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Introduction

When the Hyams Foundation embarked on the journey of the Girls’ Initiative, girls were the fastest growing segment of the juvenile justice population—nationally and locally. While the number of females in the total Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS) committed population has decreased significantly from 514 in January, 2003 to 226 in January, 2010 the percentage of females in the total Massachusetts DYS population has not (16% in 2003 and 2010). The challenge of decreasing girls’ involvement and risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system persists. However, the seven-year investment represented by the Girls’ Initiative has made notable contributions towards (a) building the capacity of local organizations to serve high risk system-involved girls, and (b) implementing broad practices that strengthen gender-responsive programming statewide.

This paper presents a summary of the goals, activities, and key results from the Girls’ Initiative Phase II along with potential strategies for building on its accomplishments. This paper is prepared by researchers from the National Institute on Out-of-School Time (NIOST) at Wellesley College, an organization that has a long history of investigating and evaluating youth development programs and bridging research, policy, and practice knowledge. For over 30 years NIOST has successfully brought national attention to the importance of children and youth’s out-of-school time, influenced policy, increased standards and professional recognition, and guided community action aimed at improving the availability, quality, and sustainability of programs serving children and youth. It is hoped that this paper will inform the myriad audiences to whom the issue of gender-responsive services and policies is critical, including legislators, funders, researchers, families, and program providers.
The Opportunity and Vision of the Girls’ Initiative

Working at the nexus of economic, social justice, and power, the Hyams Foundation in 2003 granted $800,000 over two years to eight community-based youth-serving organizations for Phase I of the Girls’ Initiative (see Appendix A for a list of grantee organizations). The purpose of the Girls’ Initiative was to focus programming and advocacy on system-involved girls in Boston and Chelsea. In December 2005, the Foundation trustees extended their original investment by awarding $1,170,000 over three years for Phase II. Additional funding of $75,000 was granted by the United Way of Massachusetts Bay.

The investment of Hyams in the Girls’ Initiative reflects its philanthropic history and ambition to support the long-term success among teens of color and low-income youth who are at high risk. Boston and Chelsea, not unlike other urban communities, have struggled with the rise of girls in their justice systems and the need for gender-responsive programming and resources.

A growing body of research provides a strong rationale for engaging in the development of gender-responsive practices and policies related to system-involved girls. In comparison to boys, girls demonstrate higher rates of serious mental health conditions including post traumatic stress disorder, psychiatric disorders, attempts of self harm, and suicide. Girls’ delinquency is more likely to be preceded by physical and sexual abuse and troubled family and school relationships. Finally, girls present unique challenges to the juvenile justice system stemming in part from the fact that the system was originally organized to respond primarily to the needs of boys.

The Girls’ Initiative Phase II: Activities, Results, and Lessons Learned

Building on the Foundation of Phase I

Phase I of the Girls’ Initiative operated from January 2003 through December 2005. All of the grantee organizations served girls ranging in age from 12 to 18 years old who were under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court, the Department of Social Services (DSS), or DYS, as a result of Child in Need of Services cases (CHINS) or delinquency petitions in Boston or Chelsea. Grantee organizations had a range of experiences in providing gender-responsive programming. Within the diversity of experiences there was sufficient opportunity to develop and refine program practices and policies of the grantee organizations to better address the needs of system-involved girls. Services provided by the eight programs included counseling, legal services, case management, mentoring, theatre arts, life skills, and academic support. The grantee organizations were funded to provide direct services to system-involved girls and to participate in a Learning Community.

Two of the major accomplishments from Phase I were (a) the sustained use of the Learning Community for collaboration and sharing with other grantee programs, including knowledge building about gender-responsive programming, and (b) an initial foray into Participatory Evaluation Research with the intent to improve processes and mechanisms for identifying and measuring outcomes.
Phase II Activities

In Phase II of the Girls’ Initiative, operating from January 2006 to December 2009, seven of the original grantees were funded to continue gender-responsive capacity-building activities and to act as “leaders for change” in the fields of gender-based youth policy and programming.10

The specific goals of Phase II were to:

Build the capacity of organizations and their staff to better serve high-risk girls
Facilitate better connections and ongoing working relationships among organizations that serve high-risk girls
Develop a public policy agenda and advocacy effort that address the needs of high-risk groups and that actively engages them and youth-serving organizations in public policy change

Phase II also included the securing and funding of the Black Ministerial Alliance’s Boston Capacity Tank (BMA/BCT) to serve as organizing intermediary and technical advisor. BMA/BCT’s supports to the Girls’ Initiative included (a) continuation of the Learning Community with monthly meetings and trainings, (b) customized technical assistance to grantee organizations, (c) leadership for the Youth Policy Initiative, and (d) project evaluation.

