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**Summary**

*Beyond Pink: A Call to Action* was a one-day gathering of juvenile justice professionals to learn strategies for implementing effective care for justice-involved girls. The Justice for Girls Coalition of Washington State (JfG) hosted this first statewide training and advocacy event.

The focus of the conference was to provide some grounding in research-based knowledge regarding girls’ development, raise awareness of biases in the system, emphasize the importance of cross-continuum and cross-agency work and have participants share their own promising practices with each other.

Attended by nearly 100 juvenile justice professionals from 17 counties, we:

- Built momentum for achieving lasting gender-responsive reforms within the Washington State juvenile justice system;
- Increased knowledge and awareness of best practices and policies for supporting girls in prevention and intervention services;
- Developed strategies to implement new knowledge in our workplace;
- Contributed knowledge and expertise to the JfG Coalition plan for moving forward with coordinated reform efforts.

Key insights on gaps in the system emerged during small group roundtable discussions at Beyond Pink. The following observations were made across the groups:

- We react to versus prevent girls’ juvenile justice involvement;
- Decisions made at transition points—from arrest to parole—are not serving girls well nor are they preventing deeper system contact;
- Inadequate gender responsive training exists, especially in the areas of trauma-informed care and female adolescent development;
- Missing links between juvenile justice, education, child welfare, education and child welfare systems hamper our ability to more effectively serve girls;
- There is inadequate training and services available for working with LGBTQ youth;
- Funding for girls’ programs and services is a low priority—possibly due to the relatively smaller numbers they represent, among other reasons.
In addition, program evaluation results suggested that Beyond Pink was an important and highly rated event. The conference contributed primarily through providing a forum for practitioners around the state to network and share strategies for implementing gender-responsive reforms, in addition to providing research-based information on girls’ development and raising awareness through experiential learning. Satisfaction with the conference was assessed on a 5 point scale for five items. Mean scores for each item are:
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The final section of the evaluation asked participants to comment on potential activities to support statewide efforts for reform. Participants were asked to rate five options on a 5 point scale. Results are:

![Justice for Girls Future Activities to Support State Reform](image)
Given the responses to the small-group roundtable observations and conference participant evaluations, the Justice for Girls Coalition believes these next steps are important to take:

**PROCEEDINGS: WHAT WE DID**

8:50-9 Welcome, Agenda and Group Participant Introductions by Ann Muno

Ann welcomed participants to **Beyond Pink, a call to action** to improve services for girls in the juvenile justice system and introduced herself as the Project Director for the Justice for Girls Coalition. Participants were asked to stand and represented nearly every part of the state and potential professional encounter a girl involved in the juvenile justice system has across the continuum of care. This included the detention system, judicial system, community advocates, law enforcement,
probation, and long term residential. Ann then reviewed the plan for the day. This morning, we will have a plenary-style session with some opportunities for turn-to-your-neighbor dialogue. Gender differences research, gender responsive best practice principles and the continuum of care concept will be presented. The goal was to move into the afternoon with a common language and framework for envisioning reform. Ann introduced presenters Susan Waild, Cheryl Sullivan-Colglazier.

9-9:10 Justice Bobbe Bridge Opening Remarks: Why system reform for girls matters NOW (Bobbe was ill, Ann summarized)

Ann shared that reform is happening in pockets all over the country and we’re learning every day how to deepen reform efforts here in our own state. In California, Texas, Utah and Washington recent reform efforts were launched by county or state-level coalitions. Santa Cruz County California’s Girls Task Force, whose mission is to assess the needs of girls at risk of detention and develop prevention program, was instrumental. The Task Force’s collaboration of county agencies, community-based organizations and youth advocates identified four waves of reform. These included: reducing incarceration through use of risk assessment; addressing Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC); assessing the needs of girls and assessing the needs of Lesbian, Gay Bisexual and Transgender youth. Similarly, the county-level effort in Texas was sparked by a strategic planning committee which included a county judge, lead prosecutor, county mental health specialist, lead juvenile probation counselor, local residential placement (private) and non-profit organizations. In Utah the Adolescent Female Advocacy Network (AFAN) has worked to improve system efforts for females for over 10 years. AFAN is supported by the juvenile courts, juvenile justice services, the child welfare system as well as several local private and non-profit organizations. A state-employed female offender specialist currently leads AFAN’s statewide efforts. The early-90s reform effort in Florida, which led to creation of seventeen PACE Centers across the state, was spearheaded by non-profit coalition efforts. Washington State cross system reform efforts were legislative in origin and began when the Washington State House of Representatives’ Health and Human Services convened a hearing on Trends in the Treatment of Girls in the Juvenile Justice System. Testimony included data on female juvenile offender populations, services and programs for meeting their needs and experiences of girls themselves. Post testimony, the Committee Chairwoman, asked the panel to make follow-up recommendations on what the state can do to better support girls in prevention and intervention services. Those who provided testimony formed Justice for Girls Coalition of Washington State which now convenes bi-monthly to share findings and inform strategic directions that relate to gender-responsive data, training, standards, new programs, evaluation and collaborations.
Dr. Walker provided a brief summary of the research literature on the social, psychological and justice intersections with gender. The purpose of the presentation was to present background on where gender differences are observed (in attitudes, development and behavior) and how this impacts involvement in the juvenile justice system and the effectiveness of interventions. A PowerPoint of her slides are available from the coalition on request.

