



Justice for Girls
COALITION OF WASHINGTON STATE

Policy Brief

SYSTEM-LEVEL JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORMS FOR GIRLS

March 2017

This is one in a series of issue briefs that summarize data, research and best practices for girls, especially those entering or at risk of entering the juvenile justice system. We provide policymakers, citizens and the media with the information they need to understand critical and emerging issues, and to improve outcomes for Washington state girls and their communities.

The Coalition builds public will and community investment in innovative policies, programs and practices so that girls, especially those facing extreme hardship, have the support and opportunities they deserve.

We believe girls affected by violence and poverty can achieve long-term economic and health security while becoming a force for change in their communities.

We are grateful to the many reviewers of this brief who dedicated their time, insight and perspective on improving its content.

AT-RISK AND DELINQUENT GIRLS IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

BACKGROUND

Despite decades of focus, girls continue to be a growing percentage of the youth arrested and detained in Washington, and our state continues to have one of the highest rates of detaining girls for non-criminal activity.

Yet here – as in the nation – current data provide a much sharper understanding of how to better meet the needs of system-involved girls. For instance, we know the risk factors for system involvement that are specific to girls, and the forms of trauma the majority have experienced. We know that girls are over-represented in status offense cases, and that most of these girls are initially served through child welfare systems. We know that girls on probation have a substantially higher prevalence of mental health issues than boys, and that treatment models should not only reflect this but the different needs that exist *among* girls. We presently have a much clearer understanding of policies, practices and gender-specific programs that promote healthy development and healing for justice-involved girls and prevent deep-end system involvement. There are also many encouraging local, state and national efforts to reform juvenile justice. Jurisdictions are working to reduce costs, address new findings about the developmental and neurological differences between youth and adults and reduce use of punitive juvenile justice models. But most of these efforts are not tailored to girls' needs and pathways into the system. Few, if any, use disaggregated data, which means girls of color and LBGQ-GNCT (Lesbian, Bi, Gay, Queer-Gender Non-Conforming Transgender) youth are especially vulnerable to policies and practices that keep them in the system. Data gaps in prostitution arrests and CSEC (Commercially Sexually Exploited Children) exist as well.

The recommendations here aim to move forward reform efforts happening here and bring girls, and the diversity of their needs, front-and-center in these policy discussions. The brief's recommendations encourage cross-system, cross-profession discussion about the unique experiences of girls and how we reduce system involvement.

Stakeholders are encouraged to consider the following questions:

- What do we know about and how do we respond to system-involved girls?
- How can we use policy, programs, and innovation to improve outcomes?
- What actions can we take to improve the outcomes for girls and their families?

WHY FOCUS ON GIRLS IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM?

The juvenile justice system was originally designed for boys, and much of the existing research on best practices in juvenile justice corrections use primarily male samples.

Focusing on gender provides an opportunity to think about the unique experiences of girls in the juvenile justice system. Specifically, how pathways into the system, treatment needs and the effectiveness of programs and policies differ for girls.

Gender-specific Pathways to Entering the Juvenile Justice System

Common reasons girls enter the juvenile justice system include:ⁱ

- Fighting with parents
- Running away
- Older/antisocial romantic partners
- Sex at a young age
- Poor relationships with peers and teachers
- Substance use

Trauma is a common root to these behaviors. Even when girls and boys experience unhealthy social contexts, girls react differently as a result of socialization and an emphasis on relationships.

Girls are Over-represented in Status Offenses

Mirroring national trends, girls in Washington are arrested and detained for status offenses at a higher rate than boys. The most common status offenses include running away from home, truancy, and possession or consumption of alcohol.

Girls are a significantly larger share of status offense cases than delinquency cases, and many girls who commit status offenses are initially served through child welfare systems. Washington state no longer operates any secure centers for status offenses and girls receiving child in need of services cannot be held in detention centers for status offenses. However, keeping status offenders in detention remains an issue. In 2017, SB 5581, which did not make it out of committee, sought to remedy this by phasing out use of the valid court order exception that places youth in detention for noncriminal behavior. Washington has been using the valid court order exception of the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention act, a loophole in federal law allowing judges to detain status offenders for disobeying court orders, more than any other state in the country. Those who opposed the bill expressed concerns about the safety of youth as Washington lacks alternatives to detention for housing status offenders.