Phase II continued the momentum of Phase I with particular attention to expanding the collaboration, networking, and advocacy work of the Learning Community. BMA/BCT convened a series of workshops and conferences for Learning Community members and others in the youth services field to share information on issues central to the Girls’ Initiative. Learning Community meetings continued as a forum to receive trainings, review promising practices, and discuss issues of mutual concern.

Working with support from BMA/BCT, an evaluation team, and a technical assistant consultant, the organizations designed a summer project that offered the experience of collecting and analyzing data specific to their program with particular attention to matching girls’ needs to service delivery. This capacity-building strategy included creating or updating logic models and outcome measurement plans.

Over the course of Phase II, grantee organizations continuously worked to incorporate the five core goals of gender-responsive programming (safety, gender and cultural sensitivity, leadership development, strengthening families, and feedback from girls) as originally conceived by the Learning Community in February 2008. Programs did this by incorporating specific safety measures, designing programs that take into account girls’ developmental differences, and providing cultural competency training for staff.

One of the largest tasks undertaken in Phase II was the development of an advocacy agenda with support from the Youth Policy Initiative (YPI) in November 2007. The YPI is a multi-year strategy to build the capacity of Boston-area youth-serving organizations and networks to advance positive educational, social, and workforce outcomes for high-risk youth through public policy action. The YPI is supported by the Barr Foundation, the Boston Foundation, the Hyams Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Funding allowed the hiring of a policy consultant and advocacy project coordinator who helped solidify a plan “to advocate for changes in policy/regulation in favor of a gender-specific approach when working with girls, and to develop gender-specific criteria, based on best practices, that would inform this policy.” Time was devoted to simultaneously summarizing the “best practices” regarding gender-responsive service delivery, preparing a report on the “status of girls” for wide distribution, and convening a public conference highlighting what was learned.11
Phase II Key Results

The articulation of the five core goals of gender-responsive programming was a significant product from Phase II. These goals “formed the basis for program re-design, development of outcome evaluation, and creation of a policy agenda.”

Phase II goals focused on increasing institutional capacity to better serve high-risk girls, increasing agency collaboration, and initiating an advocacy effort/campaign. Significant progress and accomplishments were made in each of these areas.

Capacity Building

Increasing agency capacity was considered at two levels: (a) improving outcome measurement strategies and using evidence-based outcomes to improve program outcomes, and (b) incorporating the five core goals of gender-responsive programming and maintaining these practices.

a. With training and technical assistance, grantees significantly improved their understanding of outcome measurement strategies and their value to the quality of their programming. However, a program’s ability to fully utilize and refine logic models and outcome measurement plans was negatively effected and frequently stymied by structural issues within the organizations such as staff turnover, weak leadership, and challenging data collection processes. For instance, staff training on tools could not keep up with high staff turnover, and program leaders did not offer the necessary supervision to keep front-line workers focused on job responsibilities and priorities.

b. All agencies incorporated three of the five core goals of gender-responsive programming into their work with girls: safety, gender and cultural sensitivity, and feedback from girls. Not all agencies were able to incorporate the final two core goals in gender-responsive programming with girls: leadership development and strengthening families. Lack of training and clear definitions of leadership were cited as challenges.

Capacity-building technical assistance provided by the BMA/BCT (ranging from policy development to hiring consultation) was recognized by the agencies as extremely beneficial. Specific technical assistance tasks by BMA/BCT with the Girls’ Initiative sites included development of (a) a funding proposal template, (b) a trauma assessment protocol, (c) logic models and evaluation tools, (d) a staff training and manual on “family engagement,” and (e) marketing and public relations materials. There was broad agreement that more hours of technical assistance could have been valuable and well utilized.

Collaboration

The second goal of Phase II was the promotion of better connections and ongoing working relationships among organizations that serve high-risk girls. The major venue for fostering collaboration was the Learning Community.

Collaboration within the context of the monthly Learning Community meetings helped agencies come together, build familiarity with one another, network, educate one another, and join forces on common goals for the Learning Community. The advocacy work that transpired would have not likely occurred without the Learning Community forum.

