

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
ALABAMA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2007, the state paid \$12.5 million to settle a lawsuit by 48 girls alleging sexual abuse in the state’s Chalkville youth corrections facility after a federal judge substantiated the girls’ claims of widespread and longstanding abuse. Allegations in the case involved at least 15 staff.</p> <p>Sources: “Alabama to Settle Lawsuits over Abuse at Teen Detention Center,” <i>Times Daily</i> (Florence, AL), February 8, 2007; and “Chalkville: \$12.5 million paid to end sex scandal at DYS,” <i>Birmingham News</i>, May 5, 2007.</p>
ALASKA	No systemic problems identified	
ARIZONA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2004, a U.S. Department of Justice investigation documented widespread physical and sexual abuse of youth by staff at the state’s Adobe Mountain School youth facility, excessive and inappropriate use of disciplinary isolation, as well as failure to protect youth from attacks by other youth (and in some cases actively encouraging fights among youth). Some of the same problems were also identified in the state’s Black Canyon, and Catalina training schools.</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigation of Adobe Mountain School and Black Canyon School in Phoenix; and Catalina School in Tuscon, Arizona</i>, January 23, 2004.</p>
ARKANSAS	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 1998, a series in the <i>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</i> revealed that youth in the state’s juvenile facilities were “routinely degraded; verbally, physically and sexually abused; hogtied; forced to sleep outside in freezing weather” and that “staff members have slugged children in the face and then refused to allow them to be treated by a nurse. They have locked children naked in cells overnight after turning the air conditioning on high.” A U.S. Department of Justice investigation of Arkansas’s Alexander Youth Services Center in 2002 found that the facility failed to provide constitutionally required mental health and educational services, suicide prevention, fire safety or religious freedom, but it did not reveal the types of extreme maltreatment documented earlier. However, in 2006, an internal investigation by state’s Health and Human Services Department revealed that staff in the Alexander facility “were drugging youths to control unruly behavior — in many cases without doctors’ orders, in violation of facility policy and against the children’s wills.” The day after these abuses were revealed, the state abruptly cancelled the contract of the corporation hired in 2001 to operate the Alexander facility. In addition, a 2007 report commissioned by the Arkansas’s Disability Rights Center and the National Center for Youth Law reported continuing maltreatment at the facility (which had been renamed as the Arkansas Juvenile Assessment and Treatment Center), declaring that “isolation is imposed arbitrarily and without the procedures normally required to protect youth’s due process rights and to ensure their safety during the period in which they are confined to their rooms.” In 2007, the National Center</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
ARKANSAS continued		<p>for Youth Law reported that youth confined in the Alexander facility were “being subjected to serious abuse and other unlawful practices” such as being inappropriately medicated with anti-psychotic drugs and subjected to painful and unnecessary physical restraint.</p> <p>Sources: Mary Hargrove, “Welcome to Hell: Troubled Youth in State Custody Face ‘Lesson-Teaching’ Beatings, Filthy Quarters, Cramped Cells, Unwanted Sex, and Caretakers Who Don’t Care,” <i>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</i>, June 14, 1998; U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of Alexander Youth Services Center, November 8, 2002; Mary Upshaw, “Arkansas Fires Firm Running Youth Lock-up,” <i>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</i>, November 4, 2006; Tim Roche & Kelly Dedel, <i>Conditions of Confinement at the Arkansas Juvenile Assessment and Treatment Center</i>, National Center for Youth Law and Disability Rights Center, August 13, 2007; and National Center for Youth Law, “NCYL Works to Reform Arkansas Juvenile Justice System,” www.youthlaw.org/juvenile_justice/ncyl_works_to_reform_arkansas_juvenile_justice_system/</p>
CALIFORNIA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>California witnessed an alarming number of reports since 2000 documenting systemic violence and maltreatment in its youth corrections system. These revelations caused a high-profile statewide youth corrections crisis that has been ongoing for several years. Many of the problems — including physical abuse by staff, excessive use of isolation and restraint, and failure to protect youth from harm — were cited in a class-action lawsuit, <i>Farrell v. Cate</i>, filed in 2003. An expert review of facility conditions conducted in 2003 as part of the lawsuit determined that the system suffered from “a serious problem of violence in its institutions” as well as excessive reliance on isolation, including “the use of cages to isolate non-compliant youth.” In 2006, an expert review panel reported that the state’s youth facilities were still plagued with high levels of violence, unsafe conditions for both youth and staff, and frequent lockdowns.</p> <p>Sources: Barry Krisberg, <i>General Corrections Review of the California Youth Authority</i>, December 23, 2003; and <i>Safety and Welfare Plan: Implementing Reform in California</i>, Submitted to the Safety and Welfare Planning Team to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice, March 31, 2006.</p>
COLORADO	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>The High Plains Youth Center, a privately operated youth facility serving adjudicated youth from Colorado and several other states was shut down in 1998 following the suicide of one youth resident and a long string of incidents involving sexual assaults, physical abuse, and excessive use of force by facility staff.</p> <p>Source: “Decade of Warnings Preceded Action Against Brush Lockup,” <i>Denver Post</i>, April 21, 1998; and “State Closes Juvenile Jail: More Instances of Abuse Found at High Plains,” <i>Denver Post</i>, April 21, 1998.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
CONNECTICUT	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2002, Connecticut’s Attorney General and Child Advocate jointly released reports detailing serious deficiencies at two state-funded youth corrections facilities. A May 2002 report criticized the state Department of Children and Families for licensing and failing to properly oversee a privately run youth corrections facility, Haddam Hills Academy, where staff organized some youth residents to act as “hit squads” against other youth in the facility. A September 2002 report detailed deep problems at the newly opened Connecticut Juvenile Training School, including the excessive, arbitrary, and unsafe use of physical restraints. (Follow-up reports at CTJS in 2003 and 2004 found continuing problems with excessive and unsafe reliance on physical restraints.)</p> <p>Sources: <i>Report of the Attorney General and the Child Advocate: Department of Children and Families Oversight of Haddam Hills Academy, May 30, 2002;</i> and <i>Report of the Attorney General and the Child Advocate: Connecticut Juvenile Training School, September 19, 2002.</i></p>
DELAWARE	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>A class-action lawsuit originally filed in 1990, then amended (and expanded) in 1992, detailed ongoing maltreatment at Delaware’s Ferris School youth corrections facility (and also at the New Castle County Detention Center). At Ferris School, the complaint identified excessive and unwarranted isolation, pervasive verbal abuse from staff, physical abuse, and encouragement from staff for youth to attack or fight other youth, among other problems. In May 1994, the court approved a settlement agreement in which the state agreed to substantially reform practices at the Ferris School regarding isolation, restraints, and many other factors.</p> <p>Source: <i>John A. and Mary B. v. Castle, Civil Action. No. 90-200 (D. Delaware)</i></p>
DC	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>The District of Columbia’s youth corrections system has been under court supervision continuously since 1986, when the District entered into a consent decree in a lawsuit filed the previous year over pervasive problems (including periodic physical assaults on youth by facility staff, failure to protect youth from assaults by other youth, and excessive and unwarranted use of isolation) in three District youth facilities. The courts have imposed millions of dollars in fines in the past 20-plus years over the District’s failure to adhere to the settlement agreement, and dangerous and abusive conditions continued at the District’s Oak Hill facility well past the year 2000. In a 2004 congressional hearing, the District’s public defender office testified that the facility remained drug-ridden and plagued by violence. The <i>Washington Post</i> cited testimony from an expert observer noting that violence in the facility was so severe that six youth in the facility suffered broken jaws in the first half of 2002 — and that the use of isolation at Oak Hill remained excessive and unwarranted.</p> <p>Sources: <i>Jerry M. v. District of Columbia, C.A. No. 1519-85 (IFP) (Super. Ct.);</i> <i>Testimony by Ronald Sullivan (public defender) before the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia;</i> and <i>“Court Takeover of D.C. Youth Services Administration Urged,” Washington Post, January 21, 2004.</i></p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
FLORIDA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>Florida juvenile corrections facilities have seen a large number of tragedies and abuses in recent years, including the deaths of nine confined youth — including two who died as a result of violent staff restraints, and one who was attacked by another youth. (Others died by suicide, or due to medical neglect.) In 2010, the <i>St. Petersburg Times</i> published a six-part investigative series detailing decades of abuses at the state’s Dozier training school, including reports documenting substantial violence and staff abuses in recent years. In a 2004 news article, the <i>Orlando Sentinel</i> reported that DJJ staff were responsible for 661 verified cases of child abuse from 1994 to 2004, including 119 confirmed cases in the 2001–02 fiscal year. In the five years prior to its closure in 2005, the Florida Institute for Girls, a maximum security facility, registered “hundreds of allegations of physical, sexual abuse, and poor supervision,” according to news accounts. Four girls suffered broken arms while being physically restrained by staff.</p> <p>Sources: “100 Years Later and It’s Still Hell,” <i>St. Petersburg Times</i>, October 11, 2010; “Operators of Girls Prison Get A Warning Despite Advances, State Agency Wants Fixes to Program,” <i>South Florida Sun-Sentinel</i>, April 15, 2005; and “Young Offenders at Risk: Reports of Deaths and Abuse Have Racked the State Agency for Troubled Youth,” <i>Orlando Sentinel</i>, April 11, 2004.</p>
GEORGIA	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>In 1998, a U.S. Department of Justice investigation documented what it termed “a pattern of egregious conditions violating the federal rights of youths in...Georgia juvenile facilities.” These violations included physical abuse and abusive use of mechanical restraints on mentally ill youth in state-run boot camps, and excessive use of physical force by staff in the state’s Youth Development Centers (i.e., training schools). “Because of these conditions,” the Justice Department wrote, “many youths have suffered grievous harm, such as being injured or hospitalized due to fights with other youths or physical abuse by staff.”</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigation of State Juvenile Justice Facilities (Georgia)</i>, February 12, 1998.</p>
HAWAII	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2005, a U.S. Department of Justice investigation found that staff at the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility “routinely use excessive force against youth, confine youth to their cells for days on end, [and] discipline youth without justification or oversight.” The report further noted that “it is no exaggeration to describe HYCF as existing in a state of chaos.”</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigation of the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility</i>, August 4, 2005.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
IDAHO	Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since	<p>Filed in 1984, a class-action lawsuit (Danny O. v. Bowman) alleged serious problems at Idaho’s State Youth Services Center. In July 1985, a federal judge issued “Findings of Fact,” which stated that the facility employed a number of “cruel” and excessive practices, including a number of painful and degrading restraint techniques (“standing chair,” “standing wall,” shackling youth spread-eagle to their beds), as well as excessive use of solitary confinement.</p> <p>Source: Danny O. v. Bowman, No. Civ. 84-1272 (D. Idaho).</p>
ILLINOIS	<i>Suggestive evidence of maltreatment since 2000, but no compelling proof.</i>	<p>While a 2008 monitoring report on the Illinois Youth Center in Harrisburg by the John Howard Association did not describe conditions as abusive, it detailed troubling conditions. The report stated that until October 2006, youth placed into the facility’s “reassignment unit” following a disciplinary event were placed held in their rooms for 23 hours per day and spent the remaining hour in a 12’ by 20’ cage. Youth were assigned to this unit for a minimum of three weeks. The report also states that youth were confined for 2,749 days in October 2006 — meaning one of every four residents were held in seclusion every day. The report also noted that the facility had more than 300 “occurrences” each month involving fighting, assaults, intimidation or threats, contraband, or insolence.</p> <p>Source: “Charting Change” — Progress in the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice: IYC Harrisburg, April 2008.</p>
INDIANA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2005, the U.S. Department of Justice investigated and documented unsafe and unconstitutional conditions in Indiana’s Plainfield Juvenile Correctional Facility and South Bend Juvenile Correctional Facility. At Plainfield, the investigation found that confined youth “live in a violent culture where physical assaults between youths occur regularly, overt sexual behavior among youths is commonplace, and corrections staff often use excessive physical force when restraining youths.” At South Bend, the investigation also found “an unacceptably high rate of youth violence.” A third Department of Justice investigation in 2005 at Indiana’s Logansport Juvenile Intake/Diagnostic Facility found “egregious” deficiencies in mental health treatment, but did not cite systemic problems with violence or with physical and sexual abuse. Finally, in 2010 the U.S. Department of Justice investigated a fourth training school, the Indianapolis Juvenile Correctional Facility, and identified serious problems with staff sexual abuse and misconduct, inappropriate and excessive use of force, and excessive use of isolation employed without adequate due process protections.</p> <p>Sources: U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigations of Plainfield Juvenile Correctional Facility and South Bend Juvenile Correctional Facility, September 9, 2005; and Indianapolis Juvenile Correctional Facility, January 29, 2010.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
IOWA	No systemic problems identified	
KANSAS	<i>Suggestive evidence of maltreatment since 2000, but no compelling proof.</i>	<p>In 2009, the <i>Topeka-Capital Journal</i> published a series of stories in 2009 exposing problematic conditions at the Forbes Juvenile Attention Center, a privately run youth facility in Topeka, including the repeated rape of a 12-year-old resident by an older youth. The facility closed in December 2009.</p> <p>Sources: “Youth Detention Center in ‘Chaos,’” <i>Topeka Capital-Journal</i>, October 17, 2009, and “Juvenile Center Faces Scrutiny,” <i>Topeka Capital-Journal</i>, December 2, 2009.</p>
KENTUCKY	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>In a 1995 investigation, the U.S. Department of Justice found unconstitutional conditions of confinement in all 13 of Kentucky’s youth corrections centers. Problems included failure to protect youth against incidents of staff abuse and excessive use of isolation rooms. Specifically, the investigators charged that facilities were “confining juveniles in isolation for days or even weeks after the juvenile is no longer a threat to himself or others and for no reasonable treatment purpose.”</p> <p>Sources: U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigations of Owensboro Treatment Center, Green River Boys Camp, Johnson-Breckinridge Treatment Center, Rice-Audubon Treatment Center, and Central Kentucky Treatment Center</i>, July 28, 1995; and <i>U.S. v. Commonwealth of Kentucky</i>, Civil Action No. 3:95 CV-757-S (W. Dist. of KY)</p>
LOUISIANA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 1997, a U.S. Department of Justice investigation reported “serious, systemic, and, in certain cases, life-threatening, harm being inflicted on the juveniles in all four [of Louisiana’s youth corrections] facilities...Serious physical injuries to youth from officer assault or from attacks by other youth have occurred at all four facilities. Literally dozens of juveniles are being seriously injured on a monthly basis across the four facilities.” In 1998, the <i>New York Times</i> printed a front-page story about brutal conditions in Louisiana’s Tullulah youth facility, describing it as “rife with brutality, cronyism and neglect” and noting that its resident “prisoners regularly appear at the infirmary with black eyes, broken noses or jaws or perforated eardrums from beatings by the poorly paid, poorly trained guards or from fights with other boys.”</p> <p>Sources: U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigations of Secure Correctional Facilities for Juveniles in Louisiana</i>, June 18, 1997; and <i>Owensboro Treatment Center, Green River Boys Camp, Johnson-Breckinridge Treatment Center, Rice-Audubon Treatment Center, and Central Kentucky Treatment Center</i>, June 18, 1995; and “Hard Time: A Special Report; Profits At a Juvenile Prison Come at a Chilling Cost,” <i>New York Times</i>, July 15, 1998.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
MAINE	<p>Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since; and suggestive evidence of maltreatment since 2000, but no compelling proof.</p>	<p>A lawsuit filed in 2003 by a former resident of the Maine Youth Center revealed evidence that senior administrators at the facility had “approved of days-long restraint and weeks-long isolations that far exceeded maximum limits” during the 1990s. (The plaintiff in the suit had been tied down in a restraints chair for as long as 49 hours, and spent 87 days in solitary confinement.) Even before the lawsuit was filed, the state had closed Maine Youth Center and replaced it with a new facility (Long Creek) with no isolation cells and ended the practice of physical restraints using handcuffs, leather straps, or restraint chairs in its Boys’ facility. The state settled the lawsuit in 2004 for a reported \$600,000. However, news accounts of an independent evaluation in 2004 noted continued widespread and problematic use of restraints at the state’s youth facility for girls (Mountain View), including reports that facility staff held one girl in isolation for 13 consecutive days without required permission from agency leaders.</p> <p>Sources: “Report: Youth Centers Cut Restraint Use,” <i>Portland Press Herald</i>, January 20, 2004; and “Youth Center lawsuit settled; An ex-resident of the Maine Youth Center will receive \$600,000 after claiming he was abused, tied down and isolated,” <i>Portland Press Herald</i>, February 26, 2004.</p>
MARYLAND	<p>Maltreatment documented since 2000</p>	<p>In December 1999, a four-part investigative report documented widespread physical and verbal abuse of youth in four state-run correctional boot camps. In the resulting scandal, the state’s juvenile corrections secretary resigned and the boot camps were closed. In 2001, the <i>Baltimore Sun</i> documented continuing abuse at the Victor Cullen Center and two other state facilities. At Victor Cullen, six guards were charged with assaulting juveniles or with sexual abuse in 2000, and at least six were fired in 2001 after assault allegations. Victor Cullen residents made 124 emergency room visits in 2000. The facility was closed in 2002. In 2004, the U.S. Justice Department released an investigation of the Charles Hickey School as well as the Cheltenham Youth Facility (which served primarily as a pre-adjudication detention center), finding “a deeply disturbing degree of physical abuse of youth by staff” in both facilities, as well as unsafe restraint practices, widespread youth-on-youth violence, excessive isolation, and other abusive practices. In 2007, a privately operated youth corrections center in Maryland, the Bowling Brook Preparatory School, was forced to close after one youth died as a result of violent restraint, and a pattern of unsafe restraint practices at the facility was revealed.</p> <p>Sources: “Abuse of Teens Persists Despite State Promises,” <i>Baltimore Sun</i>, November 25, 2001; U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigation of Cheltenham Youth Facility and Charles Hickey School</i>, April 9, 2004; “Youth Facility Will Be Closed,” <i>Baltimore Sun</i>, March 3, 2007.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
MASSACHUSETTS	No systemic problems identified	
MICHIGAN	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2005, a U.S. Justice Department investigation of the Maxey Training School, Michigan’s only large youth corrections facility, found a “disturbing” overreliance on physical restraints as well as excessive and often arbitrary use of isolation “for longer than is appropriate and without affording individuals their due process rights.”</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of the W.J. Maxey Training School, April 19, 2004.</p>
MINNESOTA	No systemic problems identified	
MISSISSIPPI	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2003, a U.S. Justice Department investigation revealed scandalous conditions in Mississippi’s two training schools, Oakley and Columbia. As detailed by the <i>New York Times</i>, the investigation found that confined youth “were routinely hogtied, shackled to poles or locked in restraint chairs for hours for minor infractions”; girls were forced to run while carrying tires and boys while carrying logs “sometimes to the point of vomiting”; and girls who misbehaved or got placed on suicide watch were “stripped naked and left in a windowless, stifling cinder-block cell, with nothing but the concrete floor to sleep on and a hole in the floor for a toilet.” In 2007, the Southern Poverty Law Center filed a lawsuit protesting the continuing abuse of girls in the Columbia facility, including girls being shackled for 12 hours per day and forced to eat and go to the bathroom while shackled. The state closed the Columbia facility in 2008.</p> <p>Sources: U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of Oakley and Columbia Training Schools, June 19, 2003; “Care of Juvenile Offenders is Faulted,” <i>New York Times</i>, September 1, 2003; and J.A., et al. v. Barbour, 3:07-CV-394DPJ-JCS (S.D. Miss.).</p>
MISSOURI	Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since	<p>A class-action lawsuit filed in 1973 and settled in 1975 focused primarily on excessive and abusive use of solitary confinement at the State Training School for Boys in Booneville.</p> <p>Source: Harris v. Bell, No. 73-CV-115-W-4 (W.D. Mo.)</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
MONTANA	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>In 1992, a U.S. Department of Justice CRIPA investigation of the state’s training school, the Pine Hills School for Boys, found that the facility’s approach to isolation and seclusion was “arbitrary,” “inappropriate,” “heinous,” and “wholly unacceptable.” One year later, a CRIPA investigation of Mountain View School for Girls found that the uncontrolled use of seclusion was “routinely excessive” and “dehumanizing,” as well as “arbitrary, capricious and a substantial departure from professional standards.” The report on Mountain View also noted the routine use of mechanical restraints (handcuffs, leg irons) “in circumstances that cannot be justified by any rationale for control, order, or safety.”</p> <p>Sources: CRIPA investigation of Pine Hills School for Girls, September 28, 1992; and CRIPA investigation of Mountain View School for Girls, February 26, 1993.</p>
NEBRASKA	No systemic problems identified	
NEVADA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>A 2002 U.S. Department of Justice investigation at the Nevada Youth Training Center identified a pattern or practice of use of excessive force at the facility. Instances documented by the investigators included: “punching youths in the chest, kicking their legs, grabbing shirts and shoving youths against lockers and walls, ‘dipping’ or throwing youths to the floor, slapping youths in the face, smashing youths’ heads in doors, and pulling youths from their beds to the floor. Staff and youths further indicated that, typically, the triggers for the use of force were youths disobeying or failing to follow directions, rather than youths posing an immediate threat of harm to themselves or others.”</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of Nevada Youth Training Center, November 12, 2002.</p>
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>After investigating a troubling incident in 2008 involving the use of force and restraints by staff at the state’s training school, the Sununu Youth Center, New Hampshire’s Disability Rights Center undertook a comprehensive review of 139 restraint incidents in the facility and found “a pervasive pattern of inappropriate restraints and excessive use of force by facility staff.” Specifically, the review found that: 42 percent of youth studied had been subject to restraints during their time at Sununu; staff applied excessive force in 53 percent of incidents reviewed; youth suffered injuries in 39 percent of incidents reviewed; and in 45 percent of incidents reviewed staff applied force or restraint that was not justified by the situation.</p> <p>Source: <i>Investigative Report, Findings & Recommendations: The Use of Force and Restraint and Adequacy of Mental Health Care at the John H. Sununu Youth Services Center</i>, Disability Rights Center, October 5, 2010.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
NEW JERSEY	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>New Jersey newspapers published a flurry of critical news stories in 1994 over conditions of confinement in the state’s juvenile corrections facilities. The articles reported that girls in one facility were routinely being drugged with psychotropic medications and placed in seclusion for 23 hours per day, while the state’s main training school for boys was beset by “daily violence” and extreme use of isolation. Conditions in the state’s two largest facilities in Jamesburg and Bordentown have remained problematic in recent years. Violent riots have broken out twice at the New Jersey Training School (Jamesburg) since 2007, and a riot took place at the state’s medium security facility in Bordentown. Multiple injuries were reported in all three cases. Also, the state’s heavy use of isolation continues to be heavily criticized. In 2005, a number of leading juvenile justice experts joined advocates in supporting a policy change allowing up to 30 days seclusion as a disciplinary sanction for confined youth who engage in violence or violate facility rules. In 2010, Juvenile Law Center filed a lawsuit on behalf of two youth who had been held in 23-hour per day seclusion in state facilities for 178 and 50 days, respectively. Juvenile Law Center describes New Jersey’s youth corrections systems as beset by “ongoing abuse practices.”</p> <p>Sources: “Bad Girls, Bad Prison,” <i>The Record</i> (Hackensack, NJ), February 20, 1994; “Jamesburg Reformatory Desperately Needs Reform,” <i>The Record</i> (Hackensack, NJ), March 6, 2004; “8 a.m. Riot is Latest Explosion for Juvie Justice System,” <i>The Trentonian</i>, December 30, 2009; “Gang Members Riot at Jail for Boys,” <i>The Trentonian</i>, July 29, 2008; “11 Teens Accused in Attack at Detention Center,” <i>The Star-Ledger</i> (Newark, NJ), May 3, 2007; and Juvenile Law Center, www.jlc.org/legal-docket/troy-d-and-oneill-s-v-mickens-et-al.</p>
NEW MEXICO	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In November 2007, the ACLU of New Mexico filed a class-action lawsuit against the state’s youth correction agency, the Department of Children, Youth and Families, for violating the terms of a previously negotiated agreement to rectify problematic conditions in the state’s youth facilities. Among the problems cited in the suit, ACLU alleged that “youth are subjected to violence and the threat of violence on a daily basis... from both the staff and from fellow youth.” The ACLU complaint also detailed a pattern of inappropriate and dangerous application of restraints. In September 2009, the state signed a new settlement agreement to address maltreatment problems and other issues raised in the lawsuit.</p> <p>Source: <i>ACLU of New Mexico v. N.M. Children, Youth and Families Department (N.M., 1st Judicial District filed November 20, 2007)</i>.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
NEW YORK	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In August 2009, a U.S. Justice Department investigation of four state-run youth facilities found that staff “routinely used uncontrolled, unsafe applications of force” which resulted in “an alarming number of serious injuries to youth, including concussions, broken or knocked-out teeth, and spiral fractures.” The investigators reported that in a single facility, 123 youth were injured in staff restraints in 2008.</p> <p>Source: U.S. Justice Department, CRIPA Investigation of the Lansing Residential Center, Louis Gossett, Jr. Residential Center, Tryon Residential Center, and Tryon Girls Center, August 14, 2009.</p>
NORTH CAROLINA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>Prompted by a sexual abuse lawsuit filed by residents of a state facility in 2002, the <i>Asheville Citizen-Times</i> newspaper published a series of articles examining conditions in the Swannanoa Youth Development Center, including sex abuse allegations as well as claims that youth were “hog-tied” to their beds and “left alone for hours and not allowed to go to the bathroom.” In 2003, the North Carolina’s state auditor released a report finding “unsafe conditions” throughout the state’s network of youth corrections facilities. The auditor’s report documented a high volume of abuse complaints, many of them substantiated, along with a failure in most facilities to properly document and investigate abuse claims.</p> <p>Sources: “Swannanoa: An Inmate’s Story,” <i>Asheville Citizen-Times</i>, September 28, 2002; Justice Denied: Most Swannanoa Center Staffers Named in DSS Reports Not Charged,” <i>Asheville Citizen-Times</i>, April 6, 2003; and Performance Audit of the Youth Development Centers Within the North Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of the State Auditor, May 2003.</p>
NORTH DAKOTA	No systemic problems identified	
OHIO	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>Serious abuse and maltreatment problems in several Ohio youth facilities have been documented in recent years through a wide-ranging class-action lawsuit filed in 2004 on behalf of incarcerated Ohio youth challenging conditions in eight state youth corrections facilities. In 2007, an independent fact finder appointed by the court issued a 214-page report confirming all of the allegations contained in the suit and finding that “Excessive force and the excessive use of isolation, some of it extraordinarily prolonged, is endemic to the ODYS system.”</p> <p>Source: S.H. v. Stickrath, Case No. 2:04-cv-1206 (S.D. Ohio).</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
OKLAHOMA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2005, a U.S. Department of Justice investigation revealed significant problems in the L.E. Radar Center, the state's largest youth corrections facility, with sexually inappropriate relationships involving youth and staff or other juveniles; youth-on-youth violence; and excessive use of force by facility staff. The investigation also found that facility staff "either actively encouraged a fight to occur or had knowledge that a fight would occur and allowed it to happen."</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of the L.E. Radar Center, June 8, 2005.</p>
OREGON	Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since	<p>In 1977, attorneys representing youth confined in Oregon's McLaren School for Boys filed suit over abusive conditions of confinement. Specifically the complaint declared their right to be free from: "mactings, beatings, druggings with powerful psychotropic drugs that have serious physical and psychological side effects, strapping plaintiffs to beds for long periods of time, forcing them to stand at attention for hours on end, or to sit silently for days at a time, confining them in cramped isolation cells and often depriving them of mattresses, blankets, reading materials, and bathroom facilities, forcing them to urinate out windows or on the floor." In February 1985, a federal judge ruled for the plaintiffs and detailed significant restrictions on the use of confinement as well as other changes required before the facility could be found in compliance with Constitutional requirements.</p> <p>Source: Gary H. v. Bergstrom, Civil No. 77-1039 (D. Oregon).</p>
PENNSYLVANIA	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>A 1991 lawsuit filed by the Juvenile Law Center complained that youth confined in the state's Youth Development Center–Bensalem suffered "serious physical and emotional damage as a result of extended isolation, handcuffing and beatings" inflicted by facility staff." In 1993, a federal judge approved a settlement agreement committing the state to address the problems identified in the suit.</p> <p>Source: D.B. v. Casey, Civil Action No. 91-6463 (E.D. Pa.)</p>
PUERTO RICO	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>A 1992 U.S. Department of Justice investigation found unconstitutional conditions of confinement in all seven facilities studied. Among the many problems cited were widespread reports of physical abuse by staff — including staff beating youth with night sticks, dragging naked and hand-cuffed youth by their hair, and assaulted with mace or "stun guns."</p> <p>Source: U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of Juvenile Facilities in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, December 2, 1992.</p>

"Systemic or recurring maltreatment" is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
RHODE ISLAND	Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since	<p>In 1972, the federal judge adjudicating a lawsuit filed on behalf of youth in the Rhode Island Boys’ Training School issued an opinion finding conditions in the facility “deplorable” — particularly an annex of the facility which contained what the judge termed “inhuman solitary confinement cells. The judge issued a temporary restraining order requiring the state to immediately vacate some parts of the facility. All parties in the suit entered into a consent decree to address most of the problems alleged in the suit. However, the state has never fully implemented the required reforms, and — as of early 2011, 40 years after it was initially filed — the case remains open and the facility subject to court supervision.</p> <p>Source: <i>Inmates of Boys’ Training School v. Lindgren</i>, A-7980-1 (D.R.I.)</p>
SOUTH CAROLINA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 1995, five years after a lawsuit was filed on behalf of youth involved in the S.C. juvenile corrections systems, federal judge Joe Anderson ruled conditions in the state’s facilities unconstitutional and ordered the state to reduce overcrowding and to limit the use of tear gas, which the court found was widely applied in the institutions — often in ways the court deemed inappropriate, counterproductive, and damaging to youths’ long-term health. In 1996, the court heard testimony about widespread violence in S.C. facilities, and it ordered state officials to begin compiling monthly reports on assaults within state facilities. In December 2001, a leading S.C. newspaper (<i>The State</i>) reported that a three-person panel appointed by the court found that Department of Juvenile Justice facilities remained unsafe for many incarcerated youth and that “mistreatment of juveniles by correctional officers and other teenagers remains a problem.” Soon after, the same newspaper reported that the S.C. state government paid \$1.1 million between 1999 and April 2001 to settle lawsuits brought by nine youth who were raped or sexually assaulted while in state custody.</p> <p>Sources: <i>Alexander S. v. Boyd</i>, C/A No.: 3:90-3062-17 (D.S.C.); “Juvenile Prisons Not Safe, Panel Says,” <i>The State</i>, December 13, 2001; and “Assaults on Juveniles Cost State \$1 Million,” <i>The State</i>, March 1, 2002.</p>
SOUTH DAKOTA	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In July 1999, a 14-year-old girl committed to a boot camp program at South Dakota’s boot camp program for girls in Plankington, died of heatstroke. The tragedy touched off a private class-action lawsuit over abusive conditions at Plankington, filed in February 2000. After several months of discovery, the state signed a settlement agreement in November 2000, including commitments to substantially restrict the use of restraints, cell extractions, and isolation — and to improve treatment for youth with mental health problems. In December 1999, the U.S. Department of Justice informed South Dakota’s governor of its intention to investigate conditions at Plankington as well as the state’s training school, the Custer Youth Development Center. However, for more than two years, state leaders</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
SOUTH DAKOTA continued		<p>refused to grant investigators access to the facilities. In the meantime, the state closed the Plankington facility and had ample time to rectify any egregious safety problems that may have been occurring at the Custer facility. The federal investigation, completed December 2002, found several weaknesses with the Custer facility's education programming, but no systemic problems with violence, abuse, or excessive use of isolation or restraints.</p> <p>Source: Selcraig, "Camp Fear," <i>Mother Jones</i>, December 2000; Christina A. V. Bloomburg Civ, 00-4036; and U.S. Department of Justice, CRIPA Investigation of Custer Youth Correctional Center.</p>
TENNESSEE	<p>Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since; and suggestive evidence of maltreatment since 2000, but no compelling proof.</p>	<p>In 1970 a class-action lawsuit alleging excessive use of force, physical abuse, excessive discipline, sexual abuse, and failure to protect youth from harm was filed on behalf of youth incarcerated in three state-run juvenile facilities. Nine years later, the state agreed to a consent decree prohibiting many harsh disciplinary techniques and mandating a number of other reforms. Since 2000, there have been troubling reports about conditions in some Tennessee facilities. In 2006, an article in <i>The Tennessean</i> newspaper reported that a state oversight agency, the Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth, uncovered serious problems during an August 2005 site visit at the Woodland Hills Youth Development Center, including "substantial concerns about safety and security" and a concern that vulnerable youth were "not consistently adequately protected from more aggressive youth." <i>The Tennessean</i> article also described a riot at the facility in which 16 staff members were injured. In 2009, the state's Disability Law & Advocacy Center filed suit on behalf of a mentally ill youth who was severely beaten and then denied timely medical care by two staff at the state-run Wilder Youth Development Center, and the suit included allegations that the two guards continued to work with youth despite numerous other referrals to the state's special investigations unit. In 2010, the operator of a private mental health treatment facility in the state, Chad Youth Enhancement Center, paid \$10.5 million to settle a lawsuit filed after a resident died as a result of a violent restraint in 2007. Another resident died in the facility in 2005. Like many Chad residents, both of the victims were from other states. However, Tennessee authorities who licensed the facility (which remains open, under a new name), and the Tennessee Department of Children and Families (the parent agency of the state's juvenile corrections division) continued to place youth there until 2005.</p> <p>Sources: Doe v. Henderson, A 7980-I (State Court); "Evaluators Find Juvenile Center is Run Too Loosely," <i>The Tennessean</i>, January 2, 2006; "Handle With Care," <i>Nashville Scene</i>, November 8, 2007; and "\$10.5 Million Ends Suit Over Slain DHS Teen," <i>Philadelphia Inquirer</i>, February 12, 2010.</p>

"Systemic or recurring maltreatment" is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
TEXAS	Maltreatment documented since 2000	<p>In 2005, an investigation by the Texas Rangers documented recurring sexual abuse by two staff members at the West Texas State School. However, the investigation was not made public until 2007. The revelation sparked a major controversy, and led to the resignation of the entire leadership of the Texas Youth Commission. Subsequent investigations revealed that 750 complaints of sex abuse were filed by youth confined in TYC facilities from 2000 to 2007, as well as rampant physical abuse by staff and youth-on-youth violence. A 2007 U.S. Justice Department investigation at one TYC facility, the Evins Regional Juvenile Center, documented more than 1,500 youth assaults from January 2005 through June 2006.</p> <p>Sources: Blakeslee, “Hidden in Plain Sight,” <i>Texas Observer</i>, February 22, 2007; “TYC Sex Allegations Exceed 750,” <i>Dallas Morning News</i>, March 6, 2007; U.S. Department of Justice, <i>CRIPA Investigation of Evins Regional Juvenile Center</i>, March 15, 2007.</p>
UTAH	Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since	<p>A 1975 class-action suit alleged excessive use of solitary confinement and challenged many other practices in the Utah State Industrial School. In 1979, consultants hired by the state to examine its youth corrections facility described the treatment program as “punitive, repressive and inappropriately applied and misunderstood.” The consultants also reported excessive violence among youth as well as instances of corporal punishment. The case was settled in 1981.</p> <p>Source: Manning v. Matheson, 75-34 (D. Utah); and Harry Swanger, “Juvenile Institution Litigation,” <i>Clearinghouse Review</i>, Vol. 11, 1978.</p>
VERMONT	No systemic problems identified	
VIRGINIA	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>Plagued by severe overcrowding in the mid-1990s, news reports detailed serious problems within Virginia’s juvenile facilities with violence, abuse, and excessive isolation. In fact, the <i>Richmond-Times Dispatch</i> printed more than a dozen long articles about conditions in juvenile facilities in 1996 alone. One article quoted Mark Soler of the Youth Law Center, who had toured the state’s Beaumont Juvenile Correctional Center and investigated conditions in facilities statewide. Soler said he was “shocked” at conditions in the facility, which he described as rife with “abuse and humiliation and maltreatment.” In July 1996, the <i>Times-Dispatch</i> revealed that staff at the Beaumont were employing dangerous and illegal techniques to restrain confined youth. Conditions in Virginia’s facilities again made many head-lines in 1999, following the death of a mentally retarded youth following a restraint at the state’s Oak</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
VIRGINIA continued		<p>Ridge Juvenile Correctional Center. Soon after, press reports revealed that state workers were being trained on aggressive new restraint techniques that included hitting and kicking youth. Other reports documented widespread violence against youth and staff in state facilities and excessive isolation.</p> <p>Sources: “Beaumont Leaves Youth Shaken, Hopeless; Treatment Has Given Way to Overcrowding,” <i>Richmond Times-Dispatch</i>, February 4, 1996; “Treatment of Juveniles Condemned; State Officials Deny Wrongdoing,” <i>Richmond Times-Dispatch</i>, February 16, 1996; “Illegal Restraints Used at Center,” <i>Richmond Times-Dispatch</i>, July 27, 1996; “Center Suspends Seven Workers; State Police Probing Death at Oak Ridge,” <i>Richmond Times-Dispatch</i>, May 14, 1999; and “Schools for Crime? Life at Centers, Treatment By Staff Seen as Prescriptions for Failure,” <i>Richmond Times-Dispatch</i>, October 18, 1999.</p>
WASHINGTON	Maltreatment documented between 1990 and 2000, but not since	<p>A class-action lawsuit filed in 1994 on behalf of residents of the Green Hill School, a state-run training school, accused the state of cruel and excessive use of pepper spray, as well as excessive use of restraints and isolation, and several other problematic conditions relating to the facility’s physical plant, educational programming, and other matters. The state signed a Stipulation and Judgment in September 1995 and a Supplemental Stipulation and Judgment in November 1996 agreeing to fundamentally reform the facility and end or drastically curtail these problematic practices/conditions.</p> <p>Source: <i>Horton v. Williams</i>, No. C94-5428 RJB (W.D. Wash.)</p>
WEST VIRGINIA	<i>Suggestive evidence of maltreatment since 2000, but no compelling proof.</i>	<p>Local newspapers reported a series of violent incidents at the state’s Industrial Home for Boys in late 2008 and early 2009, including two sexual assaults, a severe youth-on-youth assault (requiring facial reconstruction surgery for one youth), and the beating of one youth resident by five facility staff, along with multiple suicide attempts and the unexplained death of one youth resident in February 2009. The state’s governor told news reporters that he was “very much aware” of problems at the Industrial Home, and several legislators told reporters that they were paying close attention.</p> <p>Sources: The <i>Clarksburg Exponent Telegram</i>, <i>Charleston Daily Mail</i>, and <i>Charleston Gazette</i> all published numerous stories about problems at the Industrial Home in 2009. See for instance: “Segregation Plan Making Progress at Salem Home,” <i>Clarksburg Exponent Telegram</i>, May 18, 2009; “Changes Announced at Youth Home,” <i>Clarksburg Exponent Telegram</i>, March 18, 2009; and “Industrial Home Problems Have Manchin’s Attention,” <i>Clarksburg Exponent Telegram</i>, March 4, 2009.</p>

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.

Systemic or Recurring Maltreatment in Juvenile Corrections Facilities: State-By-State Summary

STATE	PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF SYSTEMIC MALTREATMENT	EVIDENCE
WISCONSIN	Maltreatment documented between 1970 and 1990, but not since	<p>Filed in 1979, a class-action lawsuit (Brian v. Clinicare Corp.) alleged serious problems at the Eau Clair Academy, a state-funded training school, including physical and verbal abuse by staff, excessive use of isolation, and inappropriate use of psychotropic drugs to control residents' behavior. The state agreed to address these conditions in a consent decree in 1980.</p> <p>Source: Brian v. Clinicare Corp, Civil Action No. 79-C-188 (W.D. Wis.).</p>
WYOMING	No systemic problems identified	

“Systemic or recurring maltreatment” is identified when clear evidence has emerged from federal investigations, class-action lawsuits, or authoritative reports written by reputable media outlets or respected public or private agencies showing that — at least at one particular point in time — state-funded youth corrections facilities displayed a systemic or recurring failure to protect confined youth from serious physical or psychological harm in the forms of violence from staff or other youth, sexual assaults, and/or excessive use of isolation or restraints.