A Gender-Responsive Model for Serving Girls Involved in the Juvenile Justice System, Four Year Retrospective
The mission of the Girls Justice Initiative is to ensure that girls in the system receive treatment that is responsive to their needs and nurtures their strengths.
Contents

Executive Summary .................................................................................. 6
Introduction ................................................................................................ 7

The Girls’ Justice Initiative Story ............................................................... 8
Programming .............................................................................................. 12
  Detention Based Case Planning ............................................................... 12
  Detention Based Mentoring ................................................................. 15
  Training .................................................................................................. 17
  Out of Home Placement Mentoring ..................................................... 19
  California Youth Authority Ventura County ........................................... 20

Ideas about Future Growth ........................................................................ 21
  Improving Coordination of Information and Care ............................... 21
  Expanding Regional Partnerships ......................................................... 21
  Providing a Model for Gender Responsive Services ............................. 21

Appendices
Appendix 1. Timeline ............................................................................ 24
Appendix 2. Theory of Change ............................................................... 26
Appendix 3. Types of Arrests ................................................................. 27
Appendix 4. Risk Factor Scores from GJI Intake Assessment ................ 28
Appendix 5. Organizations Attending GJI Trainings ............................. 29

Tables and Graphs
Table 1. Prior Probation Contacts of Girls Admitted to Juvenile Hall ..... 7
Table 2. Race of Girls in Detention .......................................................... 12
Table 3. Age of Girls in Detention ........................................................... 12
Table 4. Residence of Girls in Detention .................................................. 12
Table 5. Percent of Participants Who Improved Knowledge as Demonstrated by Pre-Post Tests of Selected GJI Trainings ............................. 17
Table 6. Participant Ratings of GJI Trainings 2004-2006 ....................... 18
Table 7. GJI Girls Placed Out-of-Home who Returned, 2003-2006 ..... 19
Table 8. Types of Arrests of GJI Clients, by Year .................................. 27
Table 9. Risk Scores by Factor from all Girls’ Initial GJI Assessments, and from Girls who Returned Within the Calendar Year, by Year ................. 28
Chart 1. Arrest Types for All GJI Clients 2003-2006 ............................. 13
Chart 2. All Girls Risk Factor Scores ...................................................... 14
Chart 3. Risk Factor Scores for Girls who Returned .............................. 14
On behalf of the Girls Justice Initiative, we would like to thank a few of the many staff, partners, supporters, funders, volunteers and amazing young people who have helped GJI get to where we are today.

To our amazing staff, it is an honor to work with a team of dedicated, hard working individuals who have the passion and compassion to come to work every day and face the challenges and difficulties of this work. You are an asset to the lives of youth, the community and our organization and we thank you for work.

To our partners, we have worked with many wonderful people over the last five years and appreciate all of the assistance and support we have received from community based organization staff, government partners, system players and others invested in improving the world for juvenile justice involved youth. In particular we would like to thank Raquel White of the Department of Public Health, and the committed staff members of both SAGE and CYWD for their work with girls in custody and desire to always work together as a team with us to improve services for girls.

To our funders, your financial support has allowed us to focus on the day to day work of reforming the juvenile justice system and improving the outcomes for young people.

In particular, we would like to thank United Way of the Bay Area, the Zellerbach Family Foundation, the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice and the Women’s Foundation of California for there long term financial commitment and belief in our work.

To our many volunteers over the last five years, we could not reach the hundreds of youth we serve each year without your time, energy and passion. You have provided an invaluable service as positive role models to many youth in need of understanding and acceptance. We are confident that you will go on to be assets to the greater field of youth services and we are proud to have had you as part of our family.

And finally, to the many young women we have had the honor of working with for the past five years. Thank you for trusting us to represent you and share in your lives when you were most vulnerable. Your strength and resilience inspires us to do everything we can to continuing creating opportunities for young people to reach their full potential in life and be free of violence, incarceration and oppression.

Sincerely,

Gena Castro Rodriguez and Julie Posadas Guzman
Co Founders and Directors of GJI
The Girls Justice Initiative (GJI) was started in 2002 to provide quality rehabilitation services for young women involved in the juvenile justice system. Over the last four years, a comprehensive model has emerged that has proven to achieve positive outcomes for girls, improve the system serving girls and become of interest to counties outside of San Francisco for replication.

Notably, 40% of girls detained in the Youth Guidance Center in 2005 were in custody for over two weeks, with 14% being detained for more than one month. Of youth on probation who returned to detention, 74.2% had more than one prior probation referral. In 2005, 89.7% of girls arrested for prostitution-related offenses in San Francisco were out-of-county residents. From 1999-2005, there has been a 19.5% increase in out-of-home placement commitments for youth on probation. In 2005, there was a 10.5% increase from the previous year.

The Girls Justice Initiative works with a subset of girls who have been detained in the San Francisco Youth Guidance Center. One goal of GJI’s work is to decrease girls’ recidivism rates, and over the years they have recognized that girls who are most likely to return to detention are those who are out-of-county residents or who are sent to group homes as a condition of their probation.

GJI is working to change the juvenile justice system’s response to girls by developing and implementing policies and procedures to better assess girls detained in juvenile hall, provide detention based services that stabilize and begin the healing process for girls, make direct referrals to comprehensive culturally based services in their own community when they leave detention, and track girls’ progress to keep them from returning to the system. A main strength of GJI is its ability utilize and build on existing resources in the community, while developing models, curriculum and best practices that can be applied to all girls’ services in San Francisco and other Bay Area counties.

Each year GJI provides comprehensive gender responsive intake and assessment for almost every girl in San Francisco’s juvenile hall, detention based case planning, detention based and educational mentoring, individual, group and family therapy, detention based educational groups and other supportive services for more than 300 girls and their families. GJI also provides monthly trainings for community programs, juvenile probation officers and other agencies working directly with youth in the juvenile justice system to increase their competency in working with this complex population. Over the last four years GJI has contributed to collectively reducing detention rates of young women in San Francisco by 25%.

After starting up in 2002-03 with $125,000 from the United Way Bay Area, programming began in July, 2003. In each year, GJI has substantively added to its operating budget and program offerings. For the 2005-2006 programming year, GJI’s budget was $575,000.

Findings described in this report include: by using GJI’s intake and assessment the needs of girls are more accurately identified and their strengths are used in determining their case plan, trainings have consistently been well received and increased staff competency, the Inside Mentoring Program ensures that young people in detention and group homes are stabilized and linked with consistent, positive and caring adults, and that GJI’s work with the California Youth Authority (CYA) girls shows they were doing better at CYA and not getting time added for fighting or acting out and decreasing recidivism. Based on these results, GJI continues to field requests to describe their model for other counties interested in similar reforms.

Future directions for GJI include; develop multi-system protocols and networks between jurisdictions where girls reside and where they are arrested, create strong regional partnerships with local counties to improve and expand quality services for girls in the juvenile justice system, and expand technical assistance to partner counties on how they can create gender-responsive programs that can improve the outcomes for girls on probation.
Introduction

Since its inception in 2002, The Girls Justice Initiative (GJI) has provided quality rehabilitation services for young women involved in the juvenile justice system - providing them and their families with supportive services to make long term positive changes in their lives - in order to decrease victimization and recidivism rates of girls. GJI’s strategy for success involves working closely with young women and their families and actively partnering with all juvenile justice agencies including: juvenile probation, social workers, CASA, police, public defenders, district attorneys, juvenile court judges, and community programs to develop coordinated and comprehensive rehabilitation plans.