Organizational collaboration outside the context of the Learning Community meetings (e.g., between the grantees) increased only slightly over the three years of Phase II. Desire for organization-level collaboration appeared low and, apparently, restrained by lack of structure, resources, staff turnover, and time availability.

Advocacy

The pursuit of a public policy agenda and advocacy initiative served three purposes: (a) to increase grantee’s knowledge of advocacy work and policy issues pertaining to high-risk system-involved girls, (b) to prepare a report on “the status of girls,” and (c) to shepherd state-level public policy change in support of gender-responsive programming for system-involved girls.

a. Grantee program staff strongly agreed that because of their involvement with the Girls’ Initiative “their knowledge of key policy issues for system-involved girls had increased, and their knowledge of the legislative process and working of the state government had increased.” Networking with other related agencies statewide resulted in more than 70 girl-serving organizations throughout the state establishing affiliation with the Girls’ Initiative (see Appendix B).
b. The publication “Report on High Risk Girls and Gender-Specific Programming” was produced as a result of the advocacy initiative under the leadership of the policy consultant. Copies have been shared with state-level agencies, legislators, and other girl-serving organizations.14

c. The advocacy work of the Learning Community, along with strong support from the BMA/BCT and an advocacy consultant, resulted in the submission of House No. 3418 sponsored by State Representative Cheryl A. Coakley-Rivera of the 10th District of Hampden County: An Act Establishing a Special Commission on Gender-Responsive Programming for System-Involved Girls. This bill calls for the establishment of a commission to recommend to the Governor and General Court a variety of strategies to improve the effectiveness of services for system-involved girls (see Appendix C for copy of House No. 3418/4931.) The Commission tasks would include such activities as (a) conducting a national review of gender-responsive programming implementation successes and challenges by other states’ juvenile justice systems; (b) conducting a national review of published reports, curricula, and best practices for gender-responsive programming by government, foundations, and non-profit organizations; (c) conducting a review of all relevant state training curricula; (d) analyzing and reporting the rates of recidivism for girls within an agency as well as between agencies; and (e) tracking and analyzing educational attainment of system-involved girls (see full list of Commission tasks in Appendix C).

Phase II Lessons Learned

Lesson I: Capacity building must include structural change. Capacity building in organizations, which may include strengthening managerial systems, developing organizational functions, and growing organizational skills and abilities, can be limited by weak leadership and staff turnover. Poor supervision or constant personnel changes interfere with the development and implementation of new or effective program practices. To have any lasting impact, capacity building must include permanent organizational change related to policy, management systems, physical plan, and program guidelines and procedures. In addition, it is essential to implement knowledge-building activities, networking, and single-event training. For instance, programs may institute new policies for staff training or reorganize a social/common space to be more responsive to girls’ safety. It is clear that organizations in the Girls’ Initiative had consensus on the core goals of gender-responsive programming. We believe that approaches to programming will be more institutionalized with broad organizational commitment to gender-responsive training as a standard, along with internal policy change that reflects consideration and support for gender-related differences.

Lesson II: Technical assistance is a critical component of capacity building. Having a technical assistance provider was critically important for successful capacity building and the advocacy campaign. The BMA/BCT and other technical consultants provided expertise in program improvement, sustainability, and program effectiveness, in addition to knowledge of public policy development. Capacity-building activities would not have been as effective without the guidance and contributions of the project’s technical assistance providers.
Lesson III: Like other organizations, youth development programs follow a developmental pathway.

Youth program improvement is a developmental process and is not dependent on the age of the program. Programs in an earlier developmental stage often have few systems in place, unstable leadership, and shorter-term vision. Well-developed programs have strong and consistent staff teams, link with a number of partners to deepen support and programming, are a “learning organization” for everyone, and are well-positioned to consider best practice, outcome measurement, and advocacy. As a program becomes more mature, it can take on more developmentally appropriate tasks, such as self-assessment, best-practice sharing, and partnership building. That some grantee organizations struggled with outcomes measurement and cross-agency collaboration may reflect the realities of program maturity and require attention to more fundamental organization development activities. For instance, some program staff suggested, in retrospect, that a focus on the basics of youth development principles and incorporating a youth development framework would have been valuable. Even programs with a record of service may be without the framework to address youth issues holistically. Additionally, the most effective strategy for outcome measurement intervention may be a streamlined, standardized menu-based process for measuring girl-serving outcomes which (a) considers a program’s developmental stage, (b) includes ongoing technical support, and (c) eventually can be fully managed and institutionalized by the program.

Lesson IV: It is the natural orientation of youth development practitioners and leaders to want to learn from each other and collaborate at a personal level.

The offering and supporting of a monthly Learning Community meeting in which members could learn from each other, review promising practices, and discuss issues of mutual concern was an effective mechanism for building community and solidarity among youth development professionals serving high-risk and system-involved girls. Youth-serving organizations are too often “siloed” in their work. Many youth development workers report feelings of isolation and enthusiastically respond to opportunities to connect with like professionals. The Learning Community successfully tapped into a natural orientation of youth development professionals to want to envision, plan, and advocate for common and heartfelt goals and was central to the accomplishments of Phase II.

Lesson V: Providing the necessary support to engage grassroots participation and investment in public policy development is a worthy choice.

Advocacy work may often be the most underdeveloped aspect of a community-based youth-serving organization’s scope. Community-based youth-serving organizations are typically under-resourced and under-staffed, spending a large proportion of time securing resources to keep activities serving disadvantaged youth intact. By connecting funding to participation in advocacy activities, the Hyams Foundation was able to take advantage of the richness of practitioner voices, and engage those working at the grassroots level to formulate and advance an authentic public policy document that could dramatically reshape statewide orientation toward system-involved girls. Providing the necessary support to engage grassroots participation and investment in public policy development has proven to be an effective strategy.
Taking the Next Steps

The Girls’ Initiative Phase II has proven effective in increasing the capacity of organizations in Boston and Chelsea to serve high risk, system-involved girls and to advance a shared advocacy agenda for gender-responsive programming. The publication of “Report on High Risk Girls and Gender-Specific Programming” and the filing of House No. 3418 are remarkable contributions to the field from this initiative. Within programs, new strategies and practices have been created to make organizations more responsive and better at addressing the needs of high-risk and system-involved girls. No doubt, a population of girls in Boston and Chelsea has been better served because of investments in the Girls’ Initiative. House No. 3418 was referred to the Massachusetts House Committee on Ways and Means in March 2010. The committee redrafted the bill with technical amendments and reported it out favorably as House No. 4931. On July 27, 2010, the full House referred the bill to the House Committee on Bills in Third Reading. Our goal is that passage will follow within the year.

Phase II has completed and the BMA/BCT has accepted stewardship and resource development for the continuation of the Girls’ Initiative. Based on a review of the evaluation reports developed for the Girls’ Initiative and conversations with key program administrators and funding partners, the authors make the following recommendations:

1. **Work closely with legislative partners to marshal the passage of House No. 4931.**

   The proposed legislation is significant validation of the work accomplished so far through the Girls’ Initiative. There is a loosely connected cohort of girl-serving organizations throughout the state that should be tapped to help cultivate support for the passage of the bill.

2. **Solidify a statewide network of girl-serving organizations to support field-building activities.**

   The relationships developed with other girl-serving organizations statewide as part of Phase II can provide a forum for several field-building activities including curriculum development, refining common outcome measurement processes and tools, and best-practice sharing. At the close of Phase II, grantee organizations expressed the need for additional training and technical assistance and introduction to evidenced-based curricula. There is great opportunity to implement a statewide coaching or train-the-trainer model to support the vetting and incorporation of the best practices for gender-responsive programming developed by the Girls’ Initiative. A fair amount of content to develop training modules already exists in “Report on High Risk Girls and Gender-Specific Programming.”
3. **Continue to disseminate and position the “Report on High Risk Girls and Gender-Specific Programming.”**

It is essential to make sure the content of the report is widely accessible. An executive summary or brief report geared towards program leaders and practitioners may be useful. Both the brief report and the larger report should continue to be disseminated widely and available on relevant organization websites.

4. **Convene a high-level partnership/advisory group including relevant state-level agencies to advise Girls’ Initiative strategic activities.**

System-level change will require shared interests and goals relevant to high risk and/or system-involved girls. The experiences of the Girls’ Initiative grantee organizations can be used to shape system-building activities such as a piloting of city/region/statewide gender-responsive staff training or curriculum implementation.

5. **Identify sustainable sources of public and private funding to continue and broaden targeted technical assistance delivered directly to programs statewide.**

Girls’ Initiative grantee organizations noted the value of the customized technical assistance delivered during Phase II. Historically, funding for gender-responsive programming, technical assistance specifically provided to girl-serving organizations, and advocacy work in general has been limited. Yet, data show that the percentage of girls entering the juvenile justice system has remained the same or has increased slightly over the past few years. The necessary emphasis on quality practices that support better outcomes for girls will require ongoing support for technical assistance and capacity-building activities.