What are gender responsive practice principles endorsed by the Coalition?

Be Culturally Responsive. We take a large view of culture in this principle as reflecting anything that could affect the girl's sense of herself including gender, race, ethnicity, religion, class, ability and sexual orientation. As a basic ethical mandate, providing services in the context of cultural competence is about helping to identify natural supports, building on individual and cultural strengths, and reinforcing the girls' sense of self-worth. It also encompasses other precepts of gender-responsive practice, including the acknowledgement that gender is important to consider when developing policies. In addition, this principle highlights the diversity among girls as well, that treatment may interact with culture as well as gender. In practice, this principle is reflected in providing individualized treatment and making accommodations for unique needs.

Build from Relational Theory. This principle, drawing from Gilligan's theory of female development as well as examples from our study, asserts that healthy, female development hinges on healthy, mutual relationships. This principle applies both to training for staff to learn how to work effectively with girls, as well as in developing interventions for the girls themselves. Girls in the Division of Youth Correctional facilities in Colorado are offered a healthy relationship, healthy sexuality, body image and economic literacy intervention through Girls Inc. of Metro Denver. Further, staff members in these facilities receive training on female relational aggression and gender differences.

Address Safety. Safety is nearly always listed in other lists of gender-responsive principles. We include trust development, trauma-informed care and being aware of socially-based power differences as part of this principle of safety. While safety is most intuitively translated into policies governing housing, our definition also applies to general environmental and social conditions across the continuum. So, for example, we see safety as a principle at work in the development of the gender-responsive unit in the probation department in Cook County, IL. In these courts, the judge is female and is trained in female development and trauma. As girls await court, they are placed in a shelter care facility rather than a detention center (if appropriate). Girls who transition to probation are put on girl-only, reduced caseloads of 25-30 youth. Probation officers received yearly gender-responsive
training and have the flexibility to facilitate their own groups if an issue becomes prevalent with their current caseload.

**Use Skills-based, Strengths-based approach.** This principle encompasses practices that aim to build confidence as well as competencies to facilitate success in and outside of the system. Many of the programs reviewed in our study had an explicit or implicit assumption that system-involved girls, in general, are in situations in which they feel powerless whether through poverty, abuse or chaotic households. Certainly the research literature supports this assumption. Respondents to our survey cited the importance of including strengths in assessments, so that they can be used for treatment planning. In the West Virginia facility, girls are included in treatment planning and are immediately given information about phone calls, visits and are introduced to key members of the staff. In Washington State, all probation counselors are trained in motivational interviewing and develop goals with the youth while also ensuring that the youth stays accountable to conditions of probation.

**Serve Girls Holistically.** This last principle can, in a sense, encompass all the above principles and practices. We particularly want to emphasize a holistic view that emphasizes the importance of understanding the girls’ home environment, natural supports and multifaceted needs. A well-planned transition from any phase of the continuum back into the community is critical in facilitating a girl’s success. In Bexar, TX girls ordered into the correctional facility are assigned a specially-trained probation counselor who works with the girl and her family through the residential stay and continues to work with the girls and family upon release. In the West Virginia facility, the initial intake includes an assessment of needs (educational, mental health, relational, etc) and a discharge plan in which the facility identifies needed services that staff members help to access on the girls’ behalf. Evidence-based treatments available through probation departments and the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration in Washington State emphasize the ecological context of the girl’s functioning and identify natural supports to encourage positive behaviors (Multisystemic Therapy, Family Functional Therapy).