Parents of at-risk youth (ARY) are also allowed to petition the court to order the youth to remain in the home. Incidents of contempt of court due to an ARY order that result in youth being sentenced to detention also disproportionately affect girls.

Data Gaps in Documenting Arrests for Prostitution

Nationally, the exact number of girls who are victims of domestic sexual exploitation and sex trafficking is unknown. However, the vast majority of arrests of youth for prostitution involve girls.ⁱⁱ In Washington state, no statewide data is collected on the number of youth arrested for prostitution related offenses, nor are there codes to reflect when CHINS case involves a Commercially Sexually Exploited Child (CSEC). In 2010, Washington state strengthened the Safe Harbor Law and required prosecutors to divert cases involving minors for the first offense

(diversion remains discretionary for subsequent offenses). In 2016, the Commercially Sexually Exploited Taskforce concluded that there are concerns with the effectiveness of the Safe Harbor Law and the ability to evaluate it.^{iiiiv} The Taskforce further concluded that CHINS is not an effective mechanism for obtaining services for CSEC, nor is diversion because so few are actually arrested on or charged with prostitution related offenses and because there are not adequate services to which youth can be diverted.

Data on Gender-specific Treatment Need

Research conducted in Washington state confirms the high prevalence of mental health issues among varying groups of girl offenders, and further suggests the importance of examining the risks and needs of justice-involved girls separately from boys.

The most prevalent mental health incidence is trauma, impacting between 60-90% of system girls. Girls have many more diagnosable mental illnesses than boys, including post-traumatic stress syndrome, suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, eating disorders and depression. Mental healthcare is an important service for girls and juvenile courts should plan for an array of treatment services that cater to the specific needs of girls.^v

Innovation in Girl-specific Programs and Initiatives

A growing understanding of how to prevent girls from getting stuck in the system exists. State and county initiatives across the country have generated *many* innovations specifically designed for girls. In recent years, states have piloted a number of model programs. These include:

1. Hennepin County, Minnesota's Community-based Continuum of Care
2. All-girl probation units in Baltimore, Chicago, Florida, and Minnesota
3. Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance
4. All Girls Court in Albuquerque, NM, Hawaii and Bexar County, Texas
5. Oakland, California's Alliance for Girls

A number of juvenile courts in Washington, often in collaboration with local community service providers, have implemented girl-specific programs. These include:

1. GOAL
2. Girl's Circle
3. Girl's Council
4. YWCA Juvenile Detention & Diversion Initiative
5. YWCA Healthy Relationship Class as Community Service Option
6. Art's Connect
7. ACZ
8. Statewide CSEC Model Protocol & Taskforce
9. Yoga Behind Bars

One of the distinguishing, general differences between the way males and females relate to the world is the greater emphasis females give to relationships when they make life decisions. This can be a significant strength, but can also hurt girls when they choose to stay in unhealthy relationships. Relationships with parents, peers and intimate partners are a primary driver of girl's development and behavior. It is important to recognize the power girls can give to these relationships. Importantly, these programs show a sensitivity to the role that establishing healthy relationships plays in healing and preventing recidivism.

Program sustainability is a challenge. Often-times girl-specific programs are not funded long enough to be evaluated. One exception is Girl's Circle, a nationally-tested model that demonstrated partially effective results in its initial evaluation. The GOAL program's Washington state pilot has yielded positive results.

Juvenile Justice-Involved Girls Nationally & in Washington State

Aggravated Assault & Family Conflict

- Nationally, more girls are coming in contact with the juvenile justice system for aggravated assault charges. Many of these assaults occur in the home due to family violence and conflict, and have been attributed in part to the rise in mandatory and pro-arrest policies.^{vi}
- In Washington state, justice-involved girls are more likely than boys to have home conflict, previous sexual abuse, a poor relationship with their father, and a history of running away.^{vii} Girls here are increasingly coming in contact with the juvenile justice system for aggravated assault charges.^{viii} Over 85% of juvenile arrests for in home violence do not involve serious injury and girls are disproportionately charged and detained for assault against a family member.^{ix} In 2016 the Washington state legislature granted police officers discretion when determining whether to arrest 16 and 17 year olds who appear to have committed domestic violence.^x

