Future Study**

There is so much more to learn about gender-responsive programming in juvenile justice. It was limiting to be able to examine only a few of the actual program materials, as it was difficult to make judgements based upon the evidence that was gathered. With enough lead-time, publishers might be willing to provide examination copies for academic purposes. Looking at each individual set of program materials would be valuable. Another important piece of the puzzle would be to interview the girls themselves to discover the ways that they make choices about where to seek help in the community. This has the potential to inform CBOs about the types of support systems they can offer to girls on probation. It also has the potential to inform grantors about a population that rarely receives grants.

Klein (2015) recently wrote an article about a homeless student who was living on the roof of a Compton, CA high school gym. When discovered, the school did not help him with his living situation, nor did they refer him to trauma counseling. They merely suspended him. This young man is merely indicative of a pervasive problem in our society. Bad things are happening to kids, and they need help. When they are abandoned or abused, and they have nowhere to go, they sometimes turn to a life of crime for survival. Klein’s article points out that several cases exist in the same school district, and they are considering a class action suit on behalf of all of the effected students.

Compton is just one school district. How many more are overlooking the trauma needs of their students? We need to examine schools for gender-responsive programming, which will address trauma and aid students by
connecting them with caring adults and services. These students, if untreated and abandoned, will potentially end up as justice involved youth. It has occurred to me many times, both during this study and in 30 years of teaching, that public schools are often not responsive and caring, to either gender. And this issue could end up costing schools money that they do not have, such as in the case of the class action lawsuit mentioned in the Klein (2015) article.

The GIPA is a fascinating lens through which to view the life of incarcerated girls. So often the living quarters are quite austere and certainly not gender-responsive. Williams (2015) recently described Windows from Prison, a photography workshop which asked offenders what they would most like to see, if they had a window to the outside. This project looked at the environment, and its impact upon hope in prison. Offenders were encouraged to describe scenes that they would most like to see again, and then the pictures were taken and placed on cell walls. After spending some time taking these desired photographs for inmates on his own, photographer Mark Strandquist finally enlisted the help of students at George Mason University and Duke Ellington High School in Washington, D.C. Now there are teens taking pictures requested by incarcerated teens, to help them to feel like a part of the world again. It would be interesting to conduct a study of the impact of environment on mental health in a locked facility. Currently facilities do not allow anything on the walls of a girl’s cell.

With the vast array of positive innovations found in the seven counties of the Central Valley, it would be interesting to discover what other counties in other states are doing. The literature review gave a sampling of past programs, but there is a need for a discussion of programming currently in use. During the study, counties and CBOs were anxious to get a copy of the results, as they said that they do not have many venues where they can share ideas with other counties.
or national newsletter needs to be created, which would include uses of programming, and unique innovations that are being piloted in particular juvenile justice facilities and CBOs.

It is intriguing that 40% of justice-involved girls are either LGBT or gender non-conforming. Only one program analyzed, Life Planning Education, currently attempts to adapt to this population (thanks to Portola Juvenile Facility for sharing this material). Creating appropriate programming for this grouping will provide unique areas for research and practice in the future.

Another area that needs to be explored is personal technology that might be used to monitor girls on probation. Most girls have cell phones, so it seems like a natural device to use. Girls need a website where they can check in and learn about community resources that can help them, much like programs used in Own Recognizance programs. There could be incentives for checking in with their parole officer on-line, which would help to keep them on track, and out of trouble for parole violations.

One other area of interest, concerning cell phones and social media, is the degree to which aggression currently exists electronically, keeping girls from actual physical violence. If arguments and bullying are taking place by text, will they eventually escalate to violent acts? Or will technology ultimately have a calming effect on our need for juvenile justice?