**What is the continuum model?** The continuum model we developed organizes the guiding principles of these programs across the continuum of care. Looking at the practices being implemented by juvenile justice practitioners to improve the system’s response to girls would be a good way to begin building a framework for understanding “best practice” in this area. We use the term continuum to describe the pathway through the entire offender juvenile justice process including arrest and initial court proceedings, pre-adjudication housing and detention, probation/community services, residential placement and parole/reentry.

We adopted a practice-based evidence lens in developing this model. Practice-based evidence asserts that innovative and effective treatments and practices will only be discovered in the laboratory of actual practice and is complementary to rigorous, evidence-based evaluation.
The continuum concept is useful for organizing principles of gender-responsive practice because the characteristics and needs of girls at the various stages on the continuum may vary in quality and/or quantity. For example, interventions at the court phase for status offenders should differ from interventions designed for girls at a much deeper level of system involvement. Second, adopting the continuum perspective encourages a focus on the continuity of care...

The continuum model provides the frame to organize the gender-responsive principles within practice areas common to each level. Each principle is intended to be applied at each practice point within each phase of the continuum. For example, “Be Culturally Responsive” is a principle that should be applied during screening/assessment activities from Arrest/Adjudication through Parole; and then again with treatment/services activities from Arrest/Adjudication through Parole and so on. In developing this model, it was obvious that some principles had a more immediately clear application within certain practice areas. For example, it was easy to see how the principle of safety could be applied to residential settings. Indeed, the principle of safety itself was identified precisely because administrators and practitioners were already addressing this issue. However, rather than create silos for principles within practice areas, we made a conscious decision to challenge ourselves to think about applications in all areas to enhance consistency in practice recommendations and care.

The levels of the continuum model itself, from Arrest through Parole, were selected as commonly recognized, major transition points in a criminal offender process. For the sake of parsimony, other possible pathways are not explicitly noted (for example, truancy initiatives or specialty courts) but can likely be included within one of the broad levels of involvement. The practice areas (Screening/Assessment; Treatment/Services; Staff Training; Environment; Transition) reflect our understanding of important activities that occur at each phase of the continuum; these were also reinforced by responses to our multistate survey in which respondents naturally commented on gender-responsive services in the context of these areas.

“Screening/Assessment” typically occurs at every phase of the continuum in best practice so that emergent needs (e.g., suicidality) are immediately addressed and a holistic approach through assessment is used to guide disposition, treatment planning and transitions out of the system. “Treatment/Services” encompass interventions provided by the system or through community partners. “Staff Training” delineates the professionals and staff members that could benefit from training in female development and other associated topics within each level. “Environment” includes the physical attributes of courts and residential centers that facilitate the expression of gender-responsive principles. Finally, “Transition” is the planning process for encouraging successful functioning independent of the juvenile
justice system. Figure 1 illustrates some examples of practices that embody the gender-responsive principles within each practice point. Most of these practices are taken from responses in our multistate study. Those marked with an asterisk are examples we developed of possible practices that embody one or more gender-responsive principles.

**BREAK 10:00**

10:30-11:45 Molly Pencke, Devon de Lena, Aubrey Francis, *Challenging Bias in the System & In Our Practices*

Break for lunch and participants reconvened for Keynote at 12:30.

12:30 Rebecca Larkin introduced keynote speaker Leslie Briner

I am pleased to introduce Leslie Briner today. Leslie is originally from the San Francisco, Bay Area. She relocated to Seattle in 2008 to complete her Masters in Social Work (MSW) at the University of Washington. Leslie has worked in the field of direct services with children, youth and families for over ten years. She has worked in programs for homeless families, youth with developmental disabilities, foster care youth and, since 2005, has worked with commercially sexually exploited (CSE) youth. Leslie served as the program director of youth services at SAGE (Standing Against Global Exploitation) in San Francisco, CA from 2005 to 2007. Since 2009 she has worked as an intern/consultant with the City of Seattle Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division in their efforts to develop community based training and programming to respond to commercially sexually exploited youth in Seattle. In 2010 Leslie became the Associate Director of Residential Services for YouthCare overseeing the new continuum of services for commercially sexually exploited youth in Seattle. Leslie is here today to share her perspectives on what gender responsiveness means in the context of the Bridge Program.