The Girls’ Initiative has accounted for many concrete accomplishments in Boston and Chelsea girl-serving youth programs including change in program level practice, new organization policy, expanded staff and administrator knowledge, increased number and quality of relationships among stakeholders, and new accountability structures. The Girls’ Initiative work has also highlighted many persistent challenges that require additional exploration, i.e., “What strategies are needed to institutionalize quality program and practice change, given the staff turnover characteristic of the youth development field?” “What can be done to reduce this level of turnover?” “What are effective motivators and supports to encourage collaboration between organizations strained by limited resources and competition for funding?”

As does other long-term work in the youth development field, the Girls’ Initiative reminds us that strengthening programs in an effort to improve youth outcomes “requires a patient, long-term, multifaceted, adequately funded, and coordinated approach.”16 To make this happen, the Girls’ Initiative will need the support of legislators, funders, program providers, and families.
Participants in the Girls’ Initiative

Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church  
(Generation Excel)

Bridge Over Troubled Waters

Boston Urban Youth Foundation

Caribbean U Turn – (Phase I only)

Dorchester Uhuru Project, Inc.  
(Ella J. Baker House)

Roca Inc

Roxbury Youthworks, Inc.

Youth Advocacy Foundation  
(Youth Advocacy Project)
Appendix B

Organizations Affiliated with the Girls’ Initiative Steering Committee

The Girls’ Initiative, City of Boston
Roxbury Youthworks, Inc.
Bridge Over Troubled Waters

Youth Advocacy Department
Office of State Representative Gloria Fox
GRLZRadio

Affiliates

AIDS Action Committee, Be Safe
Baptist Church and City Mission Safety
Boston Centers for Youth and Families (BCYF), Madison Park Community Center
BCYF, Orchard Gardens Community Center
Bikes Not Bombs
BIPC WHO IS THIS? Spell out
Bird Street Community Center
Boston Area Rape Crisis Center
Boston Chinatown Neighborhood Center
Boston College
Boston Day and Evening Academy
Boston Institute for Psychotherapy
Boston Project Ministries
Boston Public Health Commission
Boston Ten Point Coalition
Boston Women’s Fund
Boston Youth Sports Initiative
Boston Public Schools Comprehensive Sexuality Education
Bridge Over Troubled Waters
Brie Academy
Bromley Heath Tenant Management Center
Brookview House, Inc.
Cambridge Family and Child Services
Casa Myrna Vazquez
Catholic Charities Teen Center
Children’s Services of Roxbury (CSR) – New Leaf
CSR – Youth and Police in Partnership
City of Boston
City Mission Society
Close to Home
Codman Square Health Center
Community Boston Foundation
Compass
Cooperative Artists Institute in JP
Dorchester Nazarene Compassionate Center
Department of Youth Services, Girls’ Community Resource Center
Emmanuel Gospel Center
Family Justice Center, Kim’s Project
Family Services of Greater Boston

Family, Inc.
Federated Dorchester Neighborhood Houses (now College Bound Dorchester)
For Youth, Inc.
Generation Excel
Girl Scouts Of Eastern MA
Girls Golf of New England, Inc.
Girls Inc. of Lynn
Girls LEAP Self Defense
Go Girl Go
GRLZ Radio
Healthy Futures
Home for Little Wanderers
Hyde Square Task Force
Inquilinos Boricuas en Accion
Ideas Grow
Kathryn A. Wheeler Consulting
Louis D. Brown Peace Institute
Medicine Wheel Productions
Metro Lacrosse
Multi-Cultural IL Center of Boston
Museum of Science, Overnight Program
Nexus
Oiste
Political African American Coalition
Project Hip Hop
Project Right Inc.
Quincy-Geneva Housing Development
Reflect and Strengthen
Showdown
Simmons College
Sociedad Latina
Strong Women Strong Girls
Teen Voices
United South End Settlements
Urban Edge
Vietnamese American Civic Association
Wheelock College
Youth Options Unlimited Boston
Youth Enrichment Services
YWCA Boston

*Additional Collaborator: Investing In Girls Alliance
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

By Mr. Murphy of Burlington, for the committee on Ways and Means, that the Bill establishing a special commission on gender-responsive programming for system-involved girls (House, No. 3418) ought to pass with an amendment substituting a bill with the same title (House, No. 4931). July 26, 2010.