Nationally, girls are the fastest growing segment of the juvenile justice system. Over the last ten years, San Francisco has experienced a significant increase in the proportion of young women arrested and detained for drug sales and prostitution-related offenses.

GJI is working to change the juvenile justice system’s response to girls by developing and implementing policies and procedures to: better assess girls detained in juvenile hall, provide detention based services that stabilize and begin the healing process for girls, make direct referrals to comprehensive culturally based services in their own community when they leave detention or return home, and track and follow up with girls’ progress to keep them from returning to the system. A main strength of GJI is its ability utilize and build on the existing resources in the community, while developing models, curriculum and best practices that can be applied to all girls’ services in San Francisco and other Bay Area counties.

Each year GJI provides a comprehensive, gender responsive intake and assessment for almost every girl in San Francisco’s juvenile hall, detention based case planning, detention based and educational mentoring, individual, group and family therapy, detention based educational groups and other supportive services for more than 300 girls and their families. GJI also provides monthly trainings for community programs, juvenile probation officers and other agencies working directly with youth in the juvenile justice system to create their competency in working with this complex population. Over the last four years GJI has contributed to collectively reducing detention rates of young women in San Francisco by 25%.

Table 1. Prior Probation Contacts of Girls Admitted to Juvenile Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Girls Admitted</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls with Prior Probation Contact* (n,%)</td>
<td>385 (64%)</td>
<td>330 (67%)</td>
<td>286 (64%)</td>
<td>281 (70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In all years, from 1 to between 15-19 prior contacts, with the majority under 5 contacts, though a significant minority with more.
The formation of the Girls Justice Initiative came as the result of a passionate group of colleagues’ on-going, conversations about how they would like to see the juvenile justice system change. Though they didn't name it as such, this group was serving as a “learning community” engaging in dialogue that was based on shared self-interests and resulted in generating creative solutions to fixing a serious problem. Based on a series of interviews, group discussions and a review of documents, the following narrative chronicles the development of GJI from its founding period to the present.

Starting GJI 2002

“Julie and I and [other colleagues] were meeting once a week and talking about why we thought the number of girls were increasing in the system and what we should do.” Gena Castro Rodriguez

One of the fundamental shared observations of the group was that while most of the staff they worked with came into the field highly motivated, most needed additional training and skills to deal with the complex issues facing the girls in the system.

In addition to improving gender responsive services, the group agreed that when the probation department and community based organizations were working well together, girls had a much better chance of making improvements in their lives. Unfortunately, this kind of collaboration was sporadic.

“I saw from the District Attorney’s Office that by linking youth up with the right programs and the right people coming from the outside while the girls were in detention that you could change their behavior and improve outcomes.” Julie Posadas Guzman

Gena and Julie started to develop a concept for an initiative that would focus on the gaps their group had identified, training for community based partners working with girls, more collaboration between the probation department and community based organizations, a data tracking system for needs, strengths and outcomes of clients, and expanding programs with a girls specific focus. They would call their initiative, The Girls Justice Initiative.

The Opportunity

Independent of Gena and Julie's practitioners’ learning community, the United Way of the Bay Area (UWBA) became interested in the issue after hearing several presentations about the status of girls, including a hearing by the Commission on the Status of Women, and a convening by University of California Santa Cruz. As a result of these hearings UWBA and its Safe Communities issue cabinet committed to incubating GJI and investing $125,000 to support its launch.

The First Year: Bringing in the Players

The partnership that was created by Julie and Gena was critical because it communicated a new kind of collaboration to others in the field. Gena's background included work with community based organizations in both the dependency and delinquency system. Julie’s background was in law and work within the District Attorney's victim witness program and girls’ services with the Juvenile Probation department. Their combined existing relationships from the two fields eased the first step of establishing memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the probation department and several community based organizations to state their willingness to participate in the initiative. Fourteen community based agencies working with girls in the community signed on to be GJI partners. That partnership has evolved and changed over the subsequent years, but GJI still works with many of those agencies on a regular basis.

After building the collaboration of partners and developing an MOU with key stakeholders, GJI published the report, *Girls on the Edge: An overview of Girls in the Juvenile Justice System*. The goal of this report was to discuss pathways, risk factors, challenges and strengths of girls in the juvenile justice system, give a snap shot of the population of girls in the San Francisco Juvenile Hall and layout their model for change.

GJI also began providing monthly free trainings to partners within months of start-up. Training was provided for GJI staff and their community based partners. Topics in the first year of training included gender responsive models, case management, sexually exploited girls, harm reduction and substance abuse, overview of the juvenile justice
system, female adolescent development and mandated reporting.

GJI used research, best practices and other successful models from throughout the country to develop its own gender responsive intake and assessment tools for girls in detention. The goal of the assessment was to determine each girl’s strengths and needs, develop a case plan for her, and make appropriate referrals to community based resources.

In addition to maximizing existing relationships, GJI sought to build on existing resources and avoid duplication of effort.

“In our first year we used staff from a partner organization to start testing our new intake and assessment tool (we didn’t have to have staff that year), and we partnered with an existing detention based mentoring program created under Julie, so we had new programs running in detention right away.” Gena Castro Rodriguez

Milestones, a program providing detention based case management services under the supervision of Julie, worked closely with GJI to implement GJI’s case management model, test its gender responsive intake and assessment tool and help with the development of the first collaborative case planning meetings for girls in detention.

GJI established a weekly case planning meeting still used today that was attended by the Center for Young Women’s Development (CYWD), Standing Against Global Exploitation (SAGE), detention staff, Department of Public Health Special Programs for Youth (SPY), and Public Defenders Department. This meeting helps to insure that each girl in detention receives the services she needs, that any critical needs are being addressed, and that she has access to resources when she leaves custody. This group developed a strong collaborative relationship and was able to cut down on duplication of services and girls falling through the gap.

The Second Year: The Need to Adapt

As could be expected, as early as the second year of implementation, external pressures caused the initiative to learn how to adapt their model.

In 2003, the detention based case management program run by Milestones was ending. Recognizing the crucial need for this service, GJI wrote a grant to continue the program under GJI, hired the two staff people from the original program and began using the program as the primary vehicle for testing the new strengths and needs based assessment and approach to services.

The Inside Mentoring Program, a detention based mentoring program developed under Julie for girls and boys in detention in 1999, came under GJI in 2003 as it needed a permanent home and the support of the other programs of GJI and the girls unit of the probation department. The mentoring program was started when Julie noticed many girls in custody did not receive visits during visiting hour and had little support while navigating the system. Julie recruited college interns to be screened and trained to work with first girls, then boys too, who were in need of healthy, caring adults who could help support and guide them in their detention and probation involvement.

Also in 2003, GJI began their work with girls incarcerated at the California Youth Authority facility for girls in Ventura County. GJI was initially invited to work with girls referred there from San Francisco, but because the need for support and resources was so great, it eventually evolved into a monthly group for girls from the greater Bay Area serving time in the facility. Along with their partner CYWD, GJI drove to Ventura each month to work one on one and in groups with girls on goal setting, decision making, anger management and transition plans for returning home.