**12:30-12:45 Leslie Briner**

Leslie shared her insights about why gender responsive principles matter and thinking about issues in the continuum context was important for working effectively with girls. After Leslie finished, Rebecca asked coalition facilitators to stand for breakout sessions, ask participants to look for their star color, and follow a facilitator to their break-out room.

**1:00-2:30 Program Breakouts & Evaluation**

Group #1 Ryan Pinto & Hilltop Artists, Pierce County Juvenile Court presenter Karen Gough
The following guidelines were used during breakouts.

The roundtable discussion group objective was to create a gender responsive environment to allow participants in 5 groups of 15-25 people to mix across the continuum to:

1. Gather and share information about GR services from professionals in all parts of the juvenile justice continuum of care;
2. Identify gaps in services; and
3. Provide opportunities to find ways to close some of those gaps.

Roles:

- **Facilitator** - Coalition member assigned who will lead the group in break out activities
- **Program Model Presenter(s)** – professionals from across the state selected to present information on their GR program and model the process for other participants
- **Recorder** – Records information on flip charts for report out
- **Report Out Presenter** – Presents groups information to large group

**Program Model Presenters**

- Provide a brief program description to the group (name, who participates, goal of program, etc.)
- Provide 3-4 specific examples of how your program addresses the gender responsive principles outlined in the attached continuum document. For example: what safety and security measures do they take to be more gender-responsive, and less traumatizing (i.e. changing from jumpsuits to two piece suits, process group that strengthens relationships, basic codes you teach girls to help them succeed; changes in use of restraints).

1:00 to 2:30 Activity:

1:00-1:50  Small group introduction to the activity and roundtable discussion.

5 min. - Facilitator lays out the basic ideas of the continuum and gender
responsive best practices endorsed by the coalition. Quick round of introductions. Introduce Presenter(s).

10 - 15min. - Program Model Presenter(s) share info on program (see details below*)

30 - 35 min. – Group participants share GR program information moderated by the facilitator. Facilitator ensures information reflects GR practice/principles for quality assurance of participants learning. Allow time for Q & A. Recorder lists program names, contact person, contact information (phone number and e-mail address).

1:50-2:20 Small group discussion: Using the continuum as a guide, think about the gaps in gender responsive services in the system you work in. What concrete actions would enhance what you’re doing? Compile top 3 for group report out.

30 min. Facilitator guides the conversation and Recorder captures ideas generated by the group.
10 min. Choose top 3 gaps and actions for large group presentation.

2:20-2:30 Evaluation

2:30-2:45PM BREAK

2:45-3:45 Barbara Carr and Ryan Pinto REPORT OUT TO LARGE GROUP

See GAPS, GENDER RESPONSIVE TIPS & PROGRAM RESOURCES BELOW

3:45-4:00 WRAP & RAFFLE Ryan Pinto

Ryan thanked sponsors including the Region X Office on Women’s Health, the Washington State Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice, the University of Washington School of Medicine’s Public Behavioral Health & Justice Policy Center, Center for Children & Youth Justice, Bobbe & Jon Bridge, Michelle, Rosen, Kay Smith-Blum & Sonia Campbell

GAPS IDENTIFIED ACROSS THE CONTINUUM

Through roundtable discussion, the following themes were identified:

- We react to versus prevent girls’ juvenile justice involvement;
- Decisions made at transition points—from arrest to parole—are not serving girls well nor are they preventing deeper system contact;
- Inadequate gender responsive training exists, especially in the areas of trauma-informed care and female adolescent development;
• Missing links between juvenile justice, education, child welfare, education and child welfare systems hamper our ability to more effectively serve girls;
• There is inadequate training and services available for working with LGBTQ youth;
• Funding for girls’ programs and services is a low priority—possibly due to the relatively smaller numbers they represent, among other reasons. What can we do to be more gender responsive

What we can do to be more gender responsive:

Safety

Ensure confidentiality

Non-judgmental, 3 positives to 1 critique, build trust before addressing very sensitive issues; gender separation;

Be aware of your language; have self-and social awareness

Be mindful of facial expressions, especially judgmental ones

Utilize community resources, be aware of staffing patterns

Challenge personal and system biases; change the institutional culture

Implement a “Hands Off” policy; use least restrictive force;

Relationship-based

Be relationship-based, approachable and youth driven, ask: what does client need?