**Conclusion**

I was puzzled when my girls at the Boys & Girls Club first expressed the fact that when they get home they have changed, but no one else has. Having conducted this study, I am no longer puzzled. When they come home, no one at home has changed, but neither has our society. Prisons are still a major part of the economy in the Central Valley. The juvenile facilities are still filled with *bad girls*
that our neighbors think need to be locked up, and we continue to pay over $80,000 per inmate, per year, so that our citizens are safe (Legislative Analyst’s Office, 2013). I have been amazed at the reactions of people when they discover the subject of my research. Why would I try to help those girls? All I can do is smile, because during my research, I have found a few places where the sun is shining, where you can paint on the walls, and where caring individuals are trying to make conditions better for girls that all too often have had bad things happen to them. Yes, they have been involved with delinquency, but they still need programs responsive to their needs. We need to continue to build upon the changes to their facilities and their programming. Girls need to get back to the high school lunch tables where they belong.
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APPENDIX A: FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS OF PROGRAMS


I. Administration and Management of Gender Specific Programs

A. Program Structure

1. Program policies
2. Collecting data on Girls
3. Program Design
4. Assessment tools, screening instruments and intake practices
5. Outcome measurements

B. Staff Qualification

1. Hiring – Interview applicants about gender issues, interest in working with girls, and experience with gender-specific program delivery.
2. Diversity – Staff should reflect the race and ethnicity of the girls being served.
3. Training – There should be a new employee orientation on gender-specific issues, current research, books on female development, female issues and needs, unique issues for girls of color, staff boundary issues, sexuality and gender identity

II. Program Content

A. Environment

1. Physical safety
2. Emotional safety
3. Surroundings that value females
4. Addressing the whole girl with a Holistic approach

B. Relationship-based programming for girls
   1. Understanding girls need relationships
   2. Taking time for relationships
   3. Single gender programming
   4. Significant relationships with caring adults

C. Strengths-based programming for girls
   1. Teaching new skills built on existing strengths
   2. Teaching personal respect
   3. Giving Girls Control
   4. Victimization and trauma

D. Health-based programming
   1. Physical health and sexual health
   2. Emotional and mental health
   3. Alcohol, tobacco, and drug-free health
   4. Spiritual health and rites of passage
APPENDIX B: GENDER-INFORMED PRACTICES ASSESSMENT (GIPA)

This assessment was used during my walk-through of the juvenile facilities and CBOs:

Items were rated from 1-5 or NA for not applicable.

1. The facility is located at a safe site and near the communities the clients come from.
2. The facility is clean and well maintained.
3. The interior is comfortable and welcoming for clients and staff members and includes space for visits with family members and children.
4. Space (other than the clients’ rooms) and materials are available that clients can use for relaxation and other therapeutic activities (such as art, dance, music, reading, meditation, and exercise).
5. The décor includes empowering images of females, including those of females from diverse ethnic and cultural programs.
6. All services are based on gender-responsive principles, and the curriculum and materials used are gender responsive.
7. Female-only groups are used for treatment.
8. Treatment is based on a holistic model (physiological, social, emotional, spiritual, and environmental).
9. Groups are structured and use a process that facilitates connection between the women/girls.
10. A variety of therapeutic interventions are used (e.g. relational, family, expressive, cognitive, dynamic/systemic).
11. The program integrates mental health, substance abuse, and trauma services.
12. The program helps to prepare clients to be economically self-sufficient.
13. The program offers opportunities for cultural and spiritual exploration.
14. The program utilizes female role models and mentors.
15. Childcare is provided onsite or nearby.
16. Mental/emotional services that are specifically designed for females are offered onsite or by referral.
17. Medical/physical health services specifically designed for females are offered onsite or by referral.
18. Spiritual services are offered onsite or by referral.
19. Educational and vocational services are offered onsite or by referral.
20. Services for clients who are pregnant and/or parenting are offered onsite or by referral.

APPENDIX C: STAFF/ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your job title and responsibilities?
2. How long have you worked here?
3. Do you have other experiences working with young people in the juvenile justice system?
4. Have you ever worked with young men in the juvenile justice system? How is that the same/different than working with young women?
5. What types of activities are you involved in with the girls here?
6. What type of role do you have in the design and implementation of the activities here?
7. What do you see as the goal of the program?
8. What do you think is most effective about the activities/treatment here? Least?
9. I have heard people talk about what girls need. What do you think are special needs of girls? Do you think they differ from those of boys? If so, how? Does this program address these different needs?
10. Do you think some groups/types of young women are more or less difficult to work with? Are more or less amenable to rehabilitation? Are more or less appropriate for this program?
11. If you could change or improve anything about this program, what would it be?
12. Do you think this program is helping the young women here? If so, how? If not, why?
13. (For administration only) Are your programs for girls gender-responsive? If so, in what ways? How/why did your organization decide to initiate gender-responsive programs? What are their goals? How are these programs different from previous programs you offered? Do you think the new approach is more effective?
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