U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Bureau of Justice Statistics

SPECIAL REPORT

January 2010, NCJ 228416

Sexual Victimization in Juvenile Facilities Reported by Youth, 2008-09

Allen J. Beck, Ph.D., **Paige M. Harrison**, and **Paul Guerino,** *BJS Statisticians*

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-79) (PREA) requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to carry out a comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidents and effects of prison rape for each calendar year. This report fulfills the requirement under Sec. 4(c)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act to provide a list of juvenile correctional facilities according to the prevalence of sexual victimization.

Between June 2008 and April 2009, BJS completed the first National Survey of Youth in Custody (NSYC) of 166 state-owned or operated facilities and 29 locally or privately operated facilities. The survey, conducted by Westat (Rockville, MD), was restricted to juvenile confinement facilities that held adjudicated youth for at least 90 days. Facilities were excluded if fewer than 25% of the youth in the facility had been adjudicated, the facility held fewer than 10 adjudicated youth, or if the facility was locally or privately operated and held fewer than 105

Highlights

- This report presents findings from the first National Survey of Youth in Custody (NSYC), representing approximately 26,550 adjudicated youth held nationwide in state operated and large locally or privately operated juvenile facilities. Overall, 91% of youth in these facilities were male; 9% were female.
- An estimated 12% of youth in state juvenile facilities and large non-state facilities (representing 3,220 youth nationwide) reported experiencing one or more incidents of sexual victimization by another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission, if less than 12 months.
- About 2.6% of youth (700 nationwide) reported an incident involving another youth, and 10.3% (2,730) reported an incident involving facility staff.
- About 4.3% of youth (1,150) reported having sex or other sexual contact with facility staff as a result of some type of force; 6.4% of youth (1,710) reported sexual contact with facility staff without any force, threat, or other explicit form of coercion.
- Approximately 95% of all youth reporting staff sexual misconduct said they had been victimized by female staff. In 2008, 42% of staff in state juvenile facilities were female.
- Thirteen facilities were identified as "high rate" based on the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval of at least 35% higher than the average rate among facilities by type of consent. Six facilities had victimization rates of 30% or more; 4 had rates between 25% and 30%; and 3 had rates between 20% and 25%.
- Eleven facilities were identified as "low rate" based on a low rate of youth reporting sexual victimization and a low upper bound for the 95%-confidence interval around the rate. Among these facilities, 5 had no reported incidents of sexual victimization.
- Rates of reported sexual victimization varied among youth:
  - 10.8% of males and 4.7% of females reported sexual activity with facility staff.
  - 9.1% of females and 2.0% of males reported unwanted sexual activity with other youth.
  - Youth with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual reported significantly higher rates of sexual victimization by another youth (12.5%) compared to heterosexual youth (1.3%).
  - Youth who had experienced any prior sexual assault were more than twice as likely to report sexual victimization in the current facility (24.1%), compared to those with no sexual assault history (10.1%).
- Among youth victimized by another youth, 20% said they had been physically injured; 5% reported they had sought medical attention for their injuries. Among youth victimized by staff, 5% reported a physical injury; fewer than 1% had sought medical attention.

youth. All state facilities holding 90 or more youth were included. State facilities with fewer than 90 youth were sampled proportionate to the number of adjudicated youth held, based on the 2006 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement. Non-state (locally or privately operated) juvenile facilities holding 105 or more youth were initially included, but during the course of the survey, this criterion was increased to 150. At least one facility in each state and the District of Columbia was selected to participate in the survey. (See *Methodology* for sample description.)

The NSYC is part of the National Prison Rape Statistics Program. The program collects administrative records of reported sexual violence, as well as allegations of sexual victimization directly from victims through surveys of adult inmates in prisons and jails and surveys of youth held in juvenile correctional facilities. Administrative records have been collected annually since 2004. BJS has published two reports on sexual victimization in juvenile facilities—*Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2004* (NCJ 210333) and *Sexual Violence Reported by Juvenile Correctional Authorities, 2005-06* (NCJ 215337). BJS has also published an overview of all of its prison rape collections—*PREA Data Collection Activities, 2009* (NCJ 227377). These reports are available online at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1153>;<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1218> and <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1596> (last accessed December 17, 2009).

First national survey of youth completed to meet PREA requirements

The 2008-09 NSYC survey consisted of an audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI) in which youth, using a touch-screen, interacted with a computerized questionnaire and followed audio instructions delivered via headphones. The NSYC utilized self-administered procedures to ensure the confidentiality of the reporting youths and to encourage fuller reporting of victimization. The survey made use of audio technology to provide assistance to youth with varying levels of literacy and language skills. Approximately 98% of the interviews were conducted in English; 2% in Spanish.

Administrators in each state, county, and private facility determined the type of consent required for youths to be eligible for participation. Administrators provided *in loco parentis* (ILP) consent in 63 facilities. *In loco parentis* is when administrators provide consent "in the place of the parent" to contact youth. In the remaining 132 facilities, administrators required consent from the youths' parents or guardians (PGC). Youth in all facilities also had to assent to participate in the interview. (See *Methodology* for additional details on the process of consent.)

In each sampled PGC facility, administrators were asked 8 weeks prior to data collection to provide a roster of all adjudicated youth assigned a bed; in ILP facilities a roster was provided 4 weeks prior to data collection.

All youth were sampled in ILP facilities and in PGC facilities with 240 or fewer youth on the roster. In larger PGC facilities, all females and a random sample of males were selected. In both PGC and ILP facilities all incoming youth were added to the sample up to 4 weeks prior to the survey. Youth who had been present in the facility at least 4 weeks prior to the survey and were present at the time of the survey were considered eligible.

The result of this process yielded a sample representing 26,551 adjudicated youth held nationwide in state operated and large locally or privately operated juvenile facilities.[1] A total of 10,263 youth participated in the survey. Of these, 1,065 received an alternative survey on drug and alcohol use and treatment, and 9,198 youth participated in the survey of sexual victimization.

The NSYC collects only allegations of sexual victimization. Because participation in the survey is anonymous and reports are confidential, the NSYC does not permit any follow-up investigation or substantiation through review of official records. Some allegations in the NSYC may be untrue. At the same time, some youth may remain silent about any sexual victimization experience in the facility. To address concerns of false reporting by youth, reports of victimization were checked for consistency across survey items. Interviews that contained response patterns considered to be extreme or highly inconsistent were excluded from the calculations of victimization rates. (See box on page 6 for details.)

[1]Adjudication is the court process that determines whether the youth committed the offense, including delinquency and status offenses.

About 12% of youth in state-operated juvenile facilities and large non-state facilities reported one or more incidents of sexual victimization

Among the 9,198 youth participating in the 2008-09 survey, 1,199 reported experiencing one or more incidents of sexual victimization. Because the NSYC is a sample survey, weights were applied for sampled facilities and youth within facilities to produce national-level and facility-level estimates. The estimated number of adjudicated youth who reported experiencing sexual violence totaled 3,220 (or 12.1% of the 26,551 estimated adjudicated youth held in state-operated or large non-state facilities covered by the survey) (table 1).

About 2.6% of adjudicated youth (an estimated 700 nationwide) reported an incident involving another youth, and 10.3% reported an incident involving facility staff. Some youth (0.8%) reported sexual victimization by both another youth and facility staff. Sexual acts or contacts between youth in which there was no report of force were excluded from all measures of sexual victimization.

The NSYC screened for specific sexual activities in which youth may have been involved during the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months. Youth were asked to report which of these activities involved another youth and which involved staff at the facility. Additionally, youth were asked if any of these activities happened because they were forced, threatened with force, pressured in another way, or offered money, favors, special protection or other special treatment. (See pages 20 - 22 for specific survey questions.) Reports of unwilling youth-on-youth sexual activity were classified as either nonconsensual acts or other sexual contacts only.

Approximately 2.0% of youths (530 nationwide) said they had nonconsensual sex with another youth, including giving or receiving sexual gratification, and oral, anal, or vaginal penetration. An estimated 0.5% (140) of surveyed adjudicated youth said they had experienced one or more other unwilling sexual contacts only with other youth, such as looking at private body parts, unwanted kissing on the lips or another part of the body, and other unwanted touching of specific body parts in a sexual way.

Reports of staff sexual misconduct with youth were classified separately depending on whether the misconduct involved any force, threat, pressure, or offers of special favors or privileges. An estimated 4.3% of youth (1,150 nationwide) reported that they had sex or other sexual contact with facility staff as a result of force. An estimated 6.4% (1,710) of youth said they had sexual contact with facility staff without any force, threat, or other explicit form of coercion.

Table 1.

Youth reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Sexual victimization	National estimate[a]		
	Number	Percent	Standard error
U.S. total	3,220	12.1%	0.4%
Youth-on-youth[b,c]	700	2.6%	0.2%
Nonconsensual sexual acts[d]	530	2.0	0.2
Other sexual contacts only[e]	140	0.5	0.2
Staff sexual misconduct	2,730	10.3%	0.4%
Force reported[c,f]	1,150	4.3	0.3
Excluding touching[d]	1,030	3.9	0.2
Other sexual contacts only[e]	90	0.3	0.1
No report of force	1,710	6.4	0.3
Excluding touching[d]	1,560	5.9	0.3
Other sexual contacts only[e]	150	0.6	0.1

Note: Detail may not sum to total because youth may have reported multiple victimizations or due to item non-response. Youth were asked to report on any victimization involving another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[a]Estimates based on reports from 9,198 adjudicated youth interviewed in 195 juvenile facilities and weighted to represent the number of adjudicated youth held in the nation. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[b]Excludes acts in which there was no report of force.

[c]Detail does not sum to total due to item non-response.

[d]Includes contact between the penis and the vagina or the penis and the anus; contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus; penetration of the anal or vaginal opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object; and rubbing of another person's penis or vagina by a hand.

[e]Includes kissing on the lips or other part of the body, looking at private body parts, showing something sexual like pictures or a movie, and engaging in some other sexual contact that did not involve touching.

[f]Includes physical force, threat of force, other force or pressure, and other forms of coercion, such as being given money, favors, protections, or special treatment.

Thirteen facilities were identified as high rate after taking into account statistical variation and type of consent

Of the 195 juvenile facilities in the 2008-09 NSYC, 13 had an overall victimization rate that could be identified as "high rate" (table 2). Though other measures may be considered when comparing facilities, the overall victimization rate is a measure of prevalence that includes all reports of unwilling sexual activity between youth and all reports of staff sexual misconduct, regardless of the level of coercion and type of sexual activity.[2]

The NSYC is statistically unable to provide an exact ranking for all facilities as required under the Prison Rape Elimination Act. As with any survey, the NSYC estimates are subject to error associated with sampling. Facilities holding few youth or facilities with few youth completing the survey will have greater variance around the point estimate, making it especially important to recognize that the survey estimates may vary.

A common way to express the sampling variability is to construct a 95%-confidence interval around each survey estimate. Typically, multiplying the standard error by 1.96 and then adding or subtracting the result from the estimate produces the confidence interval. This interval expresses the range of values that could result among 95% of the different samples that could be drawn.

For small samples and estimates close to 0% or 100%, as is the case with the NSYC, the use of the standard error to construct the 95%-confidence interval may not be reliable. An alternative developed by Wilson has been shown to perform better than the traditional method when constructing a confidence interval.[3] When applied to large samples, the traditional and the Wilson confidence intervals are virtually identical.

[2]Facility-level rates are based on the reports of adjudicated youth who were in the facility at least 4 weeks prior to the time of the interview. The experiences of non-adjudicated youth and youth held in the facility in the past 12 months, but who were not in the facility when the interviews were conducted, were not included in the survey.

[3]See Brown, L.D., Cai, T. and DasGupta, A. (2001) Interval Estimation for a Binomial Proportion, *Statistical Science*, 16 (2), 101-138, and Wilson, E.B. (1927) Probable Inference, the Law of Succession, and Statistical Inference, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 22, 209-212.

Table 2.

Juvenile facilities with high rates of sexual victimization, by type of consent, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of respondents[b]	Response rate[c]	Youth reporting any sexual victimization[a]		
			Percent	95%-confidence interval	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
All facilities	9,093	54.5%	12.1%	11.3%	13.0%
***In loco parentis* (ILP)**	4,539	79.5%	14.3%	13.0%	15.6%
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)	127	87.7	36.2	30.5	42.4
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr. (TX)[d]	81	84.1	32.4	27.8	37.3
Victory Field Corr. Acad. (TX)	61	89.7	24.6	19.8	30.0
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)[e]	92	94.8	22.8	19.7	26.3
Shawono Ctr. (MI)	22	88.0	27.3	19.4	36.9
Parental/guardian consent (PGC)	4,554	39.8%	10.9%	9.9%	12.0%
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr. (NC)[e]	24	86.2	33.3	25.5	42.3
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term (VA)	50	42.9	30.0	21.5	40.1
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr. (TN)	55	53.4	26.0	18.8	34.6
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton (MD)	11	33.3	36.4	16.5	62.3
L.E. Rader Ctr. (OK)	51	45.6	25.0	16.2	36.5
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr. (VA)[d]	40	29.4	25.0	15.3	38.2
Cresson Secure Treatment Unit (PA)	12	33.3	33.3	15.0	58.6
New Jersey Training School (NJ)	71	37.7	23.3	14.7	34.8

Note: High rate facilities are those in which the lower bound of the confidence interval is larger than 1.35 times the average among facilities, by type of consent. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]Number of adjudicated youth who participated in the sexual victimization component of the survey. Excludes 105 youth due to item non-response.

[c]Response rate accounts for different probabilities of selection among youth and the exclusion of interviews with extreme or inconsistent responses. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[d]Facility houses both males and females.

[e]Facility houses females only.

Consequently, the tables in this report containing facility-level estimates provide confidence intervals based on Wilson's methodology (tables 2 through 6 and all appendix tables). Table 1 and tables 7 through 12 contain national estimates and are based on traditional standard error calculations. (See *Methodology* for details.)

Among the 13 high-rate facilities, 5 were ILP facilities (in which facility administrators provided consent for the majority of the selected youth) and 8 were PGC facilities (in which administrators required consent from the youths' parents or guardians). These facilities were identified as high because the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval was at least 35% higher than the average rate among ILP facilities (14.3%) and PGC facilities (10.9%).[4]

Although the NSYC cannot uniquely identify the facility with the highest victimization rate, 6 facilities had rates of 30% or greater. Among ILP facilities, Pendleton Juvenile Correctional Facility (Indiana) recorded an overall rate of 36.2% and Corsicana Residential Treatment Center (Texas) recorded a rate of 32.4%. Among PGC facilities, Backbone Mountain Youth Center, Swanton (Maryland) had a rate of 36.4%; Samarkand Youth Development Center (North Carolina) and Cresson Secure Treatment Unit (Pennsylvania) had rates of 33.3%; and Culpeper Juvenile Correctional Center-Long Term (Virginia) had a rate of 30.0%.

While each of the 13 facilities had high rates, some facilities not classified as having high rates were not statistically different from the 13 high rate facilities due to sampling error.

[4]The criterion of at least 35% higher than the average rate was established to identify a small group of facilities that would be considered as having high rates. Other criteria reflecting variation in the estimates would have identified a smaller or larger number of facilities.

Thirty-six facilities had no reported incidents; 11 facilities were identified as low-rate for sexual victimization

Thirty-six of the juvenile facilities (18%) had no reported incidents of sexual victimization (see appendix table 2). However, the NSYC is unable to provide an exact identification of the facilities with the lowest rates of sexual victimization. Rates in each of the 36 facilities are subject to sampling error, depending on which youth were selected and the number of surveys actually completed by youth within the facility. Although in each facility the lower bound of the confidence interval was 0%, the upper bound varied depending on the number of completed interviews.

Among the 195 surveyed facilities, 11 were identified as "low rate" facilities for sexual victimization based on the low percentages of youth who reported incidents and the upper bounds of the 95%-confidence intervals that were less than half the average rate among ILP and PGC facilities (table 3). Five of these facilities had no reported incidents of sexual victimization; 6 had at least one youth who reported a sexual victimization.

Table 3.