Year Three: A New Model

Capacity building was, and continues to be, a tremendous need. The training GJI offers is a component of the original GJI model that has also expanded significantly. In year three one funder of many of the community based organizations with which GJI partners - the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice - required all its grantees to attend GJI’s trainings. The trainings were recognized as being of such high quality that GJI was asked to offer their
series for staff who worked with both boys and girls. The trainings also took a mental health focus during that year and many were facilitated by GJI's clinical supervisor, Dr. Venita Lue. Topics of trainings included adolescent development, psychotropic medication and diagnosis for adolescents, cultural competency, working with immigrant youth and adolescent development.

GJI initially conceived of itself as a broker and monitor of community based services, however they came to take on service delivery as an element of their model. In year three, GJI began serving 300 girls annually through a comprehensive strengths and needs assessment, detention based services, and educational and therapeutic groups in both San Francisco Juvenile hall and at the California Youth Authority in Ventura.

GJI developed its therapeutic programs by offering individual, family and group therapy for girls both at GJI and CYWD. They also began offering a therapeutic support group for girls leaving detention and transitioning to community based programs. GJI's clinical supervisor worked with case planners and therapy staff to provide mental health services within the organization. GJI found that girls were more likely to access mental health services when those services were provided in an environment that met them where they were and understood their unique experiences and challenges.

GJI also facilitated a six month group for pregnant and parenting girls who had been involved in the juvenile justice system. This program was a great vehicle for building support and resources for the group of girls that were very vulnerable for returning to the juvenile system, advancing into the adult system and becoming involved in the dependency system with their own children.

Since the onset the initiative, GJI had been working to develop a database system that would reflect the services provided and all the girls they serve, including initial assessment scores, services girls received and any results. The intent of the database was to better understand the needs, strengths and outcomes of girls. While the start-up of this project was delayed several times, currently data captured ranges from demographic data of the girls served by GJI, reasons for arrest, history of victimization, family histories, education status, where girls are placed upon release, and average risk scores.

“It’s still the same goal - our biggest push is for a documented system, something that can be relied upon – for making decisions for youth in detention.” – Julie Posadas Guzman

The data tracking also extends to the evaluation of GJI's trainings, and is beginning to show that the effectiveness and competencies of staff working with youth throughout the juvenile justice system (both from within and outside) is clearly improving. The ability to objectively track this type of results is one of the most obvious accomplishments of the Girls Justice Initiative over the last four years.

Reflecting on Accomplishments

“We’ve raised the issue publicly – girls have individual and distinct needs – and we’ve sent this message to judges, probation officers, public defenders, community based organizations and it’s a recognized issue now, people are getting it.” – Gena Castro Rodriguez

“We’ve developed a model for supporting girls run by women. We have shown people that business can be managed differently. We are a co-directorship model based on communication not competition. We value our relationships with one another and we have each other’s backs. We know how to support each other and ask for help, as well as step up when needed. We are an example for the girls we work with.” – Julie Posadas Guzman

Over the last four years, starting, maintaining and expanding the Girls Justice Initiative has been both exhilarating and disappointing in turns. Some aspects of the GJI model assisted its success and some aspects, while surely worthwhile, are more challenging.

“Constantly we focus on the client. We try to not let it be about us, or about competition, or raising money. We ask ourselves, ‘How does this help the girls?’ regarding every decision we make. We are selective with the money that we take. We are able to say ’no this isn’t our focus, let’s not go there’.” – Gena Castro Rodriguez

“Over time we realized we needed coordinated policies and procedures for our staff to follow. We
always have communicated with all parties, people respect that we are consistent, and communicate our policies.” Julie Posadas Guzman

Having at least a couple of “easy sells” - services that were clearly beneficial to multiple parties - helped GJI take on the more ingrained, difficult, system-change work that was also required. For example, the training program is GJI’s gift to the field. It is free and relevant and something not offered anywhere else. In addition to building individuals’ skills, it allows for community building and professional renewal. Detention based mentoring is another area for which there is no shortage of need and it is a service that both funders and partners understand and support.

The case planning model in which GJI staff, community based organizations and probation officers are all communicating continues to be a challenge.

“What do you see when you look at me? I really want to know what you see. Do you see a girl who is locked up for naught? Or do you see someone who can be anything she wants to be? What you look at me, do you see beyond the purple and khaki? Can you look at me and tell that I’m not happy?

No. So how can you tell in a bad person just by looking at me? When it’s only the surface that you can see you may think that I’m a bad person that aint me. But of course you’ll never know that. Because you can’t see what I see.
Programming

After starting up in 2002-03 with $125,000 from the United Way Bay Area, programming began in July, 2003. In each year, GJI has substantively added to its operating budget and program offerings. Each is described in detail below.

July 2003 to June 2004 | Budget $330,000
- 228 youth served in Detention Based Case Management
- 100 youth served in Detention Based Mentoring
- 10 Trainings (Average attendance per training: 18)

July 2004 to June 2005 | Budget $469,000
- 246 youth served in Detention Based Case Management
- 131 youth served in Detention Based Mentoring
- 8 Trainings (Average attendance per training: 18)
- 76 youth served through After Care Case Management
- 12 youth served through Out-of-Home Placement Mentoring

July 2005 to June 2006 | Budget $575,000
- 245 youth served in Detention Based Case Management
- 119 youth served in Detention Based Mentoring
- 13 Trainings (Average attendance per training: 30)
- 47 youth served through After Care Case Management
- 19 youth served through Out-of-Home Placement Mentoring
- 8 youth served through Therapeutic Groups
- 19 youth served in California Youth Authority

Detention Based Case Planning: The Demographics

At any given time, averages of 15-25 girls are incarcerated in San Francisco's Youth Guidance Center. A large percentage of girls in detention are there for drug sales, prostitution, and probation violations. The majority of these young women are African American and at least 30% of the population comes from counties other than San Francisco. The average age of this population ranges between 15-18 years old. Based on GJI assessments, it is also estimated that 90% of the girls in detention have significant histories of physical and sexual abuse that are linked to their delinquency.

Table 2. Race of Girls in Detention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Other*</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subcategories represent less than 10% each

Table 3. Age of Girls in Detention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 and Under</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Residence of Girls in Detention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>20.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Addition</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>24.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All other neighborhoods or cities represent less than 15%

The San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) produces annual reports documenting demographics and other relevant statistics regarding the overall youth population in detention. In their 2005 report, they produced a special profile on girls. Notably, 40% of girls detained in the Youth Guidance Center (YGC) in 2005 were in custody for over two weeks, with 14% being detained for more than one month. Of youth on probation who returned to detention, 74% had more than one prior probation referral. In 2005, 90% of girls arrested for prostitution-related offenses in San Francisco were out-of-county residents. From 1999-2005, there has been a 20% increase in out-of-home placement commitments for youth on probation. In 2005, there was an 11% increase from the previous year.
The Girls Justice Initiative works with a subset of girls who have been detained in San Francisco juvenile hall. Since the goal of GJI is to decrease girls’ recidivism rates, over the years they have recognized that girls who are most likely to return to detention are those who are out-of-county residents or who are sent to group homes as a condition of their probation. It is a standard policy of the juvenile court to return non-residents of San Francisco to their counties of origin. GJI has therefore made a concerted effort to identify and connect girls with appropriate services in their home counties. The general finding is that statewide there is a dearth of gender-responsive programs for girls involved with the juvenile justice system, a gap that is important in understanding why many of these young women will later return to San Francisco.

JPD statistics show that 26% of all girls detained in San Francisco are out-of-county residents with the majority residing in Alameda County (Oakland and San Leandro). In response to this, GJI has actively established partnerships with the Alameda County Probation Department, the District Attorney’s Office and Oakland-based non-profits to directly refer girls to appropriate services and supports. For the past two years GJI has provided monthly education workshops to girls in Alameda county juvenile hall and has recently opened an Oakland office to increase its services to this county.

Since a large majority of girls in detention are released to out-of-home placement, GJI has worked hard to understand and address the needs of these young women. Many of them have been in the foster care system and have mental health histories that make it hard for probation to refer them to otherwise appropriate placements. The majority of these girls will be detained for over three months, so GJI provides them with mentors so they will be assured ongoing visits during their detention. Once a girl is sent to out-of-home placement, case planners stay in continued contact with the young women and send them incentives (books, gift cards, etc.) to encourage them to stay at the placement. If the young woman completes placement and returns home, GJI will continue working with her to provide service referrals and support to help her successfully complete probation. If the young woman runs from placement and returns to juvenile hall, case planners will meet with her to assess what went wrong and then advocate for changes to her disposition plan so she can be more successful in completing it.

As is seen in the chart above, probation violations had been the most common arrest type for girls seen by GJI from 2003–2005. However, from 2005–2006 the number of probation violations dropped significantly. Arrests for violent crimes against persons, on the other hand, have increased sharply in 2005–2006 and are currently the most common reason for being arrested within the GJI client population. Prostitution, though not as common, has increased along a similar trajectory during the past year (both have increased about 20%) from 2005–2006.

GJI’s goal for detention-based case planning is that at least 200 girls who are detained and are returning home will receive gender responsive intake, assessment and case plan with referrals to GJI partner community based agencies. Upon entering

5. San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, Annual Report 2005
7. San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, Annual Report 2005, p. x1
10. San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, Annual Report 2005, p. 91
juvenile hall, girls are assessed by a GJI case planner along 13 categories; family relationships, emotional stability/mental health, basic needs, substance abuse, life skills, history of abuse/neglect, physical safety, peer relationships, school/employment status, social supports, motherhood, health, and additional risks. These categories come from a risk assessment tool endorsed by the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention that was created for use in Cooke County, Illinois. GJI adapted and expanded the tool to create GJI’s current Risk, Strength and Need Assessment. Within most categories, girls can receive a score of between 1 and 5. (Although in some areas, the highest score one could receive is a 4). Category scores from each area are tallied for a total risk score. The total risk score could be anywhere from 0, meaning no risk at all, to 58, which is the highest possible score across all 13 categories.

“The goal of our strengths and needs assessment is to identify underlying needs and strengths of each girl in detention that should be addressed in her rehabilitation plan. The approach is different because plans are designed to address why they have committed the crime rather than just punishment for the crime. There are usually reasons the young person is acting out, and when the right questions aren’t asked, we see higher recidivism.”

Gena Castro Rodriguez

All GJI clients leave the juvenile justice system with an individual case plan designed to maximize their strengths, address their needs and support them in transitioning out of the juvenile justice system for good. Having these resources and services will enable this population of girls to make positive changes in their lives and decrease further involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Average scores for all girls GJI serves and specifically those that come back through the system (and are clients again of GJI) are displayed in the following graphs. We note from their assessments that:

- Family, peers and substance abuse are risk factors that are highest for most of the girls in the system, whether in detention for the first time, or having returned.
- Though mental health and abuse are specific and important risk factors for girls in the system, in general, motherhood, health and safety are relatively less important risk factors in the girls' lives.
- Overall risk scores remain the same for girls who return to the system/program. However, we are unable to know how, or if, risk factors decline overall or in specific areas for girls who stay out of the system.

Chart 2. All Girls’ Risk Factor Scores

Chart 3. Risk Factor Scores for Girls who Returned
The graphs above show categories with the highest risk scores at the bottom and categories with the lowest risk scores at the top. (The wider the bar, the more girls in the system that year experienced high risk scores in this category.) Though this data can’t tell us how risk factors might have changed for those girls who didn’t return to the system, we do see clearly that peers, family and substance abuse are the most often experienced risk factors for girls GJI sees when they first enter the system, and are still important factors for those who come back.

As early as their second year, GJI had assessed the most common risk scores and declines in risk scores in a sample of 10 girls who had returned to the system at least once. As they confirmed later with the larger database, in this small group GJI found that family relationships were a persistent risk factor. GJI’s Progress Report Year Two/Period August 2003 – December 2004, further noted that, “...San Francisco’s courts and juvenile rehabilitation system lack mechanisms to involve a girl's family in her rehabilitation plan.”

In order to address these specific risks, GJI provides tailored services. Cognitive-behavioral approaches have long been recognized as a best practice in working with youth in the juvenile justice system. Members of GJI’s staff are either cognitive behavioral therapists or have been professionally trained to facilitate gender-appropriate and competency-based curriculum for GJI clients. As a component of their gender-responsive model, GJI offers cognitive behavioral curriculum to girls detained in juvenile hall. Along with learning emotional literacy skills, classes are designed to increase competencies related to healthy decision making, money management, job readiness, and other self-sufficiency skills. GJI uses a curriculum that is evidenced-based and that has been nationally recognized for its effectiveness in working with girls in the juvenile justice system.

However, there are still not enough supports available to address all the complex needs of GJI clients, despite the services provided by GJI and other community-based organizations. For example, San Francisco has only one identified provider for substance abuse services while a clear demand for more services exists. Also, since many of the girls have histories of involvement in the dependency system or their families are a direct cause of their delinquency, getting families involved in their daughter’s stabilization and recovery continues to be a challenge.

**Detention Based Mentoring**

GJI’s strategy with detention based mentoring is to work with culturally appropriate college students, who are also learning about and want to work in this field, and match them with youth in detention. That mentors are students provides the youth in detention with a different role model - a lot of youth in the system never interact with young adults who are in college. This program gives them different schema for what they could do with their life.

The goal for detention based mentoring is that 100 youth receive detention based mentoring in which they are matched with a mentor in order to decrease the amount of time they are kept in their room alone, provide stabilization and support while detained and improve mental health status for youth who otherwise would not get any visits.

> “When I first started working with young people in detention, the most common thing they said when asked what they want to do when they grow up was ‘I want to be a PO or a guard’. Now they are saying, ‘I want to be an advocate’ or ‘I want to go to college’ ”. Julie Posadas Guzman

For their Inside Mentoring Program, GJI actively recruits culturally appropriate mentors from local community colleges and universities. Most mentors are under the age of 25, and are majoring in psychology, ethnic studies and criminal justice. Since all GJI mentors have expressed an interest in working in this field, the program provides them with hands on experience and training to be caring and competent professionals when they graduate.

The effect of this component of the GJI program can be heard vividly through the words of GJI mentees spending time in detention. In response to a post-program questionnaire question, “What was one thing your mentor taught you?” three primary themes emerge: 1) how youth deal with anger, 2) the importance of education to them, and 3) their self esteem.

My mentor taught me....

Dealing with Anger
- “How to calm myself down in situations when I feel aggravated or depressed”
- “How not to bite at what everybody does or says”
- “That I don’t have to always fight physically with everybody”
- “How to handle my anger”

Importance of Education
- “That college is hard but worth it”
- “How college is good and you get paid just to go”
- “To at least want to go to school and get my education”
- “Education is important. I actually want to be like her because she is really serious with school and I like that”

Self-Esteem
- “Not to put myself down and never give up”
- “She taught me to have patience and faith in myself”
- “Inspiration and really get to know myself a lot more. And that there is hope!”
- “How to be able to know what I do and accept what I do as a person and be able to love myself more every day”
- “That life is not easy and if you put your mind to it you can be somebody more than locked up”

When asked what the benefits of the program were to the mentees, the four relevant themes that emerged were; 1) having someone to talk to, 2) relieving stress, and 3) coping with loneliness.

Having Someone to Talk to
- “Yes because I had someone to talk about my problems”
- “It helped me by expressing the problems that I have and have someone to talk to me about it”

Relieving Stress
- “It helped me let out many feelings that I was bottling up”
- “Because when we would talk it took some of the stress away”
- “It helped me get the things that I don’t talk about off my chest”

Coping with Loneliness
- “It helped because nobody came to see me”
- “It felt good getting a visit”

The mentorship program is designed not only to benefit the youth in detention but to contribute to a field of professionals dedicated to juvenile justice. Mentors were also asked to reflect and write about their experiences with the program. When asked what they felt were the highlights, many stated that simply seeing their mentee smile or laugh or being there to listen made it a worthwhile experience. However, many mentors also wrote about their observations of a young person beginning to make a transformation. Here are some of their thoughts:
- “Seeing the kids realize and understand that what they did was wrong, noticing a change in their decision-making process”
- “When she started to open up and ask me questions about school”
- “My kid opening up her heart to me and changing her attitude”
- “Helping the mentee realize their obstacles and them figuring out an action plan to overcome them”
- “The best part was interacting with a youth and finally seeing her be released”

A significant number of mentors also stated in their questionnaires that the experience was beneficial to their career development.
- “I got a lot more interested in making my career juvenile justice oriented”
- “It allowed me to put someone else’s needs before my own, gain experience in the field of juvenile justice and insight in working with youth”
- “It gave me a chance to get know the juvenile justice system in SF and learn how to counsel youth”
- “It gave me experience before hand to see if this is the career path I really would like to go down”
- “Another foot in the door, one step closer to achieving one of my goals in life which is to be a counselor at YGC”
- “It gave me a little experience with youth to learn where these girls come from and why they are being locked up”

As one of GJI’s first programs in detention, the Inside Mentoring Program complements all of GJI’s services by ensuring that young people in detention and group homes are linked with consistent, positive and caring adults. Since many of the GJI mentors have similar backgrounds to youth in the system, they make excellent role models for their mentees; providing relevant information about college and careers, positive reinforcement for youth to make healthy decisions, and necessary emotional support for youth
at time when it is most needed. GJI believes their commitment to providing culturally and linguistically appropriate mentors has not only benefited the youth in detention, but will also improve the quality of future professionals in the field of juvenile justice.

**Trainings**

“So many non-profit programs are funded to work with youth, but most of their expertise is at a prevention level and they didn’t have the experience or competencies necessary to successfully work with youth already in the system. There weren’t a lot of training opportunities for this field that were specific – we made it free because people were working with limited budgets.” Julie Posadas Guzman

GJI trainings are attended by individuals representing a range of agencies, youth-centered community organizations, advocates and social services; from executive directors and program administrators to case managers, trainers, youth mentors, counselors, attorneys and consultants. The trainings address narrow-focus issues that affect youth in the system and are designed to benefit those working to support them. GJI’s goal is that training program participants will demonstrate improved skills and, as a result, provide increased gender responsive services for girls and general competency in their respective programs. For knowledge and skill trainings that have been formally evaluated using pre- and post-tests of participants’ areas of improvement on specific topics, a majority showed significant improvement (see Table 5. below).

Annually, GJI strives to provide topically relevant trainings specifically in the areas of health, mental health, counseling, youth development and juvenile justice system advocacy, in which staff members from a minimum of 20 community based organizations will participate (see Appendix 5 for organizational participants).

GJI trainings have been followed by an evaluative survey that asked participants to rate in a scale of 1-5 their perceived impact of the course itself, as well as the effectiveness of the materials and the instructors. The following course ratings are a cumulative rating that includes the percentage of training participants that either agreed or strongly agreed (ratings 4 and 5) with positive statements in all categories (impact, materials, course, instructors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>% Who did Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Reporting and Reporting Abuse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Burnout to Balance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Immigrant Youth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Juvenile Justice System #1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Juvenile Justice System #2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse and Addiction</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of the scores for training were either in the 80th or 90th percentile. This highly positive feedback on GJI trainings has remained consistent throughout the four years the program has been operating. Some of the highest rated courses include Overview of the Juvenile Justice System in 2006 which received a positive rating of 97%, Counseling Youth and Working with Bi-Racial and Multi-Racial Youth and Their Families, both offered in 2005, received 94% favorable ratings.

Director, Gena Castro Rodriguez, leading a training for community members.
### Table 6. Participant Ratings of GJI Trainings 2004-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Positive Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Burnout</td>
<td>8/19/2004</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Centered Counseling</td>
<td>9/23/2004</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Providers/Female Clients: Building Health Relationships</td>
<td>11/17/2004</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Case Management</td>
<td>1/20/2005</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Psychotropic Medications for Adolescents</td>
<td>2/17/2005</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Youth</td>
<td>3/3/2005</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>5/18/2005</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Bi-racial/Multi-racial Youth and Families</td>
<td>6/30/2005</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for Youth</td>
<td>8/25/2005</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated Reporting/Reporting Abuse</td>
<td>9/29/2005</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>10/26/2005</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse/Sexual Predators</td>
<td>11/17/2005</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Burnout to Balance</td>
<td>1/26/2006</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Development</td>
<td>2/26/2006</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Immigrant Youth</td>
<td>3/9/2006</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Juvenile Justice System #1</td>
<td>3/30/2006</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Juvenile Justice System #2</td>
<td>4/12/2006</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse and Addiction</td>
<td>4/27/2006</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

It's not funny that we get the way we do. It's not fun to go through what we have to. It's not funny that we think we try and tell its all fun and games till we end up in the bell. We should be trying to help ourself but instead we're fighting and killing our children. It's not funny that we're shooting each other selling drugs. Come on - y'all, where's the love?

Everybody just tries to be thugs to prove something to a bunch of people who ain't worried about what you do. Why are you running off at what somebody thinks of you? Don't worry about nobody else just do what you do cause in the long run, ain't nobody worried about you.
Some highlighted comments from participants in trainings include:

- “The training was excellent and I could really use this in my field” - Client Centered Counseling, September 23, 2004
- “The presenter and the content were excellent. She had great knowledge and was effective in making her points. The handouts and structure were very helpful” - Intensive Case Management, January 20, 2005
- “The most effective part was the facts presented on sexual abuse and the discussions followed among our group. The instructor was very clear and precise, she used great examples which helped me understand the material” - Sexual Abuse/Sexual Predators, November 17, 2005
- “I like the group settings and being able to listen to the other experts in the room, to receive their guidance and knowledge. I like the discussion about giving youth medication” - Adolescent Development, February 26, 2006
- “The whole presentation was very effective and helpful, especially the part on the juvenile codes and the part explaining juvenile and adult charges. Helped me understand” - Overview of the Juvenile Justice System #1, March 30, 2006

Out-of-Home Placement Mentoring

After GJI’s detention-based mentoring program was successfully implemented in all units of juvenile hall, GJI recognized the need to provide extended mentoring for detained youth who were being sent to out-of-home placement. In 2004, GJI expanded its program to allow youth in group homes to be matched with mentors who would write to them on a consistent basis and encourage them to stay at their placement. Both probation officers and defense attorneys have commented on how pleased they are to have this additional support service for their clients. GJI has also found that girls were more likely to stay at their placement for longer period of time as a result of having either a GJI mentor or case planner stay in contact with them.

As stated previously, a large number of girls in the San Francisco juvenile justice system are at risk or involved in out-of-home placement. Though girls who ran from group homes initially made up the largest number of GJI clients, recently there has been a dramatic decline in girls returning to detention for placement failures.

Table 7. GJI Girls Placed Out-of-Home who Returned, 2003-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Girls placed out-of-home</th>
<th>Percent who Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GJI’s findings of the increase in girls being committed to out-of-home placements is consistent with the findings of the Juvenile Probation Department “...there has been a 19.5% increase in out-of-home placement commitments for youth on probation from 1999-2005 and in 2005, there was a 10.5% increase from the previous year.”

One reason for the decline in recidivism from placements may be that JPD has made a continued commitment to placing youth in appropriate group homes. Another reason may be that many of the young women who have chronically failed out-of-home placement have been sent out of state to a Colorado program which lasts from one to three years, and often sees girls to their eighteenth birthdays. Though many of the girls are able to stabilize in this program and receive their high school diplomas, their stability upon return to San Francisco is often unknown because they have aged out of the juvenile justice system.
GJI remains committed to providing stabilization services for girls in out-of-home placement and recently began a weekly therapeutic group for girls at a local group home. GJI will continue to advocate for better aftercare services for young women in the Bay Area.

**CYA Groups**

In 2003, GJI saw a trend of girls being sent to the California Youth Authority. After being invited by CYA to provide groups for girls, GJI committed to provide monthly support groups and ongoing stabilization services for Bay Area girls from San Francisco, Alameda, and Contra Costa counties who were incarcerated in the Ventura facility.

Most of these young women had spent a greater part of their adolescence in the foster care and juvenile justice systems. The majority of the girls also had victimization and exploitation histories that remained unaddressed. Many had substance abuse and mental health issues as a result of their life experiences. Some were young mothers who were pregnant while incarcerated and had not seen their children for years. Since the Ventura facility was over 600 miles from Northern California, all of the young women in GJI’s support groups said they did not receive regular family visits and felt extremely disconnected from their communities.

In partnership with the Center for Young Women’s Development, GJI began providing therapeutic support groups which give the girls a healthy outlet to express their anger, stress and sadness. The group curriculum also incorporated skills for impulse control, meditation and healthy relationships.

As a result of the groups, girls starting reporting they were doing better at CYA and not getting time added for fighting or acting out. GJI increased its support services by provided long distance mentors for girls who needed someone positive with whom to correspond. GJI also partnered with attorneys from the Youth Law Center to ensure that Bay Area girls had legal representation at their parole hearings.

Though CYA estimates 50% recidivism rate for young women, 93% of girls who have participated in GJI support services over the last 3 years have transitioned home and not returned to CYA during this time. GJI will continue developing services and supports that enable young women in CYA to successfully stabilize in their communities.

---

14. the Center for Juvenile and Criminal Justice and the Ella Baker Center
Improving Coordination of Information and Care

San Francisco still needs to develop a coordinated and accountable post-release and aftercare program for young women. Forty percent of girls detained in San Francisco are out-of-county residents. In addition, many girls who successfully complete multi-year placements in programs outside of California have returned to juvenile hall in later years on probation violations. A large majority of these young women return home after they turn 18. Without appropriate post-release and aftercare services, they are at great risk for entering the adult criminal justice system. Since there are no shared statistics between JPD and the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department, there is no way to confirm if sending girls to programs outside California until they become legal adults has made a positive and long-term impact on decreasing their delinquency.

GJI would like to assist in developing multi-system protocols and networks between jurisdictions where girls reside and where they are arrested. By all agencies working together to identify and address the best interests of girls in the juvenile justice system, these children are less likely to fall through the cracks of systems that do not have identified methods for communication and collaboration.

Expanding Regional Partnerships

Since 2002, San Francisco has experienced a significant increase in the amount of young women arrested and detained for drug sales and prostitution-related offenses (see Appendix 3 for detail). The majority of these youth are residents of Alameda and Contra Costa counties. These youth are usually returned to their county of origin without assurance of appropriate follow-up services, protection and support, making them extremely vulnerable to continued victimization and recidivism into the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems.

As a direct result of this problem, GJI is committed to developing strong regional partnerships with local counties to improve and expand quality services for girls in the juvenile justice system. Over the last four years, GJI has partnered with Alameda County agencies such as the Interagency Child Policy Council of Alameda County to share best practices to effectively address the needs of sexually exploited minors in the Bay Area. For the last two years, GJI staff has also provided monthly educational workshops to girls detained in Alameda County’s juvenile hall.

Providing a Model for Gender-Responsive Services

As part of their future work, GJI wants to provide ongoing technical assistance to partner counties on how they can create gender-responsive classes, mentoring, therapeutic groups, and training that can improve the outcomes for girls on probation.

During the last five years, San Francisco juvenile hall ran a girls-only detention unit which enabled GJI to create and evaluate the benefits of offering gender-responsive services in a gender-specific environment. A recent JPD evaluation concluded that GJI services helped contribute to a 25% decrease in recidivism rates for girls in detention. Over the years, juvenile hall staff also reported a sharp decrease in fights and suicide attempts as a result of gender-responsive services in detention. GJI is therefore confident they have identified a strategy for successfully stabilizing young women during their confinement.

As a result of visiting jurisdictions throughout Northern California and talking with detained girls in those counties, GJI has learned that girls in California juvenile halls receive little to no gender-responsive services. Since most juvenile halls house boys and girls in the same unit, the ability to provide gender-responsive services becomes even more complicated. Since an estimated 90% of girls in the juvenile justice system have victimization and exploitation histories, the need to establish a confidential, safe and supportive detention environment is crucial for young women’s stabilization and recovery.

Because of the recognized success of detention-based programming for girls in San Francisco, many counties in California have asked GJI for technical assistance on how they can improve services for girls in their jurisdiction. GJI is currently providing assistance to Alameda, Solano, and San Joaquin counties on how they can create gender-responsive workshops and mentoring services for girls in juvenile hall and on probation.

17. Ongoing interviews between Julie Posadas Guzman and Garry Bieringer, JDAI Coordinator regarding statistical analysis of detention rates of girls in San Francisco Juvenile Hall, 2001-2005
GJI is often asked by colleagues interested in starting a similar program to GJI in their county, “What is absolutely essential be in place in order to make the effort worthwhile?” The challenges that GJI took on are substantial and their success to date has depended on several key conditions, most notably:

- Pre-existing relationships with partners that are already in both community based organizations and the county probation department.
- Offering a service or incentive to collaborate that no other organization is already offering (such as free training).
- Support from a core philanthropic donor. This donor doesn't have to fund the entire budget, but should be key to getting started and leveraging funding from other sources.
- Readiness to adapt. When something doesn’t work, be ready to move on and remember to let the clients’ needs guide the work.
- High quality staff. While GJI creates internship opportunities for girls graduating out of their programs, their core staff positions require a college degree and the personal stability to dedicate one’s work day to professionally attend to the girls’ needs.

GJI Directors also identified a second list of factors that would be ideal to have in place prior to beginning an initiative. These partnerships and resources can also be developed as the initiative evolves and grows.

- Leadership and buy in from the Juvenile Court, Probation Department, Public Defenders’ office and the District Attorney.
- Community based organizations that offer the gamut of needed services including crucial services such as individual and family therapy, paid job training and job placement, and housing.
- Available and quality research that describes the trends in detention and describes the needs of target population.
- An inventory of existing services in the regional area.

18. GJI client statistics and research published by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
## Appendix 1. Timeline

### 2002

- **Spring**: GJI launched (July)
- **Summer**: GJI signed MOUs with community based organizations, and San Francisco's Juvenile Probation Department; Girls on the Edge published; Launched Training program; Developed GJI's intake and assessment tool and gender competency model
- **Fall**: GJI's first case management client (January 10)
- **Winter**: Chief of Probation, Jesse Williams, supports GJI startup
- **Community**: High detention rates for girls
- **JPD**: Started construction of new building

### 2003

- **Spring**: GJI took over detention based case-management and mentoring for SFJPD (July) and started collaborative case management
- **Summer**: Crimes include drug sales, prostitution, and probation violations
Visits to CYA begin (March);
Started pregnant and parenting classes; long
distance mentoring;
after care case management;
started employing CYA interns;
hired clinical supervisor and
began providing individual therapy;
improved detention based policy and procedures.

2004

Winter
New Chief: Gwen Tucker; New Acting Chief: Bill Johnston

Spring
Spike in CYA convictions; Spike in out of home placements; Crimes include violence, robbery, assaults; lots of girls from Alameda

2005

Winter
New Chief: Bill Siffermann

Spring
Hired a second therapist; started the Healthy Relationships class; expanded to provide Technical Assistance to Alameda Co.; released GJI's year 2 Evaluation Report

Summer
Criminal Justice requires GJI trainings for grantees (July); ended Pregnancy and Parenting classes; ended CYA interns

2006

Winter
Hired a Policy and Program Director

0 convictions to CYA
Appendix 2. Theory of Change

**External Factors**

Complex risk factors, environment and systems affect girls including family, friends, intimate relationships, school, jobs, community, and economy.

**Internal Factors**

Partners including the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, United Way of the Bay Area, Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice, Department of Children Youth and Families, Department of Public Health, Delinquency Prevention Commission, Department of the Status of Women, and community based organizations.

**Hypothesis**

There has been an increase in the number of girls arrested for criminal offenses. There has been an attendant increase in the percentage of girls in detention.

Why does this problem exist?

- Lack of gender responsive intervention strategies and professional skills to serve target population.
- Gap between resources available and needed, lacking services include job training, counseling, housing, educational support.
- Disposition plans do not address factors that contributed to girls’ delinquency, including victimization, exploitation and violence.
- Not enough effective gender responsive placement options for girls.
- No inclusion of family in decision making regarding treatment plans.
- Lack of consistent coordination between juvenile justice and community based services.

**Strategies to Address the Problem**

- Improve assessment, tracking, referrals, system coordination, and accountability between probation and community based organizations.
- Improve community based case management and girls services through training – 10 classes per year for three years.
- Improve utilization of community based organizations for probation based referrals through more effective gender responsive policies in juvenile probation and plans.
- Collaborate and combine resources (CYWD, YWCA, SPY, CYA) to address systemic issues related to girls’ justice.
- Provide Detention Based Case Management to 300 girls a year (two staff), Inside Mentoring Programming 35 girls (one staff), Individual and Family Therapy in custody (one therapist). Employ three interns for girls transitioning out of the system.
- Provide emergency food, clothing and personal supplies.
- Document emerging model and promising practices.
- Maintain and leverage resources to expand competent girls-responsive programs.

**Short Term Goals/Results (July 2005)**

A full operational gender responsive model with policies and procedures that guides collaboration and service delivery of juvenile justice and community based organizations.

**Interim Goals/Results (Post GJI)**

- Girls going through GJI transition off of case management and no involvement in criminal justice system.
- The assessment and referral model becomes the standard procedure for girls at SF Juvenile Probation Department and other counties in the region.
- Community based organizations use gender responsive strategies with all clients having contact with juvenile justice system.
- Girls Justice Model becomes recognized locally and nationally and duplicated regionally across counties.
- New or expanded services that meet emerge from GJI: job training, therapy and basic services in their own communities.

**Long Term Goals/Results**

- Decrease recidivism for girls in SF.
- Establish a culture of organizational collaboration between probation department and community based organizations in assessments, referrals and case management.
- Increased funding for gaps in girls services.
Appendix 3. Types of Arrest

Table 8. Types of Arrests of GJI Clients, by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arreets*</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drugs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11351.5 Cocaine</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11352.(a) Controlled substances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11353.(b) Corruption of minor: sell controlled subst.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11359 Marijuana possession for sale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11379 Drug Sales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crimes against Persons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187(a) Attempted Murder</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Kidnapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 (b) Kidnapping and Robbery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Robbery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.5.(c) Robbery 2nd degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.(a) Carjacking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Assault</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241.2 Assault at school or in park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 Battery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.(e)1 Battery of spouse/partner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.5 Assault or battery at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 (2) Assault, use of Firearm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.(a) Assault with a deadly weapon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.(c) Assault w/weapon on police officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crimes against Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 Arson</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459. Burglary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484. Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487.(a) Grand theft (&gt;400)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488. Petty theft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 Poss Stolen Property</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594 Vandalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prostitution</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647.(b) Prostitution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653.22.(a) Loitering for purpose of prostitution</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10851 Driving a vehicle w/out license/car theft</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12020(A) Concealed Weapon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.(a) Resisting arrest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.9.(a) False representation of identity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182(A)(1) Conspiracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.22.(a) Criminal street gang</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422 Terrorist Threats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602 Ward of the court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777(a)(2) Removal of youth from home or group home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation Violation</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRNT602 Warrant for Probation Violation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4. Risk Factor Scores from GJI Intake Assessment

Table 9. Risk Scores by Factor from all Girls’ Initial GJI Assessments, and from Girls who Returned Within the Calendar Year, by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Risk Scores by year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Contributing Factors</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall risk</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk scores for girls who were re-arrested in the same year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>76</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average risks for girls who returned within the year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Contributing Factors</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall risk</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected recent training topics are given below with a list of attending organizations represented. (Each organization may have been represented by more than one person, and additional organizations may not be noted.)

Preventing Burnout | August 19, 2004
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Brothers Against Guns
CARECEN
Center for Young Women's Dev
Sunset Youth Services
United Playaz
Vietnamese Youth Dev. Ctr.
Western Addition Beacon Ctr.

Client Centered Counseling | September 23, 2004
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
Center for Young Women's Dev
Community Works
Huckleberry
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Vietnamese Youth Dev. Ctr.

Male Providers/Female Clients - Building Healthy Relationships | November 17, 2004
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Boys & Girls Club
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
Community Response Network
Girls Inc.
Huckleberry Youth Program
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
OMI/Excelsior Beacon
Vocational Program, JPD
YWCA-CITS

Intensive Case Management | January 20, 2005
Bayview Safe Haven
Brothers Against Guns
Bayview Hunter's Point Foundation
CARECEN
CITS
Girls 2000
Huckleberry Youth Program
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Inside Mentoring Program
Rap collaborative
RV Beacon
SAGE
Western Addition Beacon
YGIC
YO! SF
Young Queens on the Rise
YWCA Come Into the Sun

Mental Health & Psychotropic Medications for Adolescents | February 17, 2005
Bayview Beacon
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
Center for Young Women's Dev
Family Restoration House
Huckleberry Youth Program
MNC-Mission girls
San Mateo Probation
The Beat Within

Counseling Youth | March 5, 2005
Huckleberry House
Huckleberry Youth Program
Inside Mentoring Program
Neighborhood Safety Partnerships
SF SAFE
Western Addition Beacon

Conflict Resolution | May 18, 2005
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
Edgewood Center
GIRLS 2000
Huckleberry Youth Program
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Juvenile Probation Dept.
SF SAFE
Neighborhood Safety Partnership
Western Addition Beacon Ctr.
YGIC
Working with Bi-racial/Multi-racial
Youth and Families | June 30, 2005
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center Brothers
Against Guns
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Juvenile Probation Dept.
C.A.R.C
Edgewood Center
Neighborhood Safety

Advocacy For Youth | August 25, 2005
Brothers Against Guns
Community Works
Center for Young Women's Dev Edgewood Center
Greater Mission Consortium
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Richmond Village Beacon
SA.G.E
SF Conservation Corps
Walden House
YGCIC

Mandated Reporting/Reporting Abuse | September 29, 2005
Brothers Against Guns
Community Bridges Beacon
Center for Young Women's Dev DDAP
Occupational Therapy Training Prog.
Beat Within
SAGE
United Playaz
Vietnamese Youth Dev Center
Visitation Valley Beacon

Learning Disabilities | October 26, 2005
Brothers Against Guns
Center for Young Women's Dev CARECEN
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Jacobs Ladder
Mission Girls
Occupational Therapy Training Prog. SAGE
San Mateo Probation Dept.

Sexual Abuse/Sexual Predators | November 17, 2005
Asian Neighborhood Design
Bayview Hunters Point Foundation
Boys & Girls Club of SF
Brothers Against Guns
CARECEN
Legal Services for Children
MNC-Mission Girls
Safe Haven
Samoan Community
Sunset Neighborhood Center
Sunset Youth Services
TAPP
Urban Services YMCA
Visitation Valley Beacon
West Bay Filipino Multi Service

From Burnout to Balance | January 26, 2006
West Bay Filipino Multi Service
Asian Neighborhood Design
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Ctr.
Boys & Girls Club
Brothers Against Guns
Buchanan YMCA
Community Youth Center
CARECEN
Community Board
Girls 2000
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Legal Services for Children
OMI/Excelsior
Occupational Therapy Training Prog Richmond Village
Beacon Ctr.
Samoan Community Center
Sunset Youth Services
Urban Services YMCA
Visitation Valley Beacon
Western Addition Beacon Center

Adolescent Development | February 26 2006
Asian Neighborhood Design
Beat Within
Brothers Against Guns
Community Youth Center
CARECEN
Community Boards
Community Bridges Beacon
Edgewood Center
Family Service Agency
Girls Against Violence
Instituto Familiar de La Raza
Legal Services for Children
Occupational Therapy Training Prog.
SAGE
St John's Educational Center
Straight Forward Club
Sunset Neighborhood Beacon
Sunset Youth Services
Urban Institute
Urban Services YMCA
Visitation Valley Beacon
West Bay Filipino Multi Service
Western Addition Safe Haven

**Overview of the Juvenile Justice System (1) | March 30, 2006**
Asian Neighborhood Development
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
CARECEN
Community Boards
Community Bridges Beacon
Community Youth Center
Center for Young Women's Dev
Edgewood
Girls 2000
Instituto Familiar de la Raza
Richmond Village Beacon
SAGE
Sunset Neighborhood Beacon
Sunset Youth Services
Urban Services YMCA
VIP Girls
West Bay Filipino Multi Service
Western Addition Beacon
Western Addition Safe Haven

**Working with Immigrant Youth | March 9, 2006**
Arriba Juntos
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
CARECEN
Community Becons
Community Bridges Beacon
Community Youth Center
Center for Young Women's Dev
Instituto Familiar de la Raza
Legal Services for Children
Life Learning Academy
MOCJ
Project Impact
Richmond Village Beacon
SF SAFE
Sunset Neighborhood Beacon
Sunset Youth Services
Urban Services YMCA
West Bay Filipino Multi Service
Western Addition Safe Haven

**Overview of the Juvenile Justice System (2) | April 12, 2006**
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Community Education Services
Community Youth Center
Edgewood Center for Families and Children
Inside Mentoring Program
MNC
Occupational Therapy Training Prog.
Project Impact
Samoan Community Development
Tiffany and Robert Consulting
Urban Services YMCA

**Substance Abuse and Addiction | April 27, 2006**
Asian Neighborhood Design
Boys and Girls Club of SF
Brothers Against Guns
CARC
CARECEN
Community Boards
Community Bridges Beacon
Community Educational Services
Center for Young Women's Dev
Edgewood
Girls 2000
Larkin Street Youth Services
Legal Services for Children
Richmond Village Beacon
Samoan Comm. Devel. Corporation
Sunset Neighborhood Beacon Ctr.
Sunset Youth Services
United Playaz
Urban Services YMCA
West Bay Filipino Multi-Service
Western Addition Beacon Center
Western Addition Safe Haven
Unfinished Dreams:

I guess history is history.
My teenage life is a mystery.
My beautiful mama is missing me.
How could I survive in the morning
When demons seek me at night.

I brighten hard through this newcomer reputation
I'm not trying hard enough. I'm so fight harder beyond tempo.
My mind is bright with unfinished dreams
Waiting to change the image
But time wont me at the limit of freedom's hunger.

Rosevette age 15