Group work, share expertise, support, relate to others

Model healthy relationships and be there for clients, girls, youth

Get involved and engage volunteer; provide female mentors

Promote staff-teamwork/relationships; Gender responsive principles guide practice, training and discussions with staff

Culturally-responsive

Use screening and assessment to identify individual and cultural strengths and needs

Recognize the diversity among girls themselves
Develop individual treatment plans that take into account girls’ cultural needs, geographic location and language needs

**Holistic**

In home services, connect to services

Client family driven, client identifies “family” support

Reach out to family//showcase; Transportation; Functional Family Parole

**Strength, skills-based**

Provide actual skills and training opportunities

Employment services/community contacts

Partner with schools, be education-based and increase awareness of importance of education

DBT, Girls Circle, ILS & provide pro-social activities

Offer weekly groups and $ incentives

Girls choose projects and focus leadership, play to individual strengths.

**Ideas and insights from small group discussions**

“Don’t let the lack of resource or rules shut you down—creativity, will, and the right supporters can help you make something happen. There are still many things that can be done to help a program be gender responsive without a lot of money (i.e. you may not have a dedicated room that can be decorated to be a more comfortable environment for the girls, but you can temporarily convert the space you have to make it gender responsive for the group of girls you have in group (bring the things you need in and temporarily convert the space – screens, rugs, pillows, music, etc.).”

“In terms of rules, go ahead and ask the question. Sometimes we make assumptions about what can or can’t be done. When it came to ensuring enough girls for groups, one program worked to get permission and then creatively meet agency needs to combine girls in detention and on probation for Girls Circle groups. This allowed girls to participate who might not otherwise have been able to and made some of the discussions richer because of the different perspectives the girls brought to the circle. Mixed girl populations can work in other ways too and security requirements can be creatively met with willing decision makers and service delivery professionals.”

“A discussion that led to a level of open discussion that is not typically found in many groups was related to gender identity and its continuum. One conclusion from the group was the importance of not recreating the problem of bias and stereotyping that
currently exists in our culture (sexism, gender bias, the other isms) by narrowly defining what gender responsive for girls means (i.e., being a girls can look and be expressed a lot of different ways, so don’t create reform that opens the door to some, but closes the door to other girls). Biology, science, history, culture can teach us a lot and you still have to meet the girl in front of you where she is to have the results.”

“People are really excited about this work and committed to it because of the girls and the potential they have and we have as professionals and a system.”

“Relationship matters in program creation and implementation too. Let’s learn from each other, combine resources to get more training, services, and girls in good programs.”

“There were different perspectives and levels of knowledge and understanding, but it seemed everyone was really practicing good GR principles by being good communicators (listening to understand, asking clarifying questions, etc). What could have become a very tense situation regarding gender identity turned into an insightful conversation that helped most if not all to better understand complexities of the work and continue to learn in order to provide the best interventions.”

**Programs resources**

**Girls Circle**

Girls Circle facilitator Karen Gough 253.798.7953

Kitsap: Shannon Porter sporter@co.kitsap.wa.us

Pierce: Melissa Clark mclark@co.pierce.wa.us 253.798.3355

Adams: Angie Valdivinas 509.498.5646

Clallam & King

**Aggression Replacement Therapy (ART) Girls Only** in Pierce County

**Urban Art Works** in King County

**Los Suenos New Hope Dating Violence Prevention, DV & Sexual Assault in Moses Lake, WA**

**LEAP (Learning Employment Achievement Potential**  Lori Kessel 206.621.3400

**Positive Steps** (King & Pierce Counties  Jill Patnode 253.778.7839

**JRA Girl’s Facility**

**Detention Alternatives** in Spokane & Ridgeview Community
The following report displays the results from the Beyond Pink conference evaluation. The evaluation was completed by 60 of the 100 individuals who attended the conference. The evaluation was filled out after the breakout sessions and before the final wrap which included report outs from the breakout groups.

The conference evaluation included three main categories.

- General Satisfaction
- Future Conference Ideas
- Justice for Girls Strategic Planning

General Satisfaction

Satisfaction with the conference was assessed on a 5 point scale for five items. Mean scores for each item are illustrated below.

The mean scores illustrate a high degree of satisfaction overall with the event; participants were most likely to indicate that the event was well-organized but rated the conference objectives lower than other domains.