FOR THE COMMITTEE:

NAME: Charles Murphy
DISTRICT/ADDRESS: 21st Middlesex

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

In the Year Two Thousand and Ten

An Act establishing a special commission on gender-responsive programming for system-involved girls.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

There shall be a special commission to investigate and study methods of instituting gender-responsive programming for system-involved girls and to improve the effectiveness of services for system-involved girls. The commission shall: (i) conduct a national review of gender-responsive programming implementation successes and challenges by other states’ juvenile justice systems; (ii) conduct a national review of the published reports, curricula and best practices for gender-specific
programming by government, foundations and non-profit organizations; (iii) conduct a national review of leading indicators that lead to girls becoming involved in criminal justice systems; (iv) review all relevant state training curricula; (v) review all relevant state agencies’ methods of data collection and aggregation by gender and race; (vi) analyze and evaluate all relevant state contracts with private or community-based vendors for the purpose of confirming that there is a consistent approach to the delivery of girls’ programming; (vii) analyze and report the rates of recidivism for girls within an agency as well as between agencies; (viii) track and analyze educational attainment of system-involved girls; (ix) hold at least 3 regional community-wide meetings to solicit the input of community members and agencies serving high-risk girls; and (x) establish a mechanism for incorporating the opinion and values of young system-involved girls.

The commission shall be comprised of 20 members: 2 of whom shall be senators appointed by the senate president, 1 of whom shall serve as co-chair of the commission; 2 of whom shall be representatives appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives, 1 of whom shall serve as co-chair of the commission; the secretary of health and human services or a designee; the commissioner of the department of elementary and secondary education or a designee; the commissioner of probation or a designee; the commissioner of the department of youth services or a designee; the commissioner of the department of children and families or a designee; the commissioner of the department of mental health or a designee; the commissioner of the department of public health or a designee; the chief counsel for the committee for public counsel services or a designee; and 8 of whom shall be community members who are geographically representative and who represent current state vendors that provide direct services to high-risk girls appointed by the governor.

The commission shall meet at least 6 times a year and at the call of the chairpersons or a majority of its members. The commission may seek assistance from other organizations or individuals on a pro bono basis.

The commission shall file periodic reports that include recommendations concerning the adoption of gender responsive practices in programs, both community-based and state-wide, serving high-risk and system-involved girls with the clerks of the senate and the house of representatives and the joint committee on children, families and persons with disabilities. The initial report of the commission shall be filed not later than January 31, 2012 and updated biennially thereafter.

2. Massachusetts Office of Health and Human Services. (2010). Annual population analysis – Committed caseload. Retrieved from http://www.mass.gov/?pageID=eohhs2terminal&L=4&L0=Home&L1=Researcher&L2=SpecificPopulations&L3=JuvenileOfFenders&sid=Eeohhs2&b=terminal&csid=Eeohhs2. Since 2003, the number of boys in DYS has decreased at a rate similar to the decrease in the number of girls. Because juvenile justice data reported by police, courts, and probation is not consistently disaggregated by gender, age, and race, we are unable to determine where along the chain of events from arrest to detention to trial to treatment, the number of girls in the justice system has decreased. Therefore we cannot speculate regarding the reasons for the decrease, which interferes with our advocacy efforts to decrease girls’ participation further. Our Youth Policy Initiative colleague, Citizens for Juvenile Justice (CfJJ), has launched its “Just Facts” campaign to require all agencies in the juvenile justice system to collect basic, non-identifying, statistical data and share this data with the public. CfJJ is working with partners statewide to pass Senate bill No. 940 to mandate the collection of basic statistical juvenile justice data. This data is necessary for us to understand and address girls’ involvement in the juvenile justice system in a more meaningful way.

3. In this report, the term “system-involved” refers to girls who have been or are under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court, Department of Children and Families (DCF), or Department of Youth Services (DYS) as a result of a Child in Need of Services cases (CHINS) or delinquency. The girls served are between the ages of 13 to 18 (up to 21 if they remain committed to DYS).


15. NIOST, Developmental Stages for Afterschool Programs, developed by S. O’Connor and Hampshire Educational Collaborative.

Author:
Georgia Hall, PhD. Senior Research Scientist at the National Institute on Out-of-School Time at the Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College.
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