Juvenile facilities with low rates of sexual victimization, by type of consent, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of respondents[b]	Response rate[c]	Youth reporting any sexual victimization[a]		
			Percent	95%-confidence interval	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
All facilities	9,093	54.5%	12.1%	11.3%	13.0%
***In loco parentis* (ILP)**	4,539	79.5%	14.3%	13.0%	15.6%
Ft. Bellefontaine Campus (MO)	20	95.2	0.0	0.0	2.4
Camp Florence (OR)	14	93.3	0.0	0.0	3.3
Rhode Island Training School (RI)[d]	75	74.3	1.3	0.5	3.9
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 1 (TX)	78	92.9	2.6	1.5	4.4
Montgomery City Yth. Ctr. (MO)	25	73.5	0.0	0.0	5.0
Heman G. Stark Yth. Corr. Fac. (CA)	113	79.3	3.5	2.1	5.8
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Nampa (ID)[d]	33	97.1	3.0	1.5	6.0
Parental/guardian consent (PGC)	4,554	39.8%	10.9%	9.9%	12.0%
Desoto Juv. Res. Fac. (FL)	55	53.8	1.0	0.3	3.8
Green Hill School (WA)	62	41.4	1.0	0.2	4.2
Wyoming Boys School (WY)	27	77.3	0.0	0.0	4.4
Grand Mesa Yth. Srvcs. Ctr. (CO)[d]	20	84.0	0.0	0.0	4.6

Note: Low rate facilities are those in which the upper bound of the confidence interval is lower than 0.5 times the average among facilities by type of consent. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]Number of adjudicated youth who participated in the sexual victimization survey. Excludes 105 youth due to item non-response.

[c]Response rate accounts for different probabilities of selection among youth and the exclusion of interviews with extreme or inconsistent responses. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[d]Facility houses both males and females.

Interviews checked for extreme and inconsistent response patterns

As with any survey, the NSYC is subject to measurement error. To reduce this error, the survey incorporated several design features, including the use of an audio-assisted questionnaire delivered via headphones to address low levels of literacy; the use of "hotwords," highlighted in a different color, which youth could access if they were uncertain about their definition; range checks for selected questions to guard against unrealistic values; and logic checks that asked youth to verify their responses. To assist youth having difficulty with the interview, the computer flagged those who spent a long period in particular sections of the interview and prompted the youth to obtain assistance from an interviewer. While these measures and others helped to reduce error, they did not prevent it from occurring.

Once the interviews were completed, individual response patterns were assessed to identify interviews having extreme or internally inconsistent responses. Three response patterns were considered extreme and indicative of an unreliable interview overall. These patterns were—

- a youth completed the survey in less than 10 minutes. Based on internal testing, it was determined to be extremely difficult for a respondent to seriously complete the interview in less than 10 minutes.
- the reported number of forced sexual contacts with other youth exceeded 1.5 incidents per day for every day since admission to the facility.
- the reported number of forced sexual contacts with facility staff exceeded 1.5 incidents per day for every day since admission.

Out of 9,362 completed interviews, 89 had at least one of the extreme response patterns. These interviews were excluded from the calculations of sexual victimization.

An additional list of 25 indicators was developed to assess whether a youth showed signs that he or she did not fully understand the survey items, whether the youth did not consistently report the details of events, or if the youth provided inconsistent responses. One indicator was if the youth provided unrealistic dates or personal information; another indicator was if the youth reported in a debriefing item that questions on sexual activity were hard to understand. Other indicators compared responses in one section of the survey with responses in other sections. (See page 23 for a full listing of the indicators.)

The outcomes of these 25 indicators were combined into a count of the total number for each youth. While 89.6% of youth did not record any inconsistent responses, 8.0% reported one that was inconsistent, 1.5% reported two, and 0.9% reported three or more. For purposes of estimating sexual victimization rates, an additional 75 interviews were excluded based on a count of 3 or more indicators of inconsistent responses.

Because many of the indicators rely on checking the consistency of reports of sexual victimization, deletion of extreme or inconsistent responses from the estimates has the effect of lowering the overall victimization rate. Without deleting any interviews, the estimate for the overall sexual victimization rate would have been 13.1%. After deleting 164 interviews with at least one extreme response or 3 or more inconsistent responses, the rate dropped to 12.1%. If interviews with 2 or more inconsistent responses were deleted, then the rate would have dropped to approximately 11.0%; had interviews with 1 or more been deleted, the rate would have been approximately 7.5%. The 3 or more inconsistent response cutoff was selected in recognition that youth could legitimately report some inconsistent information without invalidating their entire interview.

Fort Bellefontaine Campus (Missouri) and Camp Florence (Oregon), with no youth reporting sexual victimization, had confidence intervals with the lowest upper bounds (2.4% and 3.3%, respectively) among ILP facilities. Desoto Juvenile Residential Facility (Florida) and Green Hill School (Washington) with reported sexual victimization rates of 1.0% had confidence intervals with the lowest upper bounds (3.8% and 4.2%, respectively) among PGC facilities.

Youth in high-rate facilities reported high rates of nonconsensual sexual activity

Among the 13 high-rate facilities, most reports of sexual victimization involved nonconsensual sexual acts with another youth and serious sexual acts with facility staff excluding touching (table 4). When rates of sexual victimization were limited to the most serious nonconsensual acts (excluding touching only, kissing on the lips or other body parts, and engaging in other less serious acts), the percentages of youth reporting one or more incidents remained high (between 20.3% and 36.4%).

Table 4.

Juvenile facilities with the highest rates of sexual victimization, by type of consent and contact, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

	Youth reporting sexual acts excluding touching[a]			Youth reporting other sexual contacts only[b]		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
Facility name	Percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
All facilities	10.4%	9.6%	11.3%	1.2%	0.9%	1.6%
***In loco parentis* (ILP)**	12.5%	11.3%	13.9%	1.2%	0.9%	1.5%
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)	34.1	28.6	40.1	1.6	0.6	4.0
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr. (TX)[c]	25.7	21.5	30.4	5.9	3.6	9.4
Victory Field Corr. Acad. (TX)	21.7	17.1	27.1	1.7	0.7	3.9
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)[d]	20.7	17.8	23.8	2.2	1.3	3.6
Shawono Ctr. (MI)	27.3	19.4	36.9	0.0	0.0	3.6
Parental/guardian consent (PGC)	9.2%	8.2%	10.3%	1.2%	0.8%	1.8%
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr. (NC)[d]	29.2	21.7	37.9	4.2	1.7	10.0
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term (VA)	30.0	21.5	40.1	0.0	0.0	4.5
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr. (TN)	22.9	16.1	31.4	2.1	0.6	7.8
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton (MD)	36.4	16.5	62.3	0.0	0.0	19.5
L.E. Rader Ctr. (OK)	23.1	14.5	34.8	1.9	0.7	5.0
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr. (VA)[c]	23.1	13.7	36.2	0.0	0.0	6.6
Cresson Secure Treatment Unit (PA)	25.0	9.8	50.7	8.3	1.7	32.4
New Jersey Training School (NJ)	20.3	12.5	31.3	0.8	0.2	3.7

Note: High-rate facilities are those where the lower bound of the confidence interval is larger than 1.35 times the national average, by type of consent. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

[a]Includes contact between the penis and the vagina or the penis and the anus; contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus; penetration of the anal or vaginal opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object; and rubbing of another person's penis or vagina by a hand. Includes any acts with a staff member and any forced acts with another youth.

[b]Based on youth who reported other sexual contacts only. These acts include kissing on the lips or other part of the body, looking at private body parts, showing something sexual like pictures or a movie, and engaging in some other sexual act that did not involve touching.

[c]Facility houses both males and females.

[d]Facility houses females only.

Among the ILP facilities, Pendleton Juvenile Correctional Facility (Indiana) had a rate of sexual victimization excluding touching only (34.1%) and a confidence interval with a lower bound (28.6%) that were more than double the national average. Among the PGC facilities, Samarkand Youth Development Center (North Carolina) had a 29.2% sexual victimization rate excluding touching only and a confidence interval with the highest lower bound (21.7%).

Of the 13 high-rate facilities, 4 had rates of youth-on-youth sexual victimization that exceeded 10% (table 5). In 4 facilities, none of the interviewed youth reported any sexual victimization by other youth in the facility.

Table 5.

Juvenile facilities with the highest rates of sexual victimization, by type of consent and incident, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

	Youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth[a]			Youth reporting sexual victimization by facility staff[b]		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
Facility name	Percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
All facilities	2.6%	2.2%	3.1%	10.3%	9.5%	11.1%
***In loco parentis* (ILP)**	3.3%	2.7%	4.0%	12.1%	11.1%	13.2%
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)	7.0	4.7	10.4	31.5	25.7	37.9
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr. (TX)[c]	13.9	10.3	18.4	23.7	19.4	28.5
Victory Field Corr. Acad. (TX)	0.0	0.0	1.2	24.6	19.8	30.0
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)[d]	16.3	13.6	19.4	8.7	6.6	11.4
Shawono Ctr. (MI)	18.2	11.8	27.0	22.7	15.5	32.0
Parental/guardian consent (PGC)	2.3%	1.7%	3.0%	9.2%	8.2%	10.3%
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr. (NC)[d]	12.0	7.2	19.3	29.2	21.7	37.9
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term (VA)	0.0	0.0	4.4	30.0	21.5	40.1
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr. (TN)	0.0	0.0	3.7	26.0	18.8	34.6
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton (MD)	0.0	0.0	19.5	36.4	16.5	62.3
L.E. Rader Ctr. (OK)	0.9	0.2	3.7	25.0	16.2	36.5
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr. (VA)[c]	7.5	2.9	17.8	22.5	13.3	35.4
Cresson Secure Treatment Unit (PA)	8.3	1.7	32.4	25.0	9.8	50.7
New Jersey Training School (NJ)	2.7	0.6	11.7	23.3	14.7	34.8

Note: High-rate facilities are those where the lower bound of the confidence interval is larger than 1.35 times the national average, by type of consent. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving a facility staff member in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[c]Facility houses both males and females.

[d]Facility houses females only.

High percentages of youth reported staff sexual misconduct in which no force, threat, or other forms of coercion were involved. Eleven of the 13 high-rate facilities had rates of staff sexual misconduct (with no report of force) that were more than twice the national average (6.4%) (table 6). Five of the 13 facilities had a confidence interval around the rate of staff sexual misconduct (with no force) with a lower bound that exceeded 10%.

Table 6.

Juvenile facilities with the highest rates of staff sexual misconduct, by type of consent and use of force by facility staff, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Youth reporting staff sexual misconduct with force[a]			Youth reporting staff sexual misconduct with no report of force		
	Percent	95%-confidence interval		Percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
All facilities	4.3%	3.8%	4.9%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%
***In loco parentis* (ILP)**	5.7%	4.9%	6.5%	7.1%	6.3%	7.9%
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)	18.1	13.4	24.0	16.8	12.7	21.8
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr. (TX)[b]	8.9	6.3	12.5	18.1	14.6	22.3
Victory Field Corr. Acad. (TX)	11.7	8.2	16.3	18.3	14.3	23.2
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac. (IN)[c]	6.5	4.7	9.0	2.2	1.3	3.6
Shawono Ctr. (MI)	13.6	8.2	21.9	13.6	8.2	21.9
Parental/guardian consent (PGC)	3.5%	2.9%	4.2%	6.1%	5.3%	6.9%
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr. (NC)[c]	20.8	14.2	29.5	12.5	7.5	20.1
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term (VA)	12.0	6.6	20.9	20.0	12.6	30.1
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr. (TN)	8.8	4.8	15.6	19.5	12.9	28.3
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton (MD)	36.4	16.5	62.3	18.2	5.7	44.8
L.E. Rader Ctr. (OK)	14.8	8.2	25.3	14.8	7.6	26.9
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr. (VA)[b]	7.5	2.9	17.8	15.0	7.7	27.1
Cresson Secure Treatment Unit (PA)	8.3	1.7	32.4	25.0	9.8	50.7
New Jersey Training School (NJ)	5.3	1.7	15.4	15.7	9.4	25.0

Note: High-rate facilities are those in which the lower bound of the confidence interval is larger than 1.35 times the average among facilities, by type of consent. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

[a]Includes physical force, threat of force, other force or pressure, and other forms of coercion, such as being given money, favors, protections, or special treatment.

[b]Facility houses both males and females.

[c]Facility houses females only.

Few differences in sexual victimization rates were associated with basic facility characteristics

An initial examination of available facility characteristics revealed few measurable differences at the 95%-level of statistical confidence—

- Rates of staff sexual misconduct with youth were higher in state operated facilities (10.9%) than in non-state facilities (7.9%). Reports of unwanted sexual activity between youth did not differ between state (2.7%) and non-state (2.6%) juvenile facilities (table 7).
- Female-only facilities had the highest rates of youth-on-youth sexual victimization (11.0%); male-only facilities had the highest rates of staff sexual misconduct (11.3%).
- Small facilities (those holding between 10 and 25 adjudicated youth) had the lowest overall rates of sexual victimization (6.3%), largely due to low rates of staff sexual misconduct (2.7%).
- Facilities in which youth were held an average of less than 5 months had the lowest rates of sexual victimization (7.4%), compared to facilities in which youth were held for longer periods (12.7% in facilities with an average of 5 to 6 months and 14.2% in facilities with an average of 7 to 12 months).

Rates of sexual victimization were strongly related to specific youth characteristics

Rates of sexual victimization varied among youth—

- Males were more likely than females to report sexual activity with facility staff. An estimated 10.8% of males, compared to 4.7% of females, said they had experienced one or more incidents of sexual activity with staff (table 8).
- Females were more likely than males to report forced sexual activity with other youth. About 9.1% of females and 2.0% of males reported forced sexual activity with another youth at the facility.

Table 7.

Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and selected facility characteristics, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

		Youth reporting any sexual victimization[a]		Youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth		Youth reporting sexual victimization by facility staff	
Facility characteristic	**Number of youth[b]**	**Percent**	**Standard error**	**Percent**	**Standard error**	**Percent**	**Standard error**
Operating agency							
State	21,170	12.7%	0.5%	2.7%	0.2%	10.9%	0.4%
Non-state[c]	5,380	10.0	0.9	2.6	0.7	7.9	0.8
Gender housed							
Males only	20,080	12.6%	0.5%	2.0%	0.2%	11.3%	0.5%
Females only	1,450	14.0	3.0	11.0	4.4	5.0	1.8
Both males and females	5,020	9.6	1.0	3.0	0.5	7.6	0.9
Number of adjudicated youth[d]							
10-25	1,390	6.3%	3.0%	3.3%	2.2%	2.7%	1.6%
26-50	2,500	12.3	2.4	2.9	1.2	10.5	2.4
51-100	4,140	10.7	1.7	3.3	0.9	8.1	1.2
101 or more	18,520	12.9	0.4	2.4	0.2	11.3	0.4
Average exposure in facility[e]							
Less than 5 months	5,730	7.4%	1.0%	1.3%	0.4%	6.3%	1.0%
5 - 6 months	10,940	12.7	0.7	3.0	0.4	10.6	0.6
7 - 12 months	9,890	14.2	0.6	3.1	0.3	12.3	0.6

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]Estimated number of adjudicated youth in facilities covered by the NSYC.

[c]Non-state refers to locally and privately operated juvenile facilities.

[d]Based on the number of adjudicated youth reported by the facility.

[e]The average exposure period for youth in the facility is based on reports from all interviewed youth. Exposure time is based on the number of months each youth in the sexual victimization survey was in the facility during the 12 months prior to the survey or since admission, if less than 12 months. (See *Methodology* for details.)

- White youth (4.4%) were more likely than black youth (2.1%) and Hispanic youth (0.9%) to report sexual victimization by another youth.
- Black youth (11.9%) reported slightly higher rates of sexual victimization by facility staff than white youth (9.7%) and Hispanic youth (8.1%).
- Reports of staff-on-youth sexual victimization increased with the length of time a youth had been in the facility. An estimated 14.6% of youth who had been in the facility 12 months or more, compared to 8.3% of youth who had been in the facility for less than 6 months, said they had sexual contact with facility staff.
- Youth with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual reported significantly higher rates of sexual victimization by another youth (12.5%) compared to heterosexual youth (1.3%).
- Youth who had experienced any prior sexual assault were at least twice as likely to report sexual victimization in the current facility (24.1%), compared to those with no sexual assault history (10.1%).
- Among youth who had been previously sexually assaulted at another correctional facility, two-thirds (65.0%) reported having been victimized at the current facility within the last 12 months or since admission, if less than 12 months.

Table 8.

Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and selected youth victim characteristics, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Youth victim characteristic	Number of youth[b]	Youth reporting any sexual victimization[a]		Youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth		Youth reporting sexual victimization by facility staff	
		Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error
Gender							
Male	24,200	12.1%	0.4%	2.0%	0.2%	10.8%	0.4%
Female	2,350	12.1	1.6	9.1	2.2	4.7	1.2
Age							
15 or younger	4,920	10.7%	0.9%	3.1%	0.6%	8.7%	0.9%
16	6,150	12.9	0.9	2.5	0.4	11.2	0.9
17	7,410	11.5	0.9	2.1	0.3	10.4	0.8
18 or older	8,080	13.0	0.8	2.9	0.5	10.5	0.7
Race/Hispanic origin							
White[c]	9,100	12.9%	0.8%	4.4%	0.4%	9.7%	0.6%
Black[c]	11,280	13.2	0.8	2.1	0.4	11.9	0.7
Hispanic	5,020	8.5	0.8	0.9	0.3	8.1	0.8
Other, non-Hispanic[c,d]	730	8.3	2.1	2.2	1.1	6.1	2.1
Two or more races[c]	420	12.8	2.7	2.7	2.3	10.0	2.5
Sexual orientation							
Heterosexual	23,340	11.1%	0.4%	1.3%	0.1%	10.2%	0.4%
Other[e]	3,210	20.4	1.6	12.5	1.5	11.2	1.1
Time in facility							
Less than 6 months	14,370	9.8%	0.6%	2.0%	0.4%	8.3%	0.5%
6-11 months	6,910	13.5	0.7	3.2	0.4	11.3	0.7
12 months or more	5,260	16.8	1.0	3.7	0.5	14.6	1.0
Prior sexual assault							
Yes	3,830	24.1%	1.5%	9.5%	1.1%	17.3%	1.2%
No	22,720	10.1	0.4	1.4	0.2	9.1	0.4
Sexually assaulted at another facility							
Yes	550	65.0%	4.0%	28.8%	3.3%	50.5%	4.7%
No	26,000	10.9	0.4	2.0	0.2	9.5	0.4

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]Estimated number of adjudicated youth, nationwide, in facilities covered by the NSYC.

[c]Excludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

[d]Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders.

[e]Includes youth who identify as mostly straight but also attracted to people of the same sex; equally attracted to males and females (bisexual); mostly gay, but also attracted to people of the opposite sex; and totally gay (homosexual).

Most youth-on-youth victims (81%) reported more than one incident; 43% reported more than one perpetrator

In the NSYC victims were also asked to provide information about the circumstances surrounding their victimization, including the number of times it had happened, characteristics of the perpetrators, the type of pressure or physical force, when and where the incidents had occurred, and whether or not they had been injured.

Data provided by youth who reported sexual victimization by another youth revealed that—

- About 81% had been victimized more than once; 32% had been victimized more than 10 times (table 9).
- An estimated 43% of youth-on-youth victims had been victimized by more than one perpetrator.
- More than half (59%) of the victims said that they had been victimized by another youth who was white; 75% said they had been victimized by a youth who was black; 39% of victims said they had been victimized by another youth who was Hispanic/Latino. (In comparison, 34% of all adjudicated youth held in the sampled facilities were white, 42% were black, and 19% were Hispanic.)
- Almost two-thirds of the victims (63%) said they had been victimized at least once by a youth known to be in a gang.
- Nearly half of the victims (46%) reported they had experienced physical force or threat of force, 30% had been offered favors or protection, and 17% had been given drugs or alcohol to engage in the sexual act or other sexual contact (table 10).

Youth-on-youth sexual victimizations occurred in areas throughout the facilities

Among youth who reported unwanted sexual activity with another youth, 43% said they had been victimized at least once in their room or sleeping area, and 33% said they had been victimized at least once in the room or sleeping area of another youth. Additionally, 45% reported at least one incident had occurred in a shower or bathroom, and 34% said they had been victimized in a recreation area. Nearly two-thirds of the victims (65%) said at least one incident had occurred in another common area, such as a classroom, library, kitchen, office, closet, or supply room.

Youth-on-youth sexual victimization was more common in the evening (between 6 p.m. and midnight) than at any other time. An estimated 60% of the youth who reported unwanted sexual activity with another youth said at least one of the incidents occurred during those hours.

Table 9.

Experiences of youth-on-youth victims of sexual victimization, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Experiences	Victims of sexual victimization by another youth[a]	
	Percent	Standard error
Number of incidents		
1	18.6%	3.4%
2	17.2	5.3
3-5	15.8	2.4
6-10	16.4	4.7
11 or more	32.0	4.8
Victimized by more than one perpetrator		
Yes	43.4%	6.5%
No	56.6	6.5
Race of perpetrator[b]		
White	58.7%	5.7%
Black	74.9	3.8
Other[c]	21.1	3.4
Hispanic/Latino origin of perpetrator		
Yes	38.7%	4.3%
No	61.3	4.3
Any of the perpetrators in a gang		
Yes	63.3%	5.0%
No	36.7	5.0

[a]Based on an estimated 700 youth sexually victimized by another youth.

[b]Detail sums to more than 100% because some youth reported more than one victimization and/or more than one perpetrator.

[c]Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders.

Most youth victimized by another youth (80%) said they had not been physically injured. Of those injured, approximately 5% reported being knocked unconscious, 9% reported being stabbed or cut, 5% reported broken bones, 7% reported internal injuries, and 5% reported that teeth had been chipped or knocked out. Additionally, 17% reported minor injuries, such as bruises, a black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, or welts. (Not shown in table.)

Among all youth victimized by another youth, 6% said they had received two or more serious injuries. Approximately 5% reported they had sought medical attention for their injuries.

Most perpetrators of staff sexual misconduct were female

Approximately 95% of all youth reporting staff sexual misconduct said they had been victimized by female facility staff (table 11). Among the estimated 2,730 adjudicated youths who had been victimized, 92% were males reporting sexual activity with female staff; an additional 2.5% were males reporting sexual activity with both female and male staff. In comparison, 91% of all adjudicated youth held in the sampled facilities were male. In 2008, 42% of staff in juvenile facilities under state jurisdiction were female. (Staff data for only sampled facilities were not available).

Physical force, threat of force, and other forms of pressure and coercion by facility staff were reported by an estimated 1,150 youths. Among these victims, 14% reported a male staff member as the perpetrator (including those victimized by both male and female staff).

Male staff members made up a smaller percentage of perpetrators among youth reporting staff sexual misconduct that did not involve any force. Among the estimated 1,710 youths who experienced staff sexual misconduct without force, nearly 4% reported the involvement of a male staff member.

Table 10.

Circumstances surrounding youth-on-youth sexual victimization, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

	Victims of sexual victimization by another youth[a]	
Circumstance	**Percent**	**Standard error**
Type of pressure or force[b]		
Force/threat of force	45.9%	4.2%
Gave victim drugs/alcohol	17.2	3.4
Offered protection	29.9	3.7
None	37.8	4.4
Victim injured		
Yes	19.6%	2.9%
No	80.4	2.9
Where occurred[b]		
In victim's room/sleeping area	42.8%	4.2%
In room/sleeping area of another youth	33.3	3.8
Elsewhere in the facility	78.9	3.1
Shower/bathroom	44.8	3.8
Recreation area	34.1	4.0
Other common area[c]	64.8	4.3
Off facility grounds	11.8	3.0
Time of day[b]		
6 a.m. to noon	38.4%	3.9%
Noon to 6 p.m.	47.5	4.3
6 p.m. to midnight	60.0	4.0
Midnight to 6 a.m.	28.2	3.9

[a]Based on an estimated 700 youth sexually victimized by another youth.

[b]Detail sums to more than 100% because some youth reported more than one victimization and/or more than one location.

[c]Includes classroom, library, workshop, kitchen or other workplace, office, someone else's room or sleeping area, closet, and supply room.

Table 11.

Victims of staff sexual misconduct, by gender of youth and staff and use of force, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

	Victims of staff sexual misconduct		
	All victims	**Force reported**	**No report of force**
All victims	100%	100%	100%
Male victim			
Male staff	1.7%	3.1%	0.5%
Female staff	92.0	86.1	96.3
Both male and female staff	2.5	4.7	0.7
Female victim			
Male staff	3.0%	4.5%	1.9%
Female staff	0.0	0.1	0
Both male and female staff	0.8	1.4	0.5
Estimated number of victims*	2,730	1,150	1,710

Note: In facilities covered by the NYSC, an estimated 91% of adjudicated youth were male. Based on available data from 43 states and the District of Columbia, 42% of staff in juvenile facilities under state jurisdiction on October 22, 2008, were female. (See *CJCA Yearbook 2009: A National Perspective of Juvenile Corrections*, Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, 2009.)

*Detail sums to more than total because some youth reported more than one victimization.

Data provided by youth who had been sexually victimized by facility staff revealed that–

- An estimated 88% had been victimized more than once by the staff; 27% had been victimized more than 10 times (table 12).
- A third (33%) said they had been victimized by more than one staff member.
- One in 7 (14%) reported they had experienced physical force or threat of force, 11% had been offered favors or protection, and 18% had been given drugs or alcohol to engage in the sexual act or other sexual contact.
- Most youth victimized by staff (95%) said they had not been physically injured. An estimated 2% reported 2 or more serious injuries; fewer than 1% said they sought medical attention (not shown in table).
- Nearly 80% of the victims said at least one incident had occurred in a common area, such as a classroom, library, kitchen, office, closet, or supply room. Half (51%) of the victims said at least one incident had occurred in a shower or bathroom; half (54%) also said they had been victimized by staff in the youth's room or sleeping area.
- Reports of staff sexual misconduct were more common between 6 p.m. and midnight (59%) than any other time.

Table 12.

Circumstances surrounding incidents of staff sexual misconduct, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

	Victims of staff sexual misconduct[a]	
Circumstance	**Percent**	**Standard error**
Number of incidents		
1	11.7%	1.3%
2	15.6	1.4
3-5	26.7	1.9
6-10	19.4	1.3
11 or more	26.6	1.6
Victimized by more than one staff member		
Yes	32.9%	1.4%
No	67.1	1.4
Type of pressure or force[b]		
Force/threat of force	14.0%	1.3%
Gave victim drugs/alcohol	18.0	1.4
Offered protection	11.0	1.1
None	68.7	1.6
Victim injured		
Yes	5.1%	1.0%
No	94.9	1.0
Where occurred[b]		
In victim's room/sleeping area	53.9%	2.2%
Elsewhere in the facility	84.2	1.4
Shower/bathroom	51.4	1.7
Recreation area	17.9	1.5
Other common area[c]	79.9	1.7
Off facility grounds	11.8	1.4
Time of day[b]		
6 a.m. to noon	43.4%	2.2%
Noon to 6 p.m.	47.3	1.6
6 p.m. to midnight	59.0	1.4
Midnight to 6 a.m.	47.1	1.7

[a]Based on an estimated 2,670 youth sexually victimized by facility staff.

[b]Detail sums to more than 100% because some youth reported more than one victimization and/or more than one location.

[c]Includes classroom, library, workshop, kitchen or other workplace, office, someone else's room or sleeping area, closet, and supply room.

Methodology

The National Survey of Youth in Custody (NSYC) was conducted in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, by Westat (Rockville, MD), under a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Data collection was conducted in 195 juvenile facilities between June 2008 and April 2009.

Interviewing juveniles in residential facilities on such sensitive topics required extensive preparations with agency and facility administrators prior to the interview. These preparations ranged from methods to obtain consent, procedures to file mandatory reports of child abuse or neglect, arrangements for counseling in case a youth became upset, and logistical support to actually carry out the interviewing. The specific procedures that had to be negotiated with state and local authorities were:

- Consent to interview minors—two options for consent were available: *in loco parentis* consent provided by the state agency acting as the guardian or active consent by parents/guardians. Twenty states and the District of Columbia provided consent *in loco parentis*. In 10 states either verbal or written parent/guardian consent was permitted. Written parent/guardian consent was required in 18 states. Two states required a mixture of *in loco parentis* and written parental consent.
- Mandatory reporting of abuse or neglect—all survey staff who had direct contact with youths had to comply with state and local reporting requirements when a youth made a verbal statement suggesting abuse or neglect. Jurisdictions provided contact information and instructions for submitting reports to an agency outside of the facility (e.g., local Child Protective Services).
- Counseling services—jurisdictions were asked to identify both facility-based and external resources for counseling services in the event a youth would become emotionally upset during the interview or make a specific request to the interviewer for such services.

The NSYC comprised two questionnaires – a survey of sexual victimization and a survey of past drug and alcohol use and abuse. Youth were randomly assigned one of the questionnaires so that, at the time of the interview, the content of the survey remained unknown to facility staff and the survey interviewers. The interviews averaged about 30 minutes in length and used automated collection methods. Youth interacted with the computer-administered questionnaires using a touch-screen and synchronized audio instructions delivered through headphones. Youth could choose to take the interview in either English or Spanish. Youth completed the interview in private, with the interviewer remaining in the room but in a position that did not offer a view of the computer screen. Approximately 10,400 youth completed one of the two NSYC questionnaires.

Sampling of facilities

The universe for the survey was all adjudicated youth residing in state operated facilities or large non-state facilities, locally or privately operated. The universe was restricted to facilities that house youth for at least 90 days. This restriction was imposed to allow sufficient time to obtain parental consent.

A multistage stratified sample design was used. At the first stage of selection, a total of 284 facilities was selected from the over 500 eligible facilities in the United States. Eligible juvenile facilities included state-owned or operated juvenile facilities and non-state facilities with 105 or more adjudicated youth.

Selection of facilities was completed using the 2006 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Based on a complete enumeration, 548 facilities were determined to be eligible for selection. A small number of facilities were later determined to be out-of-scope. Facilities were out-of-scope if the sampled facility 1) had closed, 2) was a non-state facility housing fewer than 105 youth, or 3) did not house youth for more than 90 days. The facility sampling rates ranged from a low of about 1 in 10 for the smallest facilities to certainty among the largest facilities.

For sample selection purposes, a measure of size equal to the number of adjudicated youth (according to the 2006 CJRP) was assigned to each facility in the frame. Two hundred-and-one facilities were included in the sample with certainty. These certainty facilities were state facilities with at least 90 youth or non-state facilities with at least 105 youth.

Next, one state facility was randomly selected from a designated substratum within each of the 9 states that did not contain a certainty facility. The designated substratum consisted of the largest facilities in the state. Within each of the designated substrata, one facility was selected with probability proportionate to the size of facility.

An additional 74 state facilities were selected for the study from the remaining facilities. Facilities were assigned to strata defined by gender of youths held in the facility, percent of youths who were female, facility size, region, and state. Within each stratum, between 2 and 5 facilities were selected with probabilities proportionate to size of facility.

In the interest of completing data collection activities by April 2009, the size criterion for the non-state facilities was increased to 150. This eliminated 32 facilities from the original sample.

Of the 252 selected juvenile facilities—

- 26 were determined to be ineligible due to an average length of stay of less than 90 days or some other constraint that precluded obtaining consent of parent or guardian.
- 18 had closed.
- 6 housed pre-adjudicated youth only or too few adjudicated youth to permit interviewing.
- 2 had merged with another participating facility.
- 2 participated but yielded no usable interviews from the sexual victimization survey.

Of the remaining 198 eligible juvenile facilities, 3 privately operated facilities refused to participate in the survey:

- Glen Mills School, Glen Mills, PA
- Northwestern Academy, Coal Township, PA
- Gulf Coast Trade Center, New Waverly, TX

Selection of youth

Rosters of adjudicated youth were provided by facilities granting *in loco parentis* (ILP) 4 weeks prior to data collection and by facilities requiring parental/guardian consent (PGC) 8 weeks prior to data collection. All youth were sampled in ILP facilities and in PGC facilities that had 240 or fewer youth on the roster. In PGC facilities that exceeded 240 youth, an initial sample of 240 was selected. Additionally, all females among those not selected were included with certainty.

The initial sample was supplemented by youth who were admitted to the facility between the 8th and 4th weeks prior to data collection. In ILP facilities and PGC facilities with at least 240 adjudicated youth, everyone was selected. In PGC facilities with more than 240, incoming youth were selected at the same rate as the initial sample.

Prior to the start of data collection, interviewing capacity at each facility was assessed based on the number of available days, interviewing rooms, and interviewers. In facilities in which the NSYC team had the capacity to complete all of the interviews, all youths for whom consent had been given were selected. In other facilities, youth were randomly sub-sampled so the number of youth did not exceed interviewing capacity.