The participants were also asked to write in what they thought was most helpful about the event. These responses were coded according common themes and are illustrated in the pie graph below.
A noticeable majority of participants cited the breakout sessions and/or the ability to network with others as the most helpful aspect of the event. Other responses included the passion and inspiration of speakers/participants (12.1%), developmental and research information (19%) and experiential learning opportunities that imparted greater awareness (10.3%).

**Future Conference Ideas**

In order to plan for future events, participants were asked to rate the helpfulness of various presentation formats for future conferences. Options were scored on a 5 point scale; mean scores are reported below.

The results indicate that training was highly rated as an important part of additional events, followed by having breakout group discussions by region/county. Promising practices and sharing information about local reforms within Washington State were also rated favorably. Participants were relatively less enthusiastic about hearing from national leaders or sharing personal reform efforts.

The evaluation then asked participants to write in what could be improved about the conference. These responses were coded into three broad themes; however, the diversity of comments was significant and so most responses fall into an “other category.” Only 28 of the 60 respondents offered a suggestion for improvement. The themes are illustrated below.
After the “other” category, the most common suggestion was to provide more specific information about how to develop and implements gender-responsive practices (32.1%). Following this, participants suggested including more youth voice and expanding the conference to 2 days.

Justice for Girls Coalition Strategic Planning

The final section of the evaluation asked participants to comment on potential activities the JfG Coalition could implement to support statewide efforts for reform. Participants were asked to rate five options on a 5 point scale. The results are below.

While most options were rated as potentially helpful, continuing Beyond Pink conferences and training on trauma-informed care had the highest mean scores. One on one mentoring received relatively lower scores.

Participants were then asked to identify which of the above strategies would be the most useful; as some participants rated more than one option, the percentages reflect the percentage of responses (n = 43) rather than participants who answered this question (n = 40). A pie graph of these responses is illustrated below.
Consistent with the high ratings for training, both trauma training and training on girls’ development were cited as the most important strategies for support reform. These were followed by a state infrastructure to support local efforts and share ideas (20.9%), continuing Beyond Pink conferences (9.3%) and one on one mentoring (7.0%).

**Summary**

The Beyond Pink conference was an important and highly rated event that contributed primarily through providing a forum for practitioners around the state to network and share strategies for implementing gender-responsive reforms, in addition to providing basic, research-based information on girls’ development and raising awareness through experiential learning. Future conferences should expand the training efforts related to girls’ development as well as trauma-informed care in addition to continuing to provide opportunities for networking and sharing practical strategies. To accomplish this, the next event should probably be expanded to two days. Youth voice should also be incorporated more visibly throughout the event.

Given the responses to this evaluation, the Justice for Girls Coalition can support statewide reforms efforts most effectively by focusing on providing training that imparts practical skills for intervention based on girls’ development and trauma. A practical and feasible option for accomplishing this might be through future Beyond Pink conferences, in addition to examining other policy options for sustaining this type of training (e.g., other statewide conferences, Criminal Justice Training Commission). In addition, a statewide infrastructure was rated by 8 participants as the most important strategy for supporting and sustaining reforms. The Justice for Girls coalition could examine the viability of developing this infrastructure to encourage local development and sustainability for reforms.

For questions or comments regarding these results contact Dr. Sarah Walker, Division of Public Behavioral Health & Justice Policy, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Washington. secwalkr@uw.edu.
**Next Steps**

We have identified inter-connected goals to move the gender responsive reform efforts forward. These are:

- **Develop Coalition Website**
- **Offer Annual Beyond Pink**
- **Build Statewide Infrastructure**

### Statewide Infrastructure
- Expand the coalition using a nomination process. New members, representing points across the continuum and different regions, develop training strategy and vision for reform.

### Coalition Website
- Develop a new Justice for Girls Coalition website so we can provide a clearinghouse of resources and reform updates.

### Annual Beyond Pink
- Offer Beyond Pink as an annual statewide event to provide training that imparts practical skills for intervention based on girls’ development and trauma.
**Coalition Mission**

The Justice for Girls Coalition of Washington State, organized in 2007, is a state-wide group leading efforts to expand expertise in gender responsive/specific programming for females in the juvenile justice system and use that expertise to help influence policy and program development toward sustainable improvements. To accomplish this work, the coalition focuses on promoting changes in policy, program, and system culture. Email us at justiceforgirls.wa to request more information.

**Additional Resources**

The following documents are available upon request

- Bios of coalition membership
- Coalition’s continuum model
- Slides from the *Why Gender Matters* presentation
- List of resources
- List of attendees