Arrest, Detention & Overall Involvement Rates

- Nearly 30% of juveniles arrested at the national level are girls or young women, and their share of arrests, detainment, and court cases has steadily increased over the past two decades.^{xi}
- Consistent with national trends, the rate of girls involved in the juvenile justice system in Washington state has grown over the last three decades, now making up 30% of total juvenile arrests compared to 20% in 1990. While the number of arrests is down, the percentage of girls arrested relative to boys is rising.^{xii}
- In 2011, over 9,000 girls were referred to juvenile departments in Washington state. Legal cases were filed in 42% of these cases, while the remaining cases were sent to diversion or resulted in informal actions. Cases in detention for violation of a Child in Need of Services order (typically for running away) were 68% girls. Girls make up approximately half of all Child in Need of Services/At Risk Youth petitions but the services offered through these mechanisms are not evaluated for their efficacy for girls.^{xiii}
- Justice involved girls in Washington state are 67% white, 13% Latina, 12% African American, 5% Native American, 2% Asian and 0.5% other.^{xiv}

Bias

- Implicit bias places girls of color at a greater risk for system involvement at every level. In 2013, African American and American Indian/Alaska Native girls were 20% more likely than white girls to be formally petitioned. In the same year, African American girls were 20% more likely to be detained than white girls, while American Indian/Alaska Native girls were 50% more likely to be detained.^{xv}
- Non-heterosexual girls are disproportionately likely to be arrested and convicted as heterosexual girls engaging in similar behavior.^{xvi} Youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other non-binary reported seven times the rate of youth-on-youth victimization in juvenile facilities than their heterosexual peers.^{xvii}

- Youth of color are significantly overrepresented in the juvenile justice system in Washington state.^{xviii}

Dual-System Involvement

- Nationally, there is a growing population of “dually-involved” or “crossover” youth who are part of both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Girls comprise a greater share of crossover youth than of youth charged only with delinquency.^{xix}
- Nearly half of all juvenile justice involved girls in Washington state have child welfare involvement^{xx} Girls and minority youth with a history of child welfare system contact have a higher likelihood of multi-system involvement.^{xxi}
- Girls are 33.7% of the population of juvenile justice referred youth with no history of child welfare system involvement, yet the representation of girls increases to 43.1% when a history of legal activity and/or out-of-home child welfare placement are considered.^{xxii} Models using a child welfare – not juvenile justice – approach by retaining crossover girls in the child welfare system whenever possible show promising results for reducing juvenile justice involvement and the number of youth entering and reentering care and the length of out-of-home placement.^{xxiii}

Physical and Mental Health

- Girls enter the juvenile justice system with a number of physical and mental health needs: 57% meet the diagnostic criteria for two or more disorders; 47% have a substance use disorder;^{xxiv} 15.7% tested positive for chlamydia,^{xxv} while many girls in placement have other unaddressed health needs related to illness, vision, dental and hearing.^{xxvi} National legislation mandates an initial health screen by medical detention staff within the first 48 to 72 hours of detention.^{xxvii}

Probation

- Nationally, probation is the most common post-adjudication disposition for all youth. In 2013, 67% of white girls, 67% of Black girls, 60% of American Indian/Alaska Native girls and 81% of Asian/Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander girls received a disposition of probation.^{xxviii} In 2013, 19% of adjudicated girls were placed outside the home. Among committed girls who were removed from their homes, 88% were placed in a locked facility.^{xxix}
- Compared to boys, girls on probation in Washington state are more likely to witness violence at home (56% vs 42%) and to experience physical abuse (44% vs 31%), sexual abuse (34% vs 8%), child neglect (33% vs 21%), and domestic violence (24.3% vs 17.7%).^{xxx}
- Girls on probation have a substantially higher prevalence of mental health issues and self-destructive behaviors than boys. Girls are more likely to have flashbacks to traumatic events (52% vs 34%), serious thoughts about suicide (34% vs 19%), and to have attempted suicide (21% vs 5%). Girls are almost two times as likely as boys to have a history of depression/anxiety (40% vs 22%), four times more likely to engage into self-mutilating behavior (26% vs 6%), and two times as likely as boys to feel that life is not worth living (18% vs 9%).^{xxxi}
- In Washington state, girls are 31.1% of probation-involved youth with a history of out-of-home placement, and 6% of youth who lived in foster or group home while on