A total of 25,939 youth were selected. Among these individuals, 7,175 left prior to the interviewing team arriving at the facility. After restricting the sample to those assigned to the sexual assault interview, 54% of the youth responded to the interview. Approximately 33% of the youth did not participate because parental/guardian consent could not be obtained; 6% refused to complete the interview; and 7% were non-respondents for other reasons (e.g., they did not complete the entire interview, they were not at the facility at the time of visit, the facility denied access, or they were excluded due to extreme or inconsistent response patterns).

As a result of sampling and consent protocols, youth who completed the NSYC were somewhat older and had committed more serious offenses than other youth in residential placement. Nearly twice as many youth in the NSYC were age 18 or older (26%), compared to adjudicated and non-adjudicated youth who had been enumerated in the 2006 CJRP (14%). Considerably more youth in the NSYC had been placed because of a violent offense (46%) than all youth in residential placement (34%).

Weighting and non-response adjustments

The survey data were weighted to provide facility-level and national-level estimates. To generate facility estimates, an initial weight was assigned to each youth corresponding to the inverse of the probability of selection within each facility. A series of adjustments were applied to the initial weight to compensate for non-response. These adjustments were completed in three steps:

1. Adjustment cells were constructed based on the number of locked doors the youth had to go through to leave the facility, offense, race/Hispanic origin, age, gender, and the number of days the youth had been in facility.
2. An adjustment required a minimum non-response cell size of 10 responding youth. In many facilities, this resulted in no non-response adjustment, as either the facility had too few interviews (less than 20) to create multiple cells or the differences between respondents and non-respondents were not significant. In facilities where significant differences were observed, 2 to 4 non-response cells were created.
3. After an initial non-response adjustment, the weights within a facility were examined. If the highest weight was 4 times greater than the lowest weight in the facility, the highest weights were trimmed and the difference in weighted counts distributed to the remaining youth, so that after trimming the high-to-low ratio in the final weight would be equal to 4.

To generate national estimates, the facility weights were adjusted to reflect each facility's probability of selection into the sample and then were adjusted for facility non-response. The steps in creating the national weight adjustments were the same as those described for facility-level weights.

Calculating facility-level response rates

Within each facility a base weight was created for each youth in the sexual victimization survey by taking the inverse of each youth's probability of selection. In most facilities youth selection probabilities were the same. However, in some sampled facilities (e.g. where females were oversampled and where rosters contained duplicate records) selection probabilities varied.

An initial facility response rate was calculated by summing the base weights for all youth completing the sexual victimization survey and dividing it by the sum of the base weights for all sampled youth (minus ineligible youth) in each facility.

A final response rate was calculated to account for the deletion of interviews containing extreme or inconsistent responses. (See discussion on page 6.) This was achieved by multiplying the initial facility response rate by an adjustment ratio. In each facility this ratio represented the sum of final weights for all interviewed youth excluding those with extreme or inconsistent responses divided by the sum of final weights for all interviewed youth including those with extreme or inconsistent responses. This final adjusted response rate was then multiplied by 100.

Calculations for Mt. Meigs Campus (Alabama) illustrate the calculation of these weighted facility-level response rates. The facility listed 278 youth on its roster. Of these listed, 193 were subsampled. Thirteen of the sampled youth were roster errors (and were excluded from the sample). Of the remaining 180 sampled youth, 32 were discharged prior to the visit, leaving 132 sampled for the sexual victimization survey and 16 for supplemental survey. Of the 132 eligible youth, 121 completed the NSYC survey. After adjusting for the probability of selection for each youth, the 121 youth who completed the sexual victimization survey represented 208 youth (or 91.7% of the 227 eligible youth in the facility). Three of the youth provided extreme or 3 or more inconsistent responses and were excluded. After adjusting for the probability of selection for each youth, a ratio adjustment of.974 was applied to the initial response rate, resulting in an overall facility response rate of 89.3% (.974 times.917 times 100%).

Standard errors and confidence intervals

Survey estimates are subject to sampling error arising from the fact that the estimates are based on a sample rather than a complete enumeration. Within each facility, the estimated sampling error varies by the size of the estimate, the number of completed interviews, and the size of the facility. Because of the relatively small samples within many of the selected facilities, it is especially important to consider the possibility of sampling error when interpreting the survey results.

Estimates of the standard errors for selected measures of sexual victimization are presented in tables that provide national-level estimates. These estimates may be used to construct confidence intervals around the survey estimates (e.g., numbers, percents, and rates), as well as to test for significant differences between the estimates.

For example, the 95%-confidence interval around the percent of male youth reporting sexual victimizations by another youth is approximately 2.0% plus or minus 1.96 times 0.2% (or 1.6% to 2.4%). Based on similarly conducted samples, 95% of the intervals would be expected to contain the true (but unknown) percentage.

The standard errors may also be used to construct confidence intervals around differences in the estimates. The 95%-confidence interval comparing the percent of male youths (2.0%) and female youths (9.1%) reporting sexual victimization may be calculated. The confidence interval around the difference of 7.1% is approximately plus or minus 1.96 times 2.2% (the square root of the pooled variance estimate, 4.9%). The pooled variance estimate is calculated by taking the square root of the sum of each standard error squared, e.g., the square root of $(0.2)^2$ plus $(2.2)^2$. Since the interval (2.8% to 11.4%) does not include zero, the difference between male youth and female youth is considered statistically significant.

To express the possible variation due to sampling associated with facility-level estimates, tables in this report provide lower and upper bounds of the related 95%-confidence intervals. Because many facility samples are small and the estimates are close to 0%, confidence intervals were constructed using an alternative method developed by Wilson. Computationally, this method produces an asymmetrical confidence interval around the facility estimates, in which the lower bound is constrained to be greater than or equal to 0% and the upper bound is less than or equal to 100%. It also provides confidence intervals for facilities in which the survey estimates are zero (but other similarly conducted surveys could yield non-zero estimates).

Exposure period

For purposes of calculating comparative rates of sexual victimization, the facility provided the most recent date of admission to the current facility. If the date of admission was at least 12 months prior to the date of the survey, youth were asked questions related to their experiences during the last 12 months. If the admission date was less than 12 months prior to the interview, youth were asked about their experiences since they arrived at the facility.

The average exposure period for sexual victimization among sampled youth was 6.9 months in ILP facilities and 6.0 months in PGC facilities. Overall, the average exposure period was 6.3 months. Ten of the 13 high rate facilities had longer average exposure periods (ranging from 6.9 months to 10.6 months). Three of the 11 low rate facilities had average exposure periods shorter than 6.3 months (not shown in tables).

Measuring sexual victimization

The NSYC relied on the reporting of direct experience of each youth, rather than youth reporting on the experience of other youth. The strategy was to first ask if the youth had engaged in any type of sexual activity at the facility within the last 12 months or since they entered the facility, if they had been in the facility for less than 12 months. These questions were not specific to the perpetrator or whether the sexual activity was coerced.

The initial series of questions differed by the age of the youth. Youth ages 15 or older were administered questions related to the touching of body parts in a sexual way, involving oral, anal, or vaginal sex. Youth ages 14 or younger, were asked less detailed questions about sexual activity. Rather than referring to explicit body parts and acts, the items had less explicit language (i.e., "private parts"). This was done to avoid exposing younger respondents to explicit sexual references. (See pages 20-21 for specific survey items.)

Youth who reported sexual activity were then asked if the activities occurred with other youth or with staff. They were next asked questions about the presence and nature of coercion (including use of physical force or threat of physical force; other type of force or pressure; or return for money, favors, protection, or other special treatment) associated with the youth-on-youth activities. A separate but identical set of questions was asked about coercion associated with staff-on-youth activities. (See page 22 for specific survey items.)

If the respondent did not report any sexual contact in the initial screening items, the ACASI survey administered a series of questions that asked if the youth had been coerced to engage in sexual activity. If a youth answered affirmatively, he/she was asked if the event occurred with another youth or with a staff member. Follow-up questions, comparable to the initial screener questions, were asked of those who reported victimization.

The ACASI survey presented additional questions related to both youth-on-youth and staff-on-youth sexual victimization. These questions collected further information on the characteristics of the victimization, such as time and location, number, race/Hispanic origin, and gender of perpetrators; injuries sustained and medical care received by the youth as a result of the assault; and reporting of the assault to authorities and action taken by them after the assault.

The entire ACASI questionnaires (listed as National Survey of Youth in Custody) are available on the BJS web site at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=321> (last accessed December 22, 2009).

Definition of terms

Sexual victimization—includes any forced sexual activity with another youth (nonconsensual sexual acts and other sexual contacts) and all sexual activity with facility staff (staff sexual misconduct and staff sexual misconduct excluding touching).

Nonconsensual sexual acts—includes forced sexual acts with another youth and all sexual acts with facility staff involving contact with the penis and the vagina or penis and the anus; contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus; penetration of the anal or vaginal opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object; and rubbing of another person's penis or vagina by a hand.

Other sexual contacts only—includes kissing on the lips or other part of the body, looking at private body parts, being shown something sexual like pictures or a movie, and engaging in some other sexual act that did not involve touching.

Staff sexual misconduct—includes all sexual activity with facility staff including contact with the penis and the vagina or the penis and the anus; contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus; penetration of the anal or vaginal opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object; rubbing of another person's penis or vagina by a hand; kissing on the lips or other part of the body; looking at private body parts; being shown something sexual like pictures or a movie; and engaging in some other sexual act that did not involve touching.

Staff sexual misconduct excluding touching—includes sexual activity with facility staff involving contact with the penis and the vagina or the penis and the anus; contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus; penetration of the anal or vaginal opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object; and rubbing of another person's penis or vagina by a hand.

Forced sexual activity—includes sexual activity between youth and facility staff as a result of physical force or threat of physical force; force or pressure of some other type (e.g. threatening with harm, threatening to get the youth in trouble, pressuring the youth, or forcing or pressuring in some other way); and in return for money, favors, protection, or other special treatment.

Survey items measuring sexual activity within the facility during the past 12 months or since entering the facility if less 12 months

Males, ages 15 and older

C11. During the past 12 months, have you rubbed another person's penis with your hand or has someone rubbed your penis with their hand?

C12. During the past 12 months, have you rubbed another person's vagina with your hand?

C13. During the past 12 months, have you put your mouth on another person's penis or has someone put their mouth on your penis?

C14. During the past 12 months, have you put your mouth on someone's vagina?

C15. During the past 12 months, have you put your penis, finger, or something else inside someone else's rear end or has someone put their penis, finger, or something else inside your rear end?

C16. During the past 12 months, have you put your penis, finger, or something else inside someone's vagina?

C17. During the past 12 months, have you had any <u>other</u> kind of sexual contact with someone at this facility?

C17a.What kind of sexual contact was that? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Kissing on the lips……..…..…....1

Kissing other parts of the body ……..……...2

Looking at private parts……..…..…….…….....3

Showing something sexual, like pictures or a movie…….…….…....4

Something else that did not involve touching ……5

Something else that did involve touching……....6

Females, ages 15 and older

C18. During the past 12 months, have you rubbed another person's penis with your hand?

C19. During the past 12 months, have you rubbed someone else's vagina with your hand or has someone else rubbed your vagina with their hand?

C20. During the past 12 months, have you put your mouth on another person's penis?

C21. During the past 12 months, have you put your mouth on someone else's vagina, or has someone put their mouth on your vagina?

C22. During the past 12 months, have you put your finger or something else inside someone else's rear end or has someone put their penis, finger, or something else inside your rear end?

C23. During the past 12 months, have you put your finger or something else inside someone else's vagina or has someone put their penis, finger, or something else inside your vagina?

C24. During the past 12 months, have you had any <u>other</u> kind of sexual contact with someone at this facility?

C24a.What kind of sexual contact was that? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Kissing on the lips……..…..…..1

Kissing other parts of the body ……..……2

Looking at private parts……..…..…….…..…. 3

Showing something sexual, like pictures or a movie…….……..….4

Something else that did not involve touching …...5

Something else that did involve touching……..6

Survey items measuring sexual activity within the facility during the past 12 months or since entering the facility if less 12 months (cont.)

All youth ages 14 or younger

C1. The next questions are about sexual contacts that happen in this facility.

Sexual contacts are when someone touches your private parts or you touch someone else's private parts in a sexual way.

By private parts, we mean any part of the body that would be covered by a bathing suit.

C11. During the past 12 months, have you rubbed anyone's private parts with your hand or has anyone rubbed your private parts with their hand?

C12. During the past 12 months, have you put your mouth on anyone's private parts or has anyone put their mouth on your private parts?

C13. During the past 12 months, have you put any part of your body inside anyone else's private parts?

C13a. During the past 12 months, has anyone put part of their body inside your private parts?

C14. During the past 12 months, have you had any <u>other</u> kind of sexual contact with someone at this facility?

C14a.What kind of sexual contact was that? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Kissing on the lips……..…..…..1

Kissing other parts of the body …….…….....2

Looking at private parts…….…..…….…….. 3

Showing something sexual, like pictures or a movie…….…….…..4

Something else that did not involve touching …. .5

Something else that did involve touching……..….6

Survey items measuring with whom the sexual activity occurred

C25. You've said that since you have been at this facility, you [*list of specific activities*]

C26. Did (this/any of these) happen with a youth at this facility?

C27. During the past 12 months, which ones happened with a youth at this facility? [*list of specific activities*]

C28. You've said that since you have been at this facility, you [*list of specific activities*]

Did (this/any of these) happen with a member of the facility staff?

C30. During the past 12 months, which ones happened with a youth at this facility? [*list of specific activities*]

Survey items measuring pressure or nature of coercion

For incidents with youth

C31. During the past 12 months, did (this/any of these) ever happen because a youth at this facility used physical force or threat of physical force?

C34. During the past 12 months, did (this/any of these) ever happen because a youth at this facility forced or pressured you in some other way to do it?

C34a. How were you forced or pressured in some other way? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Another youth threatened you with harm……..……..1

Another youth threatened to get you in trouble with other youth……. 2

Another youth threatened to get you trouble with the staff ……..…….. . . .3

Another youth kept asking you to do it …….…..…4

Another youth forced or pressured you in some other way ……….....5

C36. During the past 12 months, did (this/any of these) ever happen with a youth at this facility in return for money, favors, protection, or other special treatment?

For incidents with staff

C45. During the past 12 months, did (this/any of these) ever happen because a staff member used physical force or threat of physical force?

C48. During the past 12 months, did (this/any of these) ever happen because a staff member forced or pressured you in some other way to do it?

C48a. How were you forced or pressured in some other way? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

A staff member threatened you with harm……..…..…..1

A staff member threatened to get you in trouble with other youth……..……2

A staff member threatened to get you trouble with the staff..……....……3

A staff member kept asking you to do it ……..…..…4

A staff member forced or pressured you in some other way ……..…….……...5

C50. During the past 12 months, did (this/any of these) ever happen with a staff member in return for money, favors, protection, or other special treatment?

Items checked for extreme and inconsistent response patterns

Items unrelated to reports of sexual victimization

1. Reported one of the following:

- being admitted to the facility before turning 8 years old;
- being admitted to the facility in the future;
- being 8 feet tall or taller;
- weighing 500 pounds or more; or
- having a Body Mass Index of either less than 15 or 50 or greater.

2. Youth "strongly agreed" with the statement "that some of the questions about sexual activity were hard to understand".

3. Youth reported being sexual assaulted prior to admission to the facility but when asked "how many times" reported "0".

4. Youth reported being physically assaulted by staff more than 3 times per day.

5. Youth reported being physically assaulted by youth more than 3 times per day.

6. Youth reported being physically assaulted by staff but when asked "how many times" responded with "0".

7. Youth reported being physically assaulted by youth but when asked "how many times" responded with "0".

8. Youth reported being injured by staff but when asked "how many times" responded with "0".

9. Youth reported being injured by youth but when asked "how many times" responded with "0".

Items related to reports of sexual victimization

10. Youth reported sexual contact with a staff member, but the type of activity was not consistent with the gender of the perpetrator reported during the interview.

11. Youth reported sexual assault by another youth, but the type of activity was not consistent with the gender of the perpetrator reported during the interview.

12. Reports of injury resulting from sexual assault by staff were not consistently reported in different sections of the questionnaire.

13. Reports of injury resulting from sexual assault by youth were not consistently reported in different sections of the questionnaire.

14. Responses about reporting a sexual assault by staff to the facility administrators were not consistent across different questions of the questionnaire.