probation. The challenges and needs experienced by girls on probation are accentuated among multi-system girls, especially, exposure to violence and child maltreatment, family dysfunction, mental health issues, and substance abuse.^{xxxii} In many states, probation is focused on punishment rather than healthy development and healing from prior trauma. Accountability models of probation that lack focus on driving behavioral forces and hold girls to court-imposed rules (e.g. frequent reporting and curfews) result in disproportionate detention of girls for technical violations.^{xxxiii}

Status Offenses

- In 2013, 37% of detained girls nationally were held for status offenses and technical violations, and 21% were detained for simple assault and public order offenses (excluding weapons).^{xxxiv}
- The vast majority of girls who come in contact with and are confined within the juvenile justice system pose little or no threat to public safety.^{xxxv}
- Running away, truancy, domestic altercations, and "prostitution" charges are often the cause of girls' contact with police.^{xxxvi}
- Washington state has one of the highest rates in the nation of locking girls up for non-criminal activity.^{xxxvii} In 2015 girls made up only 38% of court referrals on juveniles in Washington but they comprised 46% of referrals for status offenses. Of the 9,863 females referred to court in 2015, almost a half were referred for status offenses.^{xxxviii}
- There is no current comprehensive data available on the number of commercially sexually exploited children in Washington and much of the data that is available is problematic.^{xxxix}
- In Washington state, truancy now accounts for nearly half of all referrals to juvenile courts, and 4,891 girls had a truancy petition in 2010/11.^{xl} Exclusionary discipline practices disproportionately affect students of color and youth living in poverty.^{xli}

School Discipline

- School discipline and exclusion often lead to justice system involvement. Youth of color are much more likely than white youth to experience school discipline, despite evidence that their behaviors do not differ as much as these disproportionate rates would suggest.^{xlii}
- Black girls are six times more likely to be suspended than white girls.^{xliii} Students with disabilities are over twice as likely to receive an out-of-school suspension than students without disabilities.^{xliv} Since high dropout rates are correlated with high rates of discipline, decreasing rates of discipline could reduce dropout rates.^{xlv}
- Mirroring national trends, black students are suspended at rates that far exceed their overall enrollment. In 2014, 8.6 percent of African-American kids were removed from Washington classrooms for misbehaving. They make up 4.8 percent of all students.^{xlvi}

Trauma

- Court involved girls have experienced high rates of trauma, including high rates of sexual abuse at 4.4 times that of boys.^{xlvii} During the court process, their behavior can be seen as defiant or disrespectful when in reality it is a response to trauma. The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN) suggests several essential elements of a trauma-informed juvenile justice system. Trauma assessment, screenings and staff trainings should be standard in the juvenile justice system.^{xlviii}
- 60 of girls in detention have likely been raped in their lifetime.^{xlix}
- 35-45% of girls in detention have had PTSD in their lifetime.^l
- Girls in detention are almost 6 times more likely than boys to have a panic disorder.^{li}

Treatment

- Nationally, and in Washington state, current treatment models do not reflect variation in risk and protective factors. Rather, treatment services should be designed to meet the intensive mental health and stable housing needs for the approximately 20% of girls who have high family conflict and trauma, 30% who show complex treatment needs and risks associated with having antisocial peers, 38% who have low adverse experiences but high substance abuse needs, and 10% who have high mental health needs and strong social assets.^{lii}
- In Washington state, a recent evaluation of Aggression Replacement Training, the most widely used service in our state's juvenile justice system, found that girls are significantly less likely to complete services than boys, largely due to insufficient engagement and running away.^{liii}

Long-Term Outcomes

- Girls with a history of juvenile justice detainment are five times more likely than their peers to die before age 29. Causes of death include homicide, drug overdose, motor vehicle accident, suicide, and other accidents.^{liv}

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Research and implement effective alternatives to detention and incarceration for girls who are engaging in status offenses, technical violations of probation, simple assault, family-based offenses, running away, and prostitution-related charges.* Promising responses to make available across jurisdictions include:^{lv}
 - a. Serve girls who commit status offenses with a family-focused approach linking them to community-based services.
 - b. Recognize that the types of family-based offenses courts see are extremely varied and require a varied response.
 - c. Use assessment to understand why girls are running away. Target programs and solutions at these underlying causes.
 - d. Provide brief respite care to diffuse family conflict and prevent running away. (e.g. Spokane, Washington's model offers a cooling-off period, a thorough assessment of youth and families, a plan for family re-unification and aftercare.
 - e. Use short-term, non-secure runaway shelters or reception centers for girls in crisis to triage cases and connect girls and their families to counseling, diagnostic services, job training, parent education and referrals for services.
 - f. Ensure that diversion for prostitution-related charges provide for effective services and that programs are evaluated for effectiveness (e.g. Youthcare's Bridge Program, King County).
2. *Ensure that girls in custody in all jurisdictions receive validated trauma-screening and assessment and that attorneys, judges and probation officers use trauma-informed approaches to improve court culture for girls.* Courts are responsive to girls' trauma when they provide:

- a. Intake screening for suicidal ideation, significant mental health symptoms and substance abuse issues by court professionals trained in mental and behavioral health.
 - b. Full assessments of needs conducted by a trained mental health professional who then provides or refers youth to another provider to develop a treatment plan with intent to provide the youth treatment for identified needs.
 - c. Training for juvenile defenders and judges to understand the social context and needs of girls.
 - d. Guidelines to ensure attorneys can identify holistic solutions and are well-versed in the range of legal issues facing girls.
3. *Provide comprehensive health screening and services for girls in the juvenile justice system, including pregnant and post-partum girls.* Recommended strategies are:
- a. Implement evidence-based and gender-responsive medical screens at intake (e.g. The Girls Health Screen) to address multiple dimensions of health and mental health needs. ^{lvi}
 - b. Increase efforts to support continuous Medicaid and CHIP coverage for girls to maintain access to ongoing and comprehensive care. ^{lvii}
 - c. Connect girls to community providers to ensure continuity of care. ^{lviii}
 - d. Collect disaggregated data on system-involved girls' coverage and care. ^{lix}
4. *Work collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure amended arrest policies for domestic violence (HB5605) focus on intimate partner violence and adults -- not on girls who are a part of intra-family conflict, many of whom are victims themselves.* Promising responses to make available across jurisdictions include:
- a. Law enforcement training to establish best practices for responding to domestic violence situations where girls are involved, including public engagement materials that explain the system and language services. Responses must be conscious of disproportionately affected communities including immigrants, communities of color and low-income communities. ^{lx}
 - b. Documenting changes in arrest statistics before and after implementation of policy to gain a better understanding of how youth are involved in domestic violence, specifically the shift from victim to perpetrator.
 - c. Divert girls to alternatives to formal court processing that avoid a juvenile record (e.g. the FIRS Program, King County).
 - d. Pre-petition diversion programming that engages the family in solutions including family programming, restorative justice processes, or family mediation (e.g. Step Up Curriculum).
 - e. Short-term, non-secure shelter care to provide respite for the family and shelter for the girl.
 - f. Validated tools to differentiate types of domestic violence developmentally, in light of family context.
5. *Offer effective, strengths-based probation services so girls have off-ramps from deep-end system involvement.* Alternatives must be developmentally appropriate, gender-specific, trauma-informed, and culturally responsive, and include prevention, treatment

and re-entry to address the housing, education, vocational, health, family, relationship, and safety needs of girls. Probation programs must be competent to serve:^{lxi}

- a. Girls who are the children of incarcerated parents;
 - b. Young mothers;
 - c. Girls of color and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning, and intersex youth;
 - d. Survivors of domestic child sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation;
 - e. Girls who experience significant levels of school suspension, expulsion, or academic failure.
6. *Fund and scale research-based, gender-specific programs and practices.* It is critical that these programs and services be funded, and that funding includes rigorous evaluation in order to contribute to the knowledge base of gender-specific, evidence-based practices for girls. Model gender-specific programs to consider include:
- a. Girl-only groups (e.g. GOAL, Girls Matter, Girls Circle and Voices Curriculum).
 - b. Girl-only juvenile probation officer caseloads.
 - c. Girl-only dockets and years-long court-based programming.
7. *Advocates, school leaders, teachers and justice system professionals should seek out best practices and promising models that close racial and gender disparities in discipline.*
- a. Engage advocates, school leaders, teachers, and justice system professionals in determining best practices for closing racial and gender disparities in discipline in the Washington state education system.
 - b. Increase discretion and trauma-informed responses to violations of school policy by re-evaluating current sexual harassment and equity policies, eliminating zero-tolerance policies, and implementing trainings that promote an intersectional, culturally-sensitive, trauma-informed approach to enforcing school policy.^{lxii}
 - c. Decriminalize minor school-based offenses commonly charged to girls, such as verbally disruptive behavior.
 - d. Research the ways that disciplinary policies and procedures affect girls, specifically girls of color and LGBTQI youth. Reevaluate all policies and procedures that fall disproportionately on certain girls, starting with suspension policies.
 - e. Craft plans to support at-risk girls in the classroom and after school activities. Support Title IX enforcement as a way of ensuring at-risk girls have equal access to after-school opportunities as other students.^{lxiii}
 - f. Institutionalize the role of police officers in schools and limit the situations where law enforcement is involved.^{lxiv}
8. *Ensure best practices are in place to help girls cope with the challenges that result from "crossover" or "dual-system" involvement.*^{lxv}
- a. *Fund research to understand* the specific needs of girls who come in contact with both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.
 - b. Ensure juvenile probation and law enforcement officers use front end screening to promptly identify crossover girls.
 - c. Retain crossover girls in the child welfare system whenever possible.

- d. Expand resources for justice-involved girls by using Title IV-E funding which provides a mechanism to promote family engagement, permanency and other strategies.
 - e. Access child welfare and behavioral health resources for justice-involved girls by using Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs) to plan for their needs.
 - f. Ensure aftercare/reentry planning provides girls with stable housing, education, vocational training, employment assistance and behavioral/mental health services.
9. *Fully implement the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) and its regulations, including the youthful inmate standard.* These include: ^{lxvi}
- a. Refrain from housing youth under age 18 held in adult facilities with adults.
 - b. Remove youth from adult jails and prisons as the best means to comply with the youthful inmate standard.
 - c. Refrain from using isolation to achieve separation between youth and adults.

ⁱ Annie Black and Francine T. Sherman, *Gender Injustice: System-Level Juvenile Justice Reforms for Girls*, (National Crittenton: 2015) http://nationalcrittenton.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Gender_Injustice_Report.pdf, 27.

ⁱⁱ Charles Puzzanchera and Sarah Hockenberry, "National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook" (Pittsburgh: National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2013), <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdcb/>, 3.

ⁱⁱⁱ CSEC Committee 2016 Final Report to the Legislature, http://agportal-s3bucket.s3.amazonaws.com/uploadedfiles/Home/Supporting_Law_Enforcement/Human_Trafficking/Commercially_Sexually_Exploited_Children_Statewide_Coordinating_Committee/2016%20Final%20CSEC%20Committee%20Report.pdf, 35.

^{iv} CSEC Committee 2016 Final Report to the Legislature, http://agportal-s3bucket.s3.amazonaws.com/uploadedfiles/Home/Supporting_Law_Enforcement/Human_Trafficking/Commercially_Sexually_Exploited_Children_Statewide_Coordinating_Committee/2016%20Final%20CSEC%20Committee%20Report.pdf, 35.

^v Asia S. Bishop, Patricia Logan-Greene, Paula S. Nurius, and Sarah Walker, "The Heterogeneity of Treatment Needs in Justice-Involved Girls," *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 43, no. 3 (March 2016): 323–342.

^{vi} Francine Sherman, "Justice for Girls: Are We Making Progress?," *UCLA Law Review* 59, no. 6 (2012): 1584–1628; Margaret A. Zahn et al., *Violence by Teenage Girls: Trends and Context* (Washington DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, May 2008), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/218905.pdf>.

^{vii} Walker, S. (2014). Is it the system or the girls who have gone wild? Gender-responsive principles and practices in the justice system. Invited Presentation for Psychiatry Grand Rounds, March 2014.

viii OJJDP 2014 Statistical Briefing Book

ix Walker, "Female Juvenile Arrests."

x "Mandatory Domestic Violence Arrest Age Increased in Washington State," *Marshall Defense Firm blog*, July 19, 2016, <http://marshalldefense.com/2016/07/19/mandatory-domestic-violence-arrest-age-increased-in-washington-state/>

xi "Girls and the Juvenile Justice System," *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*, <http://www.ojjdp.gov/policyguidance/girls-juvenile-justice-system/> 1.

xii Washington State Partnership Council, *2014 Juvenile Justice Annual Report*, (2014), <https://www.dshs.wa.gov/ra/office-juvenile-justice/2014-juvenile-justice-annual-report>.

xiii Washington State Partnership Council, *2014 Juvenile*, 30.

xiv Sarah Cusworth Walker, "Female Juvenile Arrests for Violence: Washington State Data 2011-2013," (presentation at Unintended Consequences Roundtable, Washington DC, March 10, 2016).

xv Charles Puzzanchera and Sarah Hockenberry, "National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook" (Pittsburgh: National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2013), <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdcb/>.

xvi Kathryn E.W. Himmelstein and Hannah Brückner, "Criminal-Justice and School Sanctions Against Nonheterosexual Youth: A National Longitudinal Study," *Pediatrics* (2010). <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/pediatrics/early/2010/12/06/peds.2009-2306.full.pdf>.

xvii Allen J. Beck, David Cantor, John Hartge, and Tim Smith, *Sexual Victimization in Juvenile Facilities Reported by Youth, 2012*, (Washington: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/svjfry12.pdf>, 4.

xviii Walker, "Female Juvenile Arrests."

xix Black, *Gender Injustice*, 15.

xx Catherine Pickard "Prevalence and Characteristics of Multi-System Youth in Washington State" (2014). https://www.courts.wa.gov/subsite/wscrr/docs/MultiSystemYouthInWA_Final.pdf

xxi Pickard, "Prevalence and Characteristics," 1.

xxii Ibid.

xxiii Black, *Gender Injustice*, 40.

xxiv Linda A. Teplin, et al., *The Northwestern Juvenile Project: Overview*, (Washington: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2013), <https://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/234522.pdf>.

^{xxv} Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2011*, (Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012), <http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats11/surv2011.pdf>. 9, 21, 85-86.

^{xxvi} Karla S. McPherson and Andrea J. Sedlak, *Youth Needs and Services: Findings from the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement*, (Washington: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency prevention, 2010), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/227728.pdf> 6.

^{xxvii} http://www.girlshealthandjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/GHS_PilotStudy.pdf, p. 481. Originally from Pajer, K. A., Kelleher, K., Gupta, R. A., Rolls, J., & Gardner, W. (2007). Psychiatric and medical health care policies in juvenile detention facilities. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 46, 1660–1667.

^{xxviii} Melissa Sickmund et al., *Easy Access to the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement: 1997-2013*, 2015, <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezacjrp/>

^{xxix} Sickmund, et.al., *Easy Access*.

^{xxx} Arina Gertseva (2017). *Girls on Probation, 2014-2015. Olympia: Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR)*

^{xxxi} Ibid.

^{xxxii} Ibid.

^{xxxiii} Black, *Gender Injustice*, 11.

^{xxxiv} Sickmund, et.al., *Easy Access*.

^{xxxv} *Office of Juvenile Justice*, 3.

^{xxxvi} Black, *Gender Injustice*, 14.

^{xxxvii} U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention, 2011 data

^{xxxviii} Gertseva, *Girls on Probation*.

^{xxxix} Washington State Model Protocol For Commercially Sexually Exploited Children Center for Children & Youth Justice, February 2016 Update, <https://ccyj.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Revised-Model-Protocol-Feb-2016.pdf>, 7.

^{xl} E Coker and C McCurley, *Truancy in Washington State: Trends, Juvenile Court Responses, and the Regional Outcomes of Petitioned Truant Youth*, (Olympia: Washington State Center for Court Research, 2015), <http://www.courts.wa.gov/subsite/wscrr/docs/WSCCRTruancyUpdate2015.pdf>, 20.

^{xli} Washington State Partnership Council, *2014 Juvenile*, 65.

^{xlii} J. Bachman, S Goodkind, C. Wallace and J.M. Wallace, "Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences in School Discipline Among American High School Students: 1991-2005," *The Negro Educational Review* 59, (2008) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2678799/> 47-62.

^{xliii} Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, *Black Girls Matter: Pushed Out, Overpoliced and Underprotected*, (New York: African American Policy Forum, 2015), http://www.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/legacy/files/public_affairs/2015/february_2015/black_girls_matter_report_2.4.15.pdf 16

^{xliv} U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (March 2014), *Civil Rights Data Collection: Data Snapshot (School Discipline)*, (Issue Brief No. 1), <http://ocrdata.ed.gov/Downloads/CRDC-School-Discipline-Snapshot.pdf> 1

^{xlv} National Women's Law Center, *When Girls Don't graduate We All Fail*, (Washington: National Women's Law Center, 2007), http://nwlc.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/when_girls_dont_graduate.pdf 16

^{xlvi} Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Discipline Analysis tool: <http://www.k12.wa.us/DataAdmin/PerformanceIndicators/DataAnalytics.aspx>.

^{xlvii} Michael T. Baglivio et al., "The Prevalence of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) in the Lives of Juvenile Offenders," *OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2014), <http://www.journalofjuvjustice.org/JOJJ0302/article01.htm>.

^{xlviii} "Essential Elements" *The National Child Traumatic Stress Network*, http://www.nctsn.org/sites/default/files/assets/pdfs/jj_ee_final.pdf.

^{xlix} Cauffman, E., Feldman, S., Waterman, J., Steiner, H. (1998). Posttraumatic stress disorder among female juvenile offenders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37(11), 1209-1216.

^l Linda A Teplin, et al. (April, 2006). Psychiatric disorders of youth in detention. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Washington, DC.

^{li} Ibid.

^{lii} Bishop, "The Heterogeneity of Treatment", 1.

^{liii} Chris Hayes (2014). Quality Assurance Manager, Aggression Replacement Training. Personal communication.

^{liv} Linda A. Teplin, et al., "Firearm Homicide and Other Causes of Death in Delinquents: A 16-Year Prospective Study," *Pediatrics* 134, no. 1 (2014), <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/pediatrics/early/2014/06/10/peds.2013-3966.full.pdf> 63-73, 67.

^{lv} Black, *Gender Injustice*, 11.

^{lvi} Leslie Acoca, Jessica Stephens, and Amanda Van Vleet, (May 2014), *Health Coverage and Care for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System: The Role of Medicaid and CHIP (Issue Brief)*, <http://www.girlshealthandjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/8591-health-coverage-and-care-for-youth-in-the-juvenile-justice-system.pdf> p. 11

^{lvii} Acoca, *Health Coverage and Care*, 8.

^{lviii} Ibid.

^{lix} Ibid.

^{lx} Peter S Hovmand et al. *Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Unintended Consequences of Pro and Mandatory Arrest Policies*, (paper presented at the International System Dynamics Conference, Boston, MA, July 29 – August 2, 2007), <https://www.systemdynamics.org/conferences/2007/proceed/papers/HOVMA376.pdf>

^{lxii} http://www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/centers-institutes/poverty-inequality/upload/2015_COP_sexual-abuse_layout_web-2.pdf

^{lxiii} National Women's Law Center, *When Girls Don't Graduate* , 19.

^{lxiv} Justice Policy Institute, *Education Under Arrest: The Case Against Police in Schools*, (Washington: Justice Policy Institute, 2011), http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/educationunderarrest_fullreport.pdf

^{lxv} Black, *Gender Injustice*, 11.

^{lxvi} Black, *Gender Injustice*, 56.