15. Responses about reporting a sexual assault by a youth to the facility administrators were not consistent across different questions of the questionnaire.

16. Youth reported forced sexual contact by staff in one section but did not report specific types of coercion in another section of the questionnaire.

17. Youth reported forced sexual contact by youth in one section but did not report specific types of coercion in another section of the questionnaire.

18. Youth reported having sexual contact with staff but did not provide the specific type of activity that occurred.

19. Youth reported having forced sexual contact with a youth but did not provide the specific type of activity that occurred.

20. Youth did not provide details about a report of injury resulting from forced sexual contact with staff.

21. Youth did not provide details about a report of injury resulting from forced sexual contact with youth.

22. Youth reported sexual penetration by staff in one section of the questionnaire but not in another section.

23. Youth reported sexual penetration by another youth in one section of the questionnaire but not in another section.

24. Youth reported having sexual contact with staff but when asked "how many times" responded with "0".

25. Youth reported having sexual contact with a youth but when asked "how many times" responded with "0".

Appendix Table 1.

Characteristics of juvenile facilities participating in the National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of youth sampled	Number of ineligible youth[b]	Number of respondents[a]		
			All completed NSYC interviews	Sexual victimization survey	Response rate[c]
Total	25,896	7,162	10,263	9,198	54.5%
Alabama[d]					
Chalkville Campus[e]	40	6	30	26	86.7%
Mt. Meigs Campus[f]	180	32	133	118	89.3
Vacca Campus	74	8	52	46	76.7
Alaska[d]					
McLaughlin Yth. Ctr.[g]	78	8	60	53	84.1%
Arizona					
Adobe Mtn. School[f]	276	30	42	36	16.3%
Catalina Mtn. School	98	10	23	21	26.3
Southwest Reg. Juv. Complex, Eagle Point	162	27	20	18	14.8
Arkansas[d]					
Arkansas Juv. Assess. and Trtmt. Ctr.[g,h]	84	14	63	57	90.5%
Dermott Juv. Corr. Fac.[h]	39	7	32	29	100.0
California					
Barry J. Nidorf Juv. Hall[g,i]	734	608	7	7	6.1%
Central Juv. Hall[g,i]	475	225	7	6	2.6
Central Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[g,i]	191	154	23	20	60.6
East Mesa Juv. Det. Fac.[i]	314	209	40	36	38.3
Fresno Co. Juv. Justice Campus[d,g,i]	140	38	91	82	89.1
Heman G. Stark Yth. Corr. Fac.[d]	209	48	128	115	79.3
Juv. Ranch Fac.[i]	198	155	5	5	13.2
Los Padrinos Juv. Hall[g,i]	386	335	4	3	6.7
N.A. Chaderjian Yth. Corr. Fac.[d,f]	176	21	94	83	59.7
O.H. Close Yth. Corr. Fac.[d,f]	164	4	136	122	84.7
Orange Co. Juv. Hall[g,i]	284	182	28	26	28.5
Preston Yth. Corr. Fac.[d,f]	182	35	106	94	70.7
San Mateo Co. Yth. Services Ctr.[g,i]	69	38	5	5	17.9
Santa Clara Co. Juv. Hall[g,i]	223	125	31	28	31.5
Southern Yth. Corr. Reception Ctr. and Clinic[d,f]	187	27	127	116	80.6
Ventura Co. Juv. Fac.[f,g,i]	341	195	31	28	21.4
Ventura Yth. Corr. Fac.[d,g]	184	24	121	107	74.2
West Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[g,i]	184	145	13	12	34.3
Colorado					
Grand Mesa Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[g]	60	32	24	21	84.0%
Lookout Mtn. Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.	175	23	76	68	48.9
Mt. View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[g]	118	73	13	11	28.2
Platte Valley Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[g]	77	38	22	20	57.1
Ridge View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[f,h]	242	34	116	106	56.6
Spring Creek Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[g]	69	36	19	18	60.0
Connecticut					
Connecticut Juv. Training School	128	21	14	14	14.6%
Delaware[d]					
Ferris School for Boys	80	10	62	56	88.9%
District of Columbia[d]					
Oak Hill Yth. Ctr.	76	10	21	18	30.0%

Appendix table 1. (cont.)
Characteristics of juvenile facilities participating in the National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of youth sampled	Number of ineligible youth[b]	Number of respondents[a]		
			All completed NSYC interviews	Sexual victimization survey	Response rate[c]
Florida					
Arthur G. Dozier School for Boys	161	36	72	65	58.0%
Avon Park Yth. Acad.[h]	173	19	74	64	46.9
Bristol Yth. Acad.[h]	66	13	21	19	39.6
Cypress Creek Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[h]	104	14	37	32	38.2
Desoto Dual Diagnosis Corr. Fac.	77	8	35	31	49.2
Desoto High-Risk Female Corr. Fac.[e]	80	11	36	33	52.9
Desoto Juv. Res. Fac.	149	34	62	55	53.8
Duval Halfway House	18	7	7	6	66.7
Falkenburg Acad.	110	28	48	43	58.1
Hastings Yth. Acad., Moderate Risk[h]	172	41	33	29	24.6
Jackson Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.	126	46	33	30	41.1
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.[h]	48	12	13	12	36.4
Okeechobee Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[h]	97	11	56	51	65.7
Pensacola Boys Base	29	7	16	15	78.9
Riverside Acad.[h]	177	29	57	50	37.6
Georgia[d]					
Augusta Yth. Dev. Campus	131	35	79	71	82.8%
Bill Ireland Yth. Dev. Campus[f]	184	25	124	110	76.9
Eastman Yth. Dev. Campus[f]	175	15	121	108	75.0
Macon Yth. Dev. Campus[e]	184	85	83	75	84.4
Sumter Yth. Dev. Campus	149	13	100	89	73.0
Hawaii[d]					
Hawaii Yth. Corr. Fac.[g]	63	9	41	36	73.9%
Idaho[d]					
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Lewiston[g]	37	6	31	29	100.0%
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Nampa[g]	60	22	36	33	97.1
Juv. Corr. Ctr., St. Anthony[g]	144	8	133	119	97.5
Illinois					
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Chicago	79	38	19	17	45.9%
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Harrisburg[f]	252	88	86	76	51.4
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Joliet	302	79	132	118	59.1
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Kewanee	227	27	129	117	65.1
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Murphysboro	94	35	28	26	48.1
Illinois Yth. Ctr., St. Charles[f]	361	191	81	74	48.7
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Warrenville[e]	76	15	31	28	51.6
Indiana[d]					
Camp Summit Boot Camp	77	7	61	55	88.7%
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac.[e]	123	16	101	92	94.8
North Central Juv. Corr. Fac.	143	22	119	106	98.1
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac.[f]	193	31	143	128	87.7
South Bend Juv. Corr. Fac.	123	25	87	78	88.5
Iowa[d]					
Boys State Training School	166	16	141	129	95.6%
Woodward Acad.[h]	161	21	133	119	94.4
Kansas[d]					
Kansas Juv. Corr. Complex	192	32	110	97	67.4%
Larned Juv. Corr. Fac.	110	10	92	82	91.1
Kentucky					
Adair Yth. Dev. Ctr.[g]	60	12	11	9	20.9%
Audubon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	50	12	19	17	50.0
Bluegrass Yth. Dev. Ctr.	35	5	9	8	28.6
Green River Yth. Dev. Ctr.	49	14	15	13	40.6
Lincoln Village Yth. Dev. Ctr. and Reg. Juv. Det.	46	15	13	12	41.4

Appendix table 1. (cont.)
Characteristics of juvenile facilities participating in the National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of youth sampled	Number of ineligible youth[b]	Number of respondents[a]		Response rate[c]
			All completed NSYC interviews	Sexual victimization survey	
Louisiana					
Jetson Corr. Ctr. for Yth.	69	13	29	25	50.0%
Swanson Ctr. for Yth.	249	40	121	108	57.3
Maine[d]					
Long Creek Yth. Dev. Ctr.[g]	91	8	68	61	81.3%
Maryland					
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton	53	17	12	11	33.3%
Cheltenham Yth. Fac.	58	29	2	2	7.4
Thomas J. S. Waxter Children's Ctr.[e]	18	11	3	3	50.0
Massachusetts					
Connelly Transitional Unit	17	5	2	1	10.0%
Fay A. Rotenberg School[e,h]	18	5	5	5	41.7
Metro Trtmt. Ctr.[h]	20	2	3	3	18.8
Michigan					
Maxey Training School[d]	63	4	52	47	88.7%
Oakland Co. Children's Village[g,i]	161	27	52	46	38.0
Pioneer Work and Learn Ctr.[h]	222	49	73	66	42.6
Shawono Ctr.[d]	30	2	25	22	88.0
Starr Commonwealth, Albion[h]	150	35	53	47	45.2
Minnesota					
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Red Wing	111	2	54	49	50.3%
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Togo	32	7	6	5	21.7
Mississippi					
Oakley Training School, Units 1 and 2[g]	168	94	31	28	42.4%
Missouri[d]					
Ft. Bellefontaine Campus	26	3	22	20	95.2%
Hogan Street Reg. Yth. Ctr.	32	6	23	21	87.5
Montgomery City Yth. Ctr.	41	3	28	25	73.5
Rich Hill Yth. Dev. Ctr.	22	3	19	17	100.0
Watkins Mill Park Camp[g]	63	8	35	31	62.0
Montana					
Pine Hills Yth. Corr. Fac.	79	19	30	27	50.0%
Nebraska					
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Geneva[e]	80	11	31	28	44.4%
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Kearney	168	44	50	47	42.0
Nevada					
Caliente Yth. Ctr.[g]	109	24	35	31	40.3%
Nevada Yth. Training Ctr.	122	23	32	30	34.4
Rite of Passage, Silverstate Acad.[h]	210	31	57	51	31.9
Summit View Yth. Corr. Ctr.	44	9	15	13	41.9
New Hampshire					
John H. Sununu Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[g]	95	36	11	9	17.0%
New Jersey					
Camden Res. Community Home	26	10	8	7	46.7%
Green Res. Community Home	22	10	7	7	63.6
Juv. Medium Security Fac., Males	119	38	28	25	33.8
Juv. Reception and Assess. Ctr.	233	184	6	4	9.1
New Jersey Training School[f]	286	72	78	71	37.7
Voorhees Res. Community Home	22	5	8	7	43.8
New Mexico					
New Mexico Yth. Diagnostic Dev. Ctr.[g]	141	38	74	66	70.3%

Appendix table 1. (cont.)
Characteristics of juvenile facilities participating in the National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of youth sampled	Number of ineligible youth[b]	Number of respondents[a]		Response rate[c]
			All completed NSYC interviews	Sexual victimization survey	
New York					
Allen Res. Ctr.	51	19	17	16	57.1%
Berkshire Farm Ctr. and Srvcs.[h]	102	18	10	9	11.8
Brentwood Res. Ctr.[e]	31	18	3	2	16.7
Brookwood Secure Ctr.	149	5	63	57	43.1
Highland Res. Ctr.	159	28	34	31	26.1
Industry Limited Secure Ctr.	85	28	10	8	15.7
Louis Gossett Jr. Res. Ctr.	170	86	22	20	26.7
Middletown Res. Ctr.[g]	27	8	3	2	11.8
Sgt. Henry Johnson Yth. Leadership Acad.	44	11	10	9	30.0
Tryon Boys Res. Ctr.	107	21	12	11	14.1
Tryon Girls Res. Ctr.[e]	59	7	12	12	26.1
North Carolina					
C.A. Dillon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	113	13	39	34	37.8%
Dobbs Yth. Dev. Ctr.	68	31	29	26	78.8
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr.[e]	50	18	28	25	86.2
Stonewall Jackson Yth. Dev. Ctr.	106	10	57	51	59.3
Swannanoa Valley Yth. Dev. Ctr.	51	3	18	17	39.5
North Dakota					
North Dakota Yth. Corr. Ctr.[g]	72	25	33	30	71.4%
Ohio					
Circleville Juv. Corr. Fac.	139	17	74	66	60.5%
Cuyahoga Hills Juv. Corr. Fac.[f]	285	66	101	90	45.5
Hillcrest Training School[i]	112	20	12	11	13.3
Indian River Juv. Corr. Fac.[f]	329	69	102	90	38.4
Juv. Res. Ctr. of Northwest Ohio[i]	42	4	31	28	80.0
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.	159	21	52	47	36.7
Mohican Juv. Corr. Fac.	136	23	58	52	51.5
Ohio River Valley Juv. Corr. Fac.[f]	282	44	83	74	34.7
Scioto Juv. Corr. Fac.[g]	194	151	7	5	13.2
Oklahoma					
Central Oklahoma Juv. Ctr.[g]	104	10	28	24	28.6%
L.E. Rader Ctr.	137	14	54	51	45.6
Oregon[d]					
Camp Florence	21	5	15	14	93.3%
Hillcrest Yth. Corr. Fac.	100	10	66	57	70.4
MacLaren Yth. Corr. Fac.[f]	181	21	138	124	86.1
Rogue Valley Yth. Corr. Fac.[f]	88	8	76	68	94.4
Pennsylvania					
Abraxas I[h]	182	34	85	78	58.6%
Cresson Secure Trtmt. Unit[h]	56	15	14	12	33.3
George Jr. Republic[f,h]	283	61	87	77	38.6
Loysville Yth. Dev. Ctr.	125	32	54	49	58.3
New Castle Yth. Dev. Ctr.	156	17	60	53	42.9
North Central Secure Trtmt. Unit[g]	121	15	49	45	47.4
Pennsylvania Clinical School, Keystone[h]	87	11	34	32	46.4
St. Gabriel's Hall[h]	201	30	77	69	44.7
Summit Acad.[f,h]	242	22	83	73	36.7
Rhode Island[d]					
Rhode Island Training School[g]	146	34	83	75	74.3%
South Carolina[d]					
Broad River Rd. Complex, Birchwood	66	6	57	51	96.2%
Broad River Rd. Complex, John G. Richards	117	13	76	70	74.5
South Dakota					
Patrick Henry Brady Acad.[f]	64	26	21	19	61.1%

Appendix table 1. (cont.)
Characteristics of juvenile facilities participating in the National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of youth sampled	Number of ineligible youth[b]	Number of respondents[a]		Response rate[c]
			All completed NSYC interviews	Sexual victimization survey	
Tennessee					
John S. Wilder Yth. Dev. Ctr.	125	18	55	49	50.5%
Mtn. View Yth. Dev. Ctr.	137	30	65	58	60.1
Taft Yth. Dev. Ctr.	132	34	63	56	63.3
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr.	142	28	61	55	53.4
Texas[d]					
Al Price State Juv. Corr. Fac.	187	27	140	126	87.6%
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr.[g]	111	5	90	81	84.1
Cottrell House	24	3	15	13	68.4
Crockett State School[f]	184	25	133	119	83.2
Evins Reg. Juv. Ctr.	164	22	83	74	57.7
Gainesville State School[f]	190	28	135	120	82.8
Giddings State School[f]	170	12	143	131	91.6
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 1	224	131	87	78	92.9
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 2[f]	174	9	146	132	89.3
Ron Jackson State Juv. Corr. Ctr. Unit I[e]	138	19	101	89	84.0
Schaeffer House	19	6	9	7	63.6
Victory Field Corr. Acad.	86	10	69	61	89.7
West Texas State School	94	17	67	60	85.7
Utah					
Decker Lake Yth. Ctr.[g]	38	5	16	14	46.7%
Vermont[d]					
Woodside Juv. Rehab. Ctr.[g]	14	2	11	9	90.0%
Virginia					
Beaumont Juv. Corr. Ctr.	236	43	83	74	42.5%
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr.[g]	186	34	45	40	29.4
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term	145	12	58	51	42.9
Hanover Juv. Corr. Ctr.	147	18	29	27	23.3
Washington					
Echo Glen Children's Ctr.[g]	147	34	36	32	31.7%
Green Hill School	173	9	68	62	41.4
Maple Lane School	206	49	80	71	50.7
Naselle Yth. Camp[g]	131	55	28	25	37.0
Twin Rivers Community Fac.	14	3	7	6	66.7
West Virginia[d]					
West Virginia Industrial Home for Yth.[g]	174	19	128	115	82.7%
Wisconsin					
Ethan Allen School[f]	262	68	100	90	51.4%
Lincoln Hills School	249	55	82	72	41.4
Wyoming					
Wyoming Boys School	74	25	38	34	77.3%

Note: A total of 10,263 youth participated in NSYC. Approximately 10% (1,065) were randomly assigned to an alternative survey on drug use and treatment. Two facilities in which there were no useable interviews due to extreme or inconsistent response were excluded. Facilities house males only unless otherwise notes.

[a]Number of adjudicated youth who participated in the survey. Includes 105 youth with incomplete information on sexual victimization items.

[b]Youth were considered ineligible if they were mentally or physically incapacitated, admitted to the facility within 4 weeks prior to the data collection period, transferred or released after sample selection but before the data collection period, or identified as pre-adjudicated. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[c]Response rate accounts for different probabilities of selection among youth and the exclusion of interviews with extreme or inconsistent responses. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[d]State/facility granted consent *in loco parentis*. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[e]Facility houses females only.

[f]Youth sub-sampled after initial sample selected.

[g]Facility houses both males and females.

[h]Private facility. Some private facilities may be state owned or under state jurisdiction.

[i]County facility.

Appendix Table 2.

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization, by facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization[a]		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound
Total	12.1%	11.3%	13.0%
Alabama[b]			
Chalkville Campus[c]	3.8%	1.5%	9.4%
Mt. Meigs Campus	11.2	8.2	15.1
Vacca Campus	19.6	14.3	26.1
Alaska[b]			
McLaughlin Yth. Ctr.[d]	15.1%	11.1%	20.2%
Arizona			
Adobe Mtn. School	16.9%	8.9%	29.5%
Catalina Mtn. School	23.8	10.0	46.9
Southwest Reg. Juv. Complex, Eagle Point	23.5	9.3	47.9
Arkansas[b]			
Arkansas Juv. Assess. and Trtmt. Ctr.[d,e]	10.7%	7.7%	14.7%
Dermott Juv. Corr. Fac.[e]	13.8	10.3	18.3
California			
Barry J. Nidorf Juv. Hall[d,f]	0.0%	0.0%	34.1%
Central Juv. Hall[d,f]	:	:	:
Central Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	10.3	3.8	25.0
East Mesa Juv. Det. Fac.[f]	14.3	6.3	29.2
Fresno Co. Juv. Justice Campus[b,d,f]	11.3	8.6	14.6
Heman G. Stark Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	3.5	2.1	5.8
Juv. Ranch Fac.[f]	:	:	:
Los Padrinos Juv. Hall[d,f]	0.0	0.0	54.7
N.A. Chaderjian Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	14.5	9.4	21.7
O.H. Close Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	13.9	10.7	17.9
Orange Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	4.0	0.8	17.1
Preston Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	14.0	9.2	20.8
San Mateo Co. Yth. Services Ctr.[d,f]	0.0	0.0	34.9
Santa Clara Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	3.6	1.2	10.6
Southern Yth. Corr. Reception Ctr. and Clinic[b]	8.7	5.6	13.2
Ventura Co. Juv. Fac.[d,f]	2.5	0.8	7.7
Ventura Yth. Corr. Fac.[b,d]	12.4	8.4	18.0
West Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	8.3	1.7	32.1
Colorado			
Grand Mesa Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%
Lookout Mtn. Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.	12.2	5.9	23.6
Mt. View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	0.0	0.0	20.9
Platte Valley Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	5.3	1.4	17.8
Ridge View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[e]	5.4	3.3	8.8
Spring Creek Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	5.6	1.5	18.1
Connecticut			
Connecticut Juv. Training School	0.0%	0.0%	20.4%
Delaware[b]			
Ferris School for Boys	18.2%	14.0%	23.3%
District of Columbia[b]			
Oak Hill Yth. Ctr.	11.1%	3.5%	30.1%

Appendix Table 2. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization, by facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization[a]		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound
Florida			
Arthur G. Dozier School for Boys	11.3%	6.9%	17.9%
Avon Park Yth. Acad.[e]	10.9	6.0	19.0
Bristol Yth. Acad.[e]	5.3	1.2	20.5
Cypress Creek Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	12.1	6.8	20.7
Desoto Dual Diagnosis Corr. Fac.	16.1	8.7	27.9
Desoto High-Risk Female Corr. Fac.[c]	3.6	1.4	9.3
Desoto Juv. Res. Fac.	1.0	0.3	3.8
Duval Halfway House	0.0	0.0	22.5
Falkenburg Acad.	7.0	3.3	14.3
Hastings Yth. Acad., Moderate Risk[e]	13.8	5.4	30.6
Jackson Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.	11.1	3.8	28.4
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.[e]	0.0	0.0	18.9
Okeechobee Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	16.4	10.7	24.3
Pensacola Boys Base	0.0	0.0	7.5
Riverside Acad.[e]	18.5	9.7	32.3
Georgia[b]			
Augusta Yth. Dev. Campus	21.3%	16.6%	26.9%
Bill Ireland Yth. Dev. Campus	17.4	13.0	23.0
Eastman Yth. Dev. Campus	19.4	13.5	27.2
Macon Yth. Dev. Campus[c]	14.0	10.2	18.8
Sumter Yth. Dev. Campus	23.6	18.7	29.3
Hawaii[b]			
Hawaii Yth. Corr. Fac.[d]	10.7%	6.0%	18.3%
Idaho[b]			
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Lewiston[d]	25.0%	13.8%	41.1%
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Nampa[d]	3.0	1.5	6.0
Juv. Corr. Ctr., St. Anthony[d]	7.6	6.1	9.3
Illinois			
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Harrisburg	11.8	6.8	19.8
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Joliet	13.9	10.0	18.9
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Kewanee	9.8	6.9	13.8
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Murphysboro	0.0	0.0	7.6
Illinois Yth. Ctr., St. Charles	10.2	4.5	21.3
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Warrenville[c]	11.4	4.8	24.7
Indiana[b]			
Camp Summit Boot Camp	9.1%	6.2%	13.2%
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac.[c]	22.8	19.7	26.3
North Central Juv. Corr. Fac.	11.3	9.4	13.6
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac.	36.2	30.5	42.4
South Bend Juv. Corr. Fac.	8.2	5.8	11.4
Iowa[b]			
Boys State Training School	9.3%	7.4%	11.7%
Woodward Acad.[e]	11.8	9.9	14.0
Kansas[b]			
Kansas Juv. Corr. Complex	14.6%	10.2%	20.4%
Larned Juv. Corr. Fac.	15.9	12.5	19.9
Kentucky			
Adair Yth. Dev. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	30.8%
Audubon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	11.8	4.2	29.0
Bluegrass Yth. Dev. Ctr.	/	/	/
Green River Yth. Dev. Ctr.	7.7	1.7	28.5
Lincoln Village Yth. Dev. Ctr. and Reg. Juv. Det.	0.0	0.0	16.4

Appendix table 2. (cont.)
Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization, by facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization[a]		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound
Louisiana			
Jetson Corr. Ctr. for Yth.	8.0%	2.9%	20.1%
Swanson Ctr. for Yth.	16.6	12.1	22.4
Maine[b]			
Long Creek Yth. Dev. Ctr.[d]	16.4%	11.9%	22.1%
Maryland			
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton	36.4%	16.5%	62.3%
Cheltenham Yth. Fac.	0.0	0.0	64.1
Thomas J. S. Waxter Children's Ctr.[c]	0.0	0.0	42.3
Massachusetts			
Connelly Transitional Unit	0.0%	0.0%	77.9%
Fay A. Rotenberg School[c,e]	:	:	:
Metro Trtmt. Ctr.[e]	:	:	:
Michigan			
Maxey Training School[b]	23.4%	18.2%	29.5%
Oakland Co. Children's Village[d,f]	6.7	2.1	18.9
Pioneer Work and Learn Ctr.[e]	7.5	4.0	13.6
Shawono Ctr.[b]	27.3	19.4	36.9
Starr Commonwealth, Albion[e]	6.4	2.8	14.1
Minnesota			
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Red Wing	2.8%	1.0%	7.4%
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Togo	0.0	0.0	38.1
Mississippi			
Oakley Training School, Units 1 and 2[d]	7.1%	2.4%	19.1%
Missouri[b]			
Ft. Bellefontaine Campus	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
Hogan Street Reg. Yth. Ctr.	14.3	8.9	22.1
Montgomery City Yth. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	5.0
Rich Hill Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	6.3
Watkins Mill Park Camp[d]	3.2	0.9	10.6
Montana			
Pine Hills Yth. Corr. Fac.	18.5%	10.0%	31.6%
Nebraska			
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Geneva[c]	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Kearney	2.2	0.5	8.8
Nevada			
Caliente Yth. Ctr.[d]	4.3%	1.0%	17.2%
Nevada Yth. Training Ctr.	4.5	1.0	19.0
Rite of Passage, Silverstate Acad.[e]	17.7	9.2	31.4
Summit View Yth. Corr. Ctr.	15.4	5.2	37.7
New Hampshire			
John H. Sununu Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	26.6%
New Jersey			
Camden Res. Community Home	/%	/%	/%
Green Res. Community Home	0.0	0.0	18.6
Juv. Medium Security Fac., Males	16.0	7.1	32.2
Juv. Reception and Assess. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	46.9
New Jersey Training School	23.3	14.7	34.8
Voorhees Res. Community Home	:	:	:
New Mexico			
New Mexico Yth. Diagnostic Dev. Ctr.[d]	16.5%	11.6%	22.8%

Appendix table 2. (cont.)
Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization, by facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization[a]		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound
New York			
Allen Res. Ctr.	25.0%	12.8%	43.0%
Berkshire Farm Ctr. and Srvcs.[e]	:	:	:
Brentwood Res. Ctr.[c]	0.0	0.0	61.9
Brookwood Secure Ctr.	6.3	2.5	15.0
Highland Res. Ctr.	16.1	7.7	30.6
Industry Limited Secure Ctr.	0.0	0.0	29.2
Louis Gossett Jr. Res. Ctr.	5.0	1.5	15.4
Middletown Res. Ctr.[d]	0.0	0.0	63.2
Sgt. Henry Johnson Yth. Leadership Acad.	0.0	0.0	23.7
Tryon Boys Res. Ctr.	9.1	1.6	38.5
Tryon Girls Res. Ctr.[c]	33.3	14.4	59.7
North Carolina			
C.A. Dillon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	5.9%	2.0%	16.4%
Dobbs Yth. Dev. Ctr.	19.2	12.5	28.3
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr.[c]	33.3	25.5	42.3
Stonewall Jackson Yth. Dev. Ctr.	3.9	1.6	9.5
Swannanoa Valley Yth. Dev. Ctr.	25.0	11.4	46.3
North Dakota			
North Dakota Yth. Corr. Ctr.[d]	3.3%	1.1%	10.0%
Ohio			
Circleville Juv. Corr. Fac.	15.2%	9.9%	22.8%
Cuyahoga Hills Juv. Corr. Fac.	6.7	3.0	14.2
Hillcrest Training School[f]	0.0	0.0	23.5
Indian River Juv. Corr. Fac.	7.3	3.9	13.3
Juv. Res. Ctr. of Northwest Ohio[f]	4.0	1.5	10.3
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.	16.9	7.9	32.6
Mohican Juv. Corr. Fac.	9.6	4.7	18.8
Ohio River Valley Juv. Corr. Fac.	14.2	8.4	23.1
Scioto Juv. Corr. Fac.[d]	:	:	:
Oklahoma			
Central Oklahoma Juv. Ctr.[d]	16.7%	7.3%	33.7%
L.E. Rader Ctr.	25.0	16.2	36.5
Oregon[b]			
Camp Florence	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
Hillcrest Yth. Corr. Fac.	8.9	5.4	14.5
MacLaren Yth. Corr. Fac.	12.9	8.9	18.3
Rogue Valley Yth. Corr. Fac.	11.9	9.0	15.8
Pennsylvania			
Abraxas I[e]	5.8%	2.9%	11.2%
Cresson Secure Trtmt. Unit[e]	33.3	15.0	58.6
George Jr. Republic[e]	11.7	6.4	20.3
Loysville Yth. Dev. Ctr.	12.2	6.9	20.6
New Castle Yth. Dev. Ctr.	6.9	3.6	12.7
North Central Secure Trtmt. Unit[d]	9.6	4.6	19.3
Pennsylvania Clinical School, Keystone[e]	11.5	5.3	23.4
St. Gabriel's Hall[e]	12.2	7.6	19.2
Summit Acad.[e]	3.8	1.3	10.7
Rhode Island[b]			
Rhode Island Training School[d]	1.3%	0.5%	3.9%
South Carolina[b]			
Broad River Rd. Complex, Birchwood	17.6%	14.0%	22.0%
Broad River Rd. Complex, John G. Richards	20.9	16.2	26.5
South Dakota			
Patrick Henry Brady Acad.	0.0%	0.0%	10.1%

Appendix table 2. (cont.)
Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization, by facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization[a]		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound
Tennessee			
John S. Wilder Yth. Dev. Ctr.	16.3%	10.1%	25.2%
Mtn. View Yth. Dev. Ctr.	17.5	11.5	25.7
Taft Yth. Dev. Ctr.	14.5	9.1	22.4
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr.	26.0	18.8	34.6
Texas[b]			
Al Price State Juv. Corr. Fac.	15.1%	12.4%	18.3%
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr.[d]	32.4	27.8	37.3
Cottrell House	23.1	11.2	41.5
Crockett State School	20.2	17.2	23.6
Evins Reg. Juv. Ctr.	24.2	17.9	31.9
Gainesville State School	17.5	12.7	23.6
Giddings State School	20.8	15.8	26.7
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 1	2.6	1.5	4.4
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 2	21.2	16.8	26.5
Ron Jackson State Juv. Corr. Ctr. Unit I[c]	14.6	11.6	18.3
Schaeffer House	0.0	0.0	20.2
Victory Field Corr. Acad.	24.6	19.8	30.0
West Texas State School	16.9	12.5	22.4
Utah			
Decker Lake Yth. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%
Vermont[b]			
Woodside Juv. Rehab. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%
Virginia			
Beaumont Juv. Corr. Ctr.	13.6%	7.8%	22.9%
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr.[d]	25.0	15.3	38.2
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term	30.0	21.5	40.1
Hanover Juv. Corr. Ctr.	22.2	11.1	39.5
Washington			
Echo Glen Children's Ctr.[d]	9.4%	3.7%	21.6%
Green Hill School	1.0	0.2	4.2
Maple Lane School	12.8	7.8	20.2
Naselle Yth. Camp[d]	1.7	0.4	7.3
Twin Rivers Community Fac.	0.0	0.0	22.5
West Virginia[b]			
West Virginia Industrial Home for Yth.[d]	13.0%	10.5%	16.1%
Wisconsin			
Ethan Allen School	8.6%	5.1%	14.2%
Lincoln Hills School	12.5	7.8	19.3
Wyoming			
Wyoming Boys School	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%

Note: See "Definition of terms" in *Methodology* for measures of sexual victimization by type. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

/Not reported. Insufficient data to provide a facility rate.

:Not calculated. One or more youth victimized. Value suppressed to protect confidentiality.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]State/facility granted consent *in loco parentis*. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[c]Facility houses females only.

[d]Facility houses both males and females.

[e]Private facility. Some private facilities may be state owned or under state jurisdiction.

[f]County facility.

Appendix Table 3.

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting victimization by another youth[a]					
	All youth-on-youth			Nonconsensual sexual acts		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Total	2.6%	2.2%	3.1%	2.0%	1.6%	2.4%
Alabama[b]						
Chalkville Campus[c]	3.8%	1.5%	9.4%	3.8%	1.5%	9.4%
Mt. Meigs Campus	0.8	0.2	2.8	0.8	0.2	2.8
Vacca Campus	2.2	0.8	6.0	2.2	0.8	6.0
Alaska[b]						
McLaughlin Yth. Ctr.[d]	3.8%	1.9%	7.3%	3.8%	1.9%	7.3%
Arizona						
Adobe Mtn. School	5.6%	1.7%	17.3%	2.9%	0.5%	14.3%
Catalina Mtn. School	4.8	1.0	20.6	4.8	1.0	20.6
Southwest Reg. Juv. Complex, Eagle Point	0.0	0.0	15.6	0.0	0.0	15.6
Arkansas[b]						
Arkansas Juv. Assess. and Trtmt. Ctr.[d,e]	3.6%	2.0%	6.3%	3.6%	2.0%	6.3%
Dermott Juv. Corr. Fac.[e]	3.4	1.9	6.2	3.4	1.9	6.2
California						
Central Juv. Hall[d,f]	:%	:%	:%	:%	:%	:%
Central Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	0.0	0.0	8.9	0.0	0.0	8.9
East Mesa Juv. Det. Fac.[f]	0.0	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	9.9
Fresno Co. Juv. Justice Campus[b,d,f]	2.5	1.3	4.5	2.5	1.3	4.5
Heman G. Stark Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Juv. Ranch Fac.[f]	:	:	:	:	:	:
N.A. Chaderjian Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	7.2	4.0	12.6	7.2	4.0	12.6
O.H. Close Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	2.5	1.3	4.6	1.7	0.8	3.5
Orange Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	0.0	0.0	14.5	0.0	0.0	14.5
Preston Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9
Santa Clara Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	1.8	0.4	8.0	1.8	0.4	8.0
Southern Yth. Corr. Reception Ctr. and Clinic[b]	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Ventura Co. Juv. Fac.[d,f]	0.0	0.0	12.2	0.0	0.0	12.2
Ventura Yth. Corr. Fac.[b,d]	4.2	2.0	8.6	4.2	2.0	8.6
West Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	0.0	0.0	18.1	0.0	0.0	18.1
Colorado						
Lookout Mtn. Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.	9.2%	3.7%	21.1%	4.1%	1.0%	15.4%
Platte Valley Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	8.6
Ridge View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[e]	1.8	0.7	4.4	1.2	0.4	3.6
Spring Creek Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0	8.8
Delaware[b]						
Ferris School for Boys	1.8%	0.8%	4.2%	1.8%	0.8%	4.2%
District of Columbia[b]						
Oak Hill Yth. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%

Appendix table 3. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting victimization by another youth[a]					
	All youth-on-youth			Nonconsensual sexual acts		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Florida						
Arthur G. Dozier School for Boys	2.2%	0.6%	7.7%	2.2%	0.6%	7.7%
Avon Park Yth. Acad.[e]	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	3.9
Bristol Yth. Acad.[e]	0.0	0.0	11.5	0.0	0.0	11.5
Cypress Creek Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0	8.8
Desoto Dual Diagnosis Corr. Fac.	6.5	2.4	16.1	6.5	2.4	16.1
Desoto High-Risk Female Corr. Fac.[c]	3.6	1.4	9.3	1.8	0.5	6.8
Desoto Juv. Res. Fac.	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8
Falkenburg Acad.	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	4.1
Hastings Yth. Acad., Moderate Risk[e]	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	11.8
Jackson Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	10.1	0.0	0.0	10.1
Okeechobee Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	6.3	3.1	12.3	4.8	2.0	10.9
Riverside Acad.[e]	0.8	0.2	3.6	0.0	0.0	6.7
Georgia[b]						
Augusta Yth. Dev. Campus	5.1%	3.2%	8.2%	3.9%	2.2%	6.7%
Bill Ireland Yth. Dev. Campus	0.9	0.2	3.7	0.9	0.2	3.7
Eastman Yth. Dev. Campus	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1
Macon Yth. Dev. Campus[c]	10.3	7.2	14.6	7.9	5.1	12.1
Sumter Yth. Dev. Campus	1.1	0.4	3.3	1.1	0.4	3.3
Hawaii[b]						
Hawaii Yth. Corr. Fac.[d]	2.2%	0.7%	6.5%	2.2%	0.7%	6.5%
Idaho[b]						
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Lewiston[d]	3.4%	2.1%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Nampa[d]	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Juv. Corr. Ctr., St. Anthony[d]	5.0	3.9	6.6	2.5	1.7	3.7
Illinois						
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Harrisburg	3.4%	1.1%	9.4%	1.7%	0.4%	7.2%
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Joliet	1.5	0.4	5.3	1.5	0.4	5.3
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Kewanee	4.1	2.3	7.4	4.1	2.3	7.4
Illinois Yth. Ctr., St. Charles	0.8	0.2	3.5	0.8	0.2	3.5
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Warrenville[c]	11.4	4.8	24.7	6.8	2.3	18.2
Indiana[b]						
Camp Summit Boot Camp	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac.[c]	16.3	13.6	19.4	14.1	11.8	16.8
North Central Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac.	7.0	4.7	10.4	7.0	4.7	10.4
South Bend Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Iowa[b]						
Boys State Training School	1.6%	0.9%	2.6%	1.6%	0.9%	2.6%
Woodward Acad.[e]	4.2	3.0	5.8	2.5	1.7	3.9
Kansas[b]						
Kansas Juv. Corr. Complex	3.1%	1.5%	6.1%	3.1%	1.5%	6.1%
Larned Juv. Corr. Fac.	2.5	1.4	4.4	2.5	1.4	4.4
Kentucky						
Audubon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Green River Yth. Dev. Ctr.	7.7	1.7	28.5	0.0	0.0	15.7
Louisiana						
Jetson Corr. Ctr. for Yth.	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%
Swanson Ctr. for Yth.	1.0	0.3	3.6	1.0	0.3	3.6
Maine[b]						
Long Creek Yth. Dev. Ctr.[d]	9.8%	6.2%	15.2%	9.8%	6.2%	15.2%
Maryland						
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton	0.0%	0.0%	19.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.5%

Appendix table 3. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting victimization by another youth[a]					
	All youth-on-youth			Nonconsensual sexual acts		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Massachusetts						
Fay A. Rotenberg School[c,e]	:%	:%	:%	:%	:%	:%
Metro Trtmt. Ctr.[e]	0.0	0.0	51.6	0.0	0.0	51.6
Michigan						
Maxey Training School[b]	6.4%	3.9%	10.4%	6.4%	3.9%	10.4%
Oakland Co. Children's Village[d,f]	2.2	0.5	9.2	0.0	0.0	5.4
Pioneer Work and Learn Ctr.[e]	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.8
Shawono Ctr.[b]	18.2	11.8	27.0	18.2	11.8	27.0
Starr Commonwealth, Albion[e]	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	4.6
Minnesota						
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Red Wing	1.4%	0.4%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%
Mississippi						
Oakley Training School, Units 1 and 2[d]	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
Missouri[b]						
Hogan Street Reg. Yth. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Watkins Mill Park Camp[d]	3.2	0.9	10.6	3.2	0.9	10.6
Montana						
Pine Hills Yth. Corr. Fac.	7.4%	2.8%	18.4%	7.4%	2.8%	18.4%
Nebraska						
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Kearney	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%
Nevada						
Caliente Yth. Ctr.[d]	4.3%	1.0%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Nevada Yth. Training Ctr.	0.0	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	9.9
Rite of Passage, Silverstate Acad.[e]	2.9	0.6	12.4	2.9	0.6	12.4
Summit View Yth. Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	15.7	0.0	0.0	15.7
New Jersey						
Juv. Medium Security Fac., Males	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
New Jersey Training School	2.7	0.6	11.7	2.7	0.6	11.7
Voorhees Res. Community Home	0.0	0.0	24.4	0.0	0.0	24.4
New Mexico						
New Mexico Yth. Diagnostic Dev. Ctr.[d]	3.6%	1.6%	8.0%	3.6%	1.6%	8.0%
New York						
Allen Res. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%
Berkshire Farm Ctr. and Srvcs.[e]	0.0	0.0	27.6	0.0	0.0	27.6
Brookwood Secure Ctr.	0.0	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	5.8
Highland Res. Ctr.	3.2	0.7	14.3	3.2	0.7	14.3
Louis Gossett Jr. Res. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	15.1	0.0	0.0	15.1
Tryon Boys Res. Ctr.	9.1	1.6	38.5	0.0	0.0	23.3
Tryon Girls Res. Ctr.[c]	33.3	14.4	59.7	33.3	14.4	59.7
North Carolina						
C.A. Dillon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%
Dobbs Yth. Dev. Ctr.	7.7	3.7	15.3	7.7	3.7	15.3
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr.[c]	12.0	7.2	19.3	12.0	7.2	19.3
Stonewall Jackson Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.4
Swannanoa Valley Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	13.4	0.0	0.0	13.4
North Dakota						
North Dakota Yth. Corr. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%

Appendix table 3. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting victimization by another youth[a]					
	All youth-on-youth			Nonconsensual sexual acts		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Ohio						
Circleville Juv. Corr. Fac.	6.0%	3.6%	9.8%	4.1%	2.2%	7.6%
Cuyahoga Hills Juv. Corr. Fac.	2.1	0.5	8.2	0.0	0.0	3.4
Indian River Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.6	0.1	2.6	0.6	0.1	2.6
Juv. Res. Ctr. of Northwest Ohio[f]	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	3.9
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	0.0	7.6
Mohican Juv. Corr. Fac.	3.8	1.4	9.8	0.0	0.0	3.8
Ohio River Valley Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0
Scioto Juv. Corr. Fac.[d]	:	:	:	:	:	:
Oklahoma						
Central Oklahoma Juv. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%
L.E. Rader Ctr.	0.9	0.2	3.7	0.0	0.0	6.1
Oregon[b]						
Hillcrest Yth. Corr. Fac.	1.8%	0.6%	5.4%	1.8%	0.6%	5.4%
MacLaren Yth. Corr. Fac.	4.8	2.7	8.5	3.2	1.6	6.5
Rogue Valley Yth. Corr. Fac.	3.0	1.6	5.5	1.5	0.6	3.5
Pennsylvania						
Abraxas I[e]	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
Cresson Secure Trtmt. Unit[e]	8.3	1.7	32.4	0.0	0.0	18.5
George Jr. Republic[e]	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7
Loysville Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0
New Castle Yth. Dev. Ctr.	1.4	0.3	5.6	1.4	0.3	5.6
North Central Secure Trtmt. Unit[d]	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.6
Pennsylvania Clinical School, Keystone[e]	8.3	3.0	20.6	1.6	0.4	6.3
St. Gabriel's Hall[e]	1.6	0.4	6.3	1.6	0.4	6.3
Summit Acad.[e]	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Rhode Island[b]						
Rhode Island Training School[d]	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
South Carolina[b]						
Broad River Rd. Complex, Birchwood	2.0%	0.9%	4.1%	2.0%	0.9%	4.1%
Broad River Rd. Complex, John G. Richards	4.3	2.3	8.0	2.9	1.3	6.2
Tennessee						
John S. Wilder Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%
Mtn. View Yth. Dev. Ctr.	2.5	1.0	6.0	2.5	1.0	6.0
Taft Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.1
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7
Texas[b]						
Al Price State Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.8%	0.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr.[d]	13.9	10.3	18.4	9.7	6.7	13.9
Cottrell House	8.3	2.5	24.6	8.3	2.5	24.6
Crockett State School	2.5	1.4	4.4	2.5	1.4	4.4
Evins Reg. Juv. Ctr.	4.4	2.1	9.2	4.4	2.1	9.2
Gainesville State School	2.5	1.1	5.4	2.5	1.1	5.4
Giddings State School	3.8	1.8	7.9	3.1	1.3	7.2
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 1	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 2	2.9	1.6	5.4	2.2	1.1	4.5
Ron Jackson State Juv. Corr. Ctr. Unit I[c]	11.2	8.5	14.6	7.9	5.6	11.0
Victory Field Corr. Acad.	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2
West Texas State School	4.0	2.0	7.7	4.0	2.0	7.7
Virginia						
Beaumont Juv. Corr. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr.[d]	7.5	2.9	17.8	5.1	1.6	14.9
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.4
Hanover Juv. Corr. Ctr.	3.7	0.7	16.7	3.7	0.7	16.7

Appendix table 3. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting sexual victimization by another youth, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting victimization by another youth[a]					
	All youth-on-youth			Nonconsensual sexual acts		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Washington						
Echo Glen Children's Ctr.[d]	6.3%	2.0%	17.9%	6.3%	2.0%	17.9%
Green Hill School	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	5.7
Maple Lane School	3.0	1.0	8.7	3.0	1.0	8.7
Naselle Yth. Camp[d]	0.0	0.0	12.8	0.0	0.0	12.8
West Virginia[b]						
West Virginia Industrial Home for Yth.[d]	8.8%	6.5%	11.7%	8.0%	5.8%	10.8%
Wisconsin						
Ethan Allen School	1.2%	0.3%	4.8%	1.2%	0.3%	4.8%
Lincoln Hills School	4.2	1.8	9.5	2.8	1.0	7.6

Note: Facilities in which there were no reports of sexual victimization of any type are not listed. See "Definition of terms" in *Methodology* for measures of sexual victimization by type. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

:Not calculated. One or more youth victimized. Value suppressed to protect confidentiality.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another youth in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]State/facility granted consent *in loco parentis*. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[c]Facility houses females only.

[d]Facility houses both males and females.

[e]Private facility. Some private facilities may be state owned or under state jurisdiction.

[f]County facility.

Appendix Table 4.

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct[a]					
	All staff sexual misconduct			Sexual acts excluding touching		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval		Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
Total	10.3%	9.5%	11.1%	9.2%	8.5%	10.0%
Alabama[b]						
Chalkville Campus[c]	3.8%	1.5%	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Mt. Meigs Campus	10.3	7.4	14.1	9.5	6.7	13.2
Vacca Campus	19.6	14.3	26.1	17.8	12.7	24.3
Alaska[b]						
McLaughlin Yth. Ctr.[d]	11.3%	7.9%	16.0%	7.5%	4.8%	11.7%
Arizona						
Adobe Mtn. School	14.0%	6.8%	26.8%	14.0%	6.8%	26.8%
Catalina Mtn. School	19.0	6.9	42.8	19.0	6.9	42.8
Southwest Reg. Juv. Complex, Eagle Point	23.5	9.3	47.9	23.5	9.3	47.9
Arkansas[b]						
Arkansas Juv. Assess. and Trtmt. Ctr.[d,e]	8.8%	6.1%	12.5%	7.0%	4.6%	10.5%
Dermott Juv. Corr. Fac.[e]	13.8	10.3	18.3	10.3	7.3	14.4
California						
Central Juv. Hall[d,f]	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%
Central Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	10.3	3.8	25.0	10.3	3.8	25.0
East Mesa Juv. Det. Fac.[f]	14.3	6.3	29.2	12.7	5.2	28.0
Fresno Co. Juv. Justice Campus[b,d,f]	9.9	7.4	13.0	9.9	7.4	13.0
Heman G. Stark Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	3.5	2.1	5.7	3.5	2.1	5.7
Juv. Ranch Fac.[f]	0.0	0.0	40.4	0.0	0.0	40.4
N.A. Chaderjian Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	9.6	5.9	15.3	9.6	5.9	15.3
O.H. Close Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	12.3	9.2	16.2	11.5	8.6	15.1
Orange Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	4.0	0.8	17.1	2.0	0.4	9.0
Preston Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	13.8	9.0	20.6	11.7	7.3	18.2
Santa Clara Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	1.8	0.4	8.0	1.8	0.4	8.0
Southern Yth. Corr. Reception Ctr. and Clinic[b]	8.7	5.6	13.2	8.7	5.6	13.2
Ventura Co. Juv. Fac.[d,f]	2.5	0.8	7.7	2.5	0.8	7.7
Ventura Yth. Corr. Fac.[b,d]	9.0	5.7	14.1	9.0	5.7	14.1
West Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	8.3	1.7	32.1	8.3	1.7	32.1
Colorado						
Lookout Mtn. Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.	11.2%	5.2%	22.7%	7.1%	2.8%	16.8%
Platte Valley Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	5.3	1.4	17.8	5.3	1.4	17.8
Ridge View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[e]	4.2	2.4	7.5	4.2	2.4	7.5
Spring Creek Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	5.6	1.5	18.1	0.0	0.0	8.8
Delaware[b]						
Ferris School for Boys	18.2%	14.0%	23.3%	18.2%	14.0%	23.3%
District of Columbia[b]						
Oak Hill Yth. Ctr.	11.1%	3.5%	30.1%	11.1%	3.5%	30.1%

Appendix table 4. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct[a]					
	All staff sexual misconduct			Sexual acts excluding touching		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Florida						
Arthur G. Dozier School for Boys	11.3%	6.9%	17.9%	10.3%	6.1%	16.9%
Avon Park Yth. Acad.[e]	10.9	6.0	19.0	10.9	6.0	19.0
Bristol Yth. Acad.[e]	5.3	1.2	20.5	5.3	1.2	20.5
Cypress Creek Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	12.1	6.8	20.7	12.1	6.8	20.7
Desoto Dual Diagnosis Corr. Fac.	12.9	6.3	24.5	10.0	4.3	21.5
Desoto High-Risk Female Corr. Fac.[c]	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	6.2
Desoto Juv. Res. Fac.	1.0	0.3	3.8	1.0	0.3	3.8
Falkenburg Acad.	7.0	3.3	14.3	7.0	3.3	14.3
Hastings Yth. Acad., Moderate Risk[e]	13.8	5.4	30.6	8.8	3.0	22.7
Jackson Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.	11.1	3.8	28.4	11.1	3.8	28.4
Okeechobee Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	10.1	5.7	17.3	10.1	5.7	17.3
Riverside Acad.[e]	18.5	9.7	32.3	16.8	8.3	31.0
Georgia[b]						
Augusta Yth. Dev. Campus	20.0%	15.4%	25.5%	17.4%	13.0%	23.0%
Bill Ireland Yth. Dev. Campus	16.4	12.2	21.6	12.7	8.7	18.2
Eastman Yth. Dev. Campus	19.4	13.5	27.2	18.5	12.6	26.4
Macon Yth. Dev. Campus[c]	11.6	8.0	16.3	7.9	5.1	12.0
Sumter Yth. Dev. Campus	22.5	17.7	28.1	18.0	13.3	23.8
Hawaii[b]						
Hawaii Yth. Corr. Fac.[d]	8.5%	4.4%	15.8%	8.5%	4.4%	15.8%
Idaho[b]						
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Lewiston[d]	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Nampa[d]	3.0	1.5	6.0	3.0	1.5	6.0
Juv. Corr. Ctr., St. Anthony[d]	2.5	1.7	3.7	0.8	0.4	1.7
Illinois						
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Harrisburg	11.8%	6.8%	19.8%	11.8%	6.8%	19.8%
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Joliet	13.9	10.0	18.9	13.2	9.4	18.2
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Kewanee	5.7	3.8	8.5	5.7	3.8	8.5
Illinois Yth. Ctr., St. Charles	9.3	3.9	20.6	9.3	3.9	20.6
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Warrenville[c]	6.8	2.3	18.3	2.2	0.6	8.4
Indiana[b]						
Camp Summit Boot Camp	9.1%	6.2%	13.2%	7.3%	4.7%	11.1%
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac.[c]	8.7	6.6	11.4	8.7	6.6	11.4
North Central Juv. Corr. Fac.	11.3	9.4	13.6	11.3	9.4	13.6
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac.	31.5	25.7	37.9	29.4	23.8	35.7
South Bend Juv. Corr. Fac.	8.2	5.8	11.4	6.8	4.7	9.8
Iowa[b]						
Boys State Training School	7.8%	6.0%	10.0%	7.0%	5.4%	9.0%
Woodward Acad.[e]	8.4	6.8	10.4	5.1	3.8	6.8
Kansas[b]						
Kansas Juv. Corr. Complex	11.5%	7.7%	16.7%	10.4%	7.0%	15.1%
Larned Juv. Corr. Fac.	13.4	10.7	16.7	13.4	10.7	16.7
Kentucky						
Audubon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	11.8%	4.2%	29.0%	11.8%	4.2%	29.0%
Green River Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	15.7	0.0	0.0	15.7
Louisiana						
Jetson Corr. Ctr. for Yth.	8.0%	2.9%	20.1%	8.0%	2.9%	20.1%
Swanson Ctr. for Yth.	15.6	11.2	21.4	15.6	11.2	21.4
Maine[b]						
Long Creek Yth. Dev. Ctr.[d]	11.5%	8.0%	16.2%	11.5%	8.0%	16.2%
Maryland						
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton	36.4%	16.5%	62.3%	36.4%	16.5%	62.3%

Appendix table 4. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct[a]					
	All staff sexual misconduct			Sexual acts excluding touching		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Massachusetts						
Fay A. Rotenberg School[c,e]	0.0%	0.0%	32.1%	0.0%	0.0%	32.1%
Metro Trtmt. Ctr.[e]	:	:	:	:	:	:
Michigan						
Maxey Training School[b]	17.0%	12.6%	22.6%	17.0%	12.6%	22.6%
Oakland Co. Children's Village[d,f]	4.3	1.5	12.0	2.2	0.5	9.0
Pioneer Work and Learn Ctr.[e]	7.5	4.0	13.6	5.9	2.9	11.6
Shawono Ctr.[b]	22.7	15.5	32.0	18.2	11.8	27.0
Starr Commonwealth, Albion[e]	6.4	2.8	14.1	4.3	1.5	11.4
Minnesota						
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Red Wing	2.8%	1.0%	7.4%	2.8%	1.0%	7.4%
Mississippi						
Oakley Training School, Units 1 and 2[d]	7.1%	2.4%	19.1%	3.6%	0.8%	14.1%
Missouri[b]						
Hogan Street Reg. Yth. Ctr.	14.3%	8.9%	22.1%	14.3%	8.9%	22.1%
Watkins Mill Park Camp[d]	3.2	0.9	10.6	3.2	0.9	10.6
Montana						
Pine Hills Yth. Corr. Fac.	14.8%	7.2%	28.0%	11.1%	4.8%	23.5%
Nebraska						
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Kearney	2.1%	0.5%	8.6%	2.1%	0.5%	8.6%
Nevada						
Caliente Yth. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Nevada Yth. Training Ctr.	4.5	1.0	19.0	4.5	1.0	19.0
Rite of Passage, Silverstate Acad.[e]	17.7	9.2	31.4	17.7	9.2	31.4
Summit View Yth. Corr. Ctr.	15.4	5.2	37.7	15.4	5.2	37.7
New Jersey						
Juv. Medium Security Fac., Males	16.0%	7.1%	32.2%	16.0%	7.1%	32.2%
New Jersey Training School	23.3	14.7	34.8	20.3	12.5	31.3
Voorhees Res. Community Home	:	:	:	:	:	:
New Mexico						
New Mexico Yth. Diagnostic Dev. Ctr.[d]	14.7%	10.1%	20.8%	10.5%	6.6%	16.2%
New York						
Allen Res. Ctr.	25.0%	12.8%	43.0%	18.8%	8.6%	36.2%
Berkshire Farm Ctr. and Srvcs.[e]	:	:	:	:	:	:
Brookwood Secure Ctr.	6.3	2.5	15.0	5.4	1.9	14.4
Highland Res. Ctr.	12.9	5.5	27.3	12.9	5.5	27.3
Louis Gossett Jr. Res. Ctr.	5.0	1.5	15.4	2.5	0.5	11.7
Tryon Boys Res. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	25.1	0.0	0.0	25.1
Tryon Girls Res. Ctr.[c]	0.0	0.0	19.8	0.0	0.0	19.8
North Carolina						
C.A. Dillon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	5.9%	2.0%	16.4%	5.9%	2.0%	16.4%
Dobbs Yth. Dev. Ctr.	15.4	9.5	24.0	15.4	9.5	24.0
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr.[c]	29.2	21.7	37.9	25.0	18.1	33.5
Stonewall Jackson Yth. Dev. Ctr.	3.9	1.6	9.5	3.9	1.6	9.5
Swannanoa Valley Yth. Dev. Ctr.	23.5	10.8	44.0	17.6	7.1	37.4
North Dakota						
North Dakota Yth. Corr. Ctr.[d]	3.3%	1.1%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%

Appendix table 4. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct[a]					
	All staff sexual misconduct			Sexual acts excluding touching		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Ohio						
Circleville Juv. Corr. Fac.	11.2%	6.4%	19.0%	10.2%	6.0%	16.9%
Cuyahoga Hills Juv. Corr. Fac.	4.6	1.8	11.3	4.0	1.6	9.3
Indian River Juv. Corr. Fac.	6.7	3.4	12.8	6.7	3.4	12.8
Juv. Res. Ctr. of Northwest Ohio[f]	4.0	1.5	10.3	4.0	1.5	10.3
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.	16.9	7.9	32.6	16.9	7.9	32.6
Mohican Juv. Corr. Fac.	5.8	2.6	12.2	3.8	1.4	9.8
Ohio River Valley Juv. Corr. Fac.	14.0	8.2	22.7	12.6	7.0	21.5
Scioto Juv. Corr. Fac.[d]	0.0	0.0	40.4	0.0	0.0	40.4
Oklahoma						
Central Oklahoma Juv. Ctr.[d]	16.7%	7.3%	33.7%	16.7%	7.3%	33.7%
L.E. Rader Ctr.	25.0	16.2	36.5	23.1	14.5	34.8
Oregon[b]						
Hillcrest Yth. Corr. Fac.	8.8%	5.3%	14.2%	7.0%	3.9%	12.2%
MacLaren Yth. Corr. Fac.	8.1	4.9	13.0	7.3	4.2	12.3
Rogue Valley Yth. Corr. Fac.	8.8	6.2	12.3	7.4	5.0	10.7
Pennsylvania						
Abraxas I[e]	5.7%	2.9%	11.0%	2.5%	0.9%	6.5%
Cresson Secure Trtmt. Unit[e]	25.0	9.8	50.7	25.0	9.8	50.7
George Jr. Republic[e]	11.7	6.4	20.3	10.4	5.9	17.6
Loysville Yth. Dev. Ctr.	11.8	6.7	20.1	7.9	3.9	15.5
New Castle Yth. Dev. Ctr.	6.9	3.6	12.7	4.1	1.7	9.7
North Central Secure Trtmt. Unit[d]	9.6	4.6	19.3	9.6	4.6	19.3
Pennsylvania Clinical School, Keystone[e]	3.2	1.2	8.6	0.0	0.0	8.4
St. Gabriel's Hall[e]	12.2	7.6	19.2	10.8	6.4	17.6
Summit Acad.[e]	3.8	1.3	10.7	3.8	1.3	10.7
Rhode Island[b]						
Rhode Island Training School[d]	1.3%	0.5%	3.9%	1.3%	0.5%	3.9%
South Carolina[b]						
Broad River Rd. Complex, Birchwood	15.7%	12.2%	20.0%	14.0%	10.7%	18.1%
Broad River Rd. Complex, John G. Richards	19.1	14.5	24.9	17.6	13.1	23.4
Tennessee						
John S. Wilder Yth. Dev. Ctr.	16.3%	10.1%	25.2%	16.3%	10.1%	25.2%
Mtn. View Yth. Dev. Ctr.	15.1	9.4	23.2	10.7	6.3	17.6
Taft Yth. Dev. Ctr.	14.5	9.1	22.4	14.5	9.1	22.4
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr.	26.0	18.8	34.6	22.9	16.1	31.4
Texas[b]						
Al Price State Juv. Corr. Fac.	14.3%	11.7%	17.5%	13.6%	10.9%	16.7%
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr.[d]	23.7	19.4	28.5	20.9	16.8	25.6
Cottrell House	15.4	6.4	32.5	15.4	6.4	32.5
Crockett State School	20.2	17.2	23.6	18.5	15.6	21.8
Evins Reg. Juv. Ctr.	21.3	15.6	28.3	19.8	14.2	26.8
Gainesville State School	16.7	11.9	22.8	16.0	11.4	21.9
Giddings State School	17.7	13.0	23.6	14.1	9.5	20.3
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 1	2.6	1.5	4.4	2.6	1.5	4.4
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 2	20.5	16.2	25.5	19.0	15.0	23.9
Ron Jackson State Juv. Corr. Ctr. Unit I[c]	4.5	2.8	7.2	2.2	1.1	4.4
Victory Field Corr. Acad.	24.6	19.8	30.0	23.0	18.3	28.3
West Texas State School	16.7	12.3	22.1	16.7	12.3	22.1

Appendix table 4. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct, by type of incident and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct[a]					
	All staff sexual misconduct			Sexual acts excluding touching		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Virginia						
Beaumont Juv. Corr. Ctr.	13.6%	7.8%	22.9%	13.6%	7.8%	22.9%
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr.[d]	22.5	13.3	35.4	22.5	13.3	35.4
Culpepper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term	30.0	21.5	40.1	30.0	21.5	40.1
Hanover Juv. Corr. Ctr.	18.5	8.7	35.2	18.5	8.7	35.2
Washington						
Echo Glen Children's Ctr.[d]	6.3%	2.0%	17.6%	3.2%	0.7%	13.8%
Green Hill School	1.0	0.2	4.2	1.0	0.2	4.2
Maple Lane School	12.0	7.2	19.4	11.3	6.5	18.9
Naselle Yth. Camp[d]	1.7	0.4	7.3	1.7	0.4	7.3
West Virginia[b]						
West Virginia Industrial Home for Yth.[d]	7.8%	5.7%	10.6%	6.1%	4.3%	8.6%
Wisconsin						
Ethan Allen School	7.4%	4.2%	12.6%	6.2%	3.4%	11.1%
Lincoln Hills School	9.7	5.6	16.2	9.7	5.6	16.2

Note: Facilities in which there were no reports of sexual victimization have been suppressed. See "Definition of terms" in *Methodology* for measures of sexual victimization by type.

:Not calculated. One or more youth victimized. Value suppressed to protect confidentiality.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]State/facility granted consent *in loco parentis*.

[c]Facility houses females.

[d]Facility houses both males and females.

[e]Private facility. Some private facilities may be state owned or under state jurisdiction.

[f]County facility.

Appendix Table 5.

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching, by use of force and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching[a]					
	Force reported			No report of force		
		95%-confidence interval			95%-confidence interval	
	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound	Weighted percent	Lower bound	Upper bound
Total	3.9%	3.5%	4.4%	5.9%	5.4%	6.5%
Alabama[b]						
Chalkville Campus[c]	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Mt. Meigs Campus	1.9	0.7	4.8	7.7	5.2	11.4
Vacca Campus	8.7	5.3	14.1	11.1	7.0	17.1
Alaska[b]						
McLaughlin Yth. Ctr.[d]	3.8%	1.9%	7.2%	3.8%	1.9%	7.2%
Arizona						
Adobe Mtn. School	11.2%	4.8%	23.9%	5.6%	1.6%	17.6%
Catalina Mtn. School	4.8	1.0	20.5	14.3	5.6	32.0
Southwest Reg. Juv. Complex, Eagle Point	5.9	1.1	26.8	17.6	6.1	41.4
Arkansas[b]						
Arkansas Juv. Assess. and Trtmt. Ctr.[d,e]	3.6%	2.0%	6.3%	3.6%	2.0%	6.4%
Dermott Juv. Corr. Fac.[e]	6.9	4.5	10.4	3.4	1.9	6.2
California						
Central Juv. Hall[d,f]	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%
Central Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	6.7	1.8	22.1	10.3	3.8	25.0
East Mesa Juv. Det. Fac.[f]	3.2	1.1	8.9	11.1	4.0	27.2
Fresno Co. Juv. Justice Campus[b,d,f]	2.5	1.4	4.5	8.8	6.4	11.8
Heman G. Stark Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	2.6	1.5	4.7	1.8	0.9	3.6
Juv. Ranch Fac.[f]	0.0	0.0	40.4	0.0	0.0	40.4
N.A. Chaderjian Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	6.0	3.2	10.9	3.6	1.6	8.1
O.H. Close Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	2.5	1.3	4.6	9.1	6.6	12.5
Orange Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	0.0	0.0	14.5	2.0	0.4	9.0
Preston Yth. Corr. Fac.[b]	5.4	2.4	11.7	7.5	4.2	13.0
Santa Clara Co. Juv. Hall[d,f]	1.8	0.4	8.0	0.0	0.0	13.0
Southern Yth. Corr. Reception Ctr. and Clinic[b]	1.7	0.7	4.2	7.0	4.4	10.7
Ventura Co. Juv. Fac.[d,f]	0.0	0.0	12.6	2.5	0.8	7.7
Ventura Yth. Corr. Fac.[b,d]	4.5	2.1	9.3	5.4	3.1	9.3
West Valley Juv. Det. and Assess. Ctr.[d,f]	0.0	0.0	18.1	8.3	1.7	32.1
Colorado						
Lookout Mtn. Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.	5.1%	1.5%	15.6%	6.1%	2.2%	16.1%
Platte Valley Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	5.3	1.4	17.8	5.3	1.4	17.8
Ridge View Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[e]	1.2	0.4	3.6	3.0	1.5	6.0
Spring Creek Yth. Srvcs. Ctr.[d]	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0	8.8
Delaware[b]						
Ferris School for Boys	9.1%	6.2%	13.2%	10.9%	7.7%	15.2%
District of Columbia[b]						
Oak Hill Yth. Ctr.	5.6%	1.1%	23.0%	5.6%	1.1%	23.0%

Appendix table 5. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching, by use of force and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching[a]					
	Force reported			No report of force		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval		Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
Florida						
Arthur G. Dozier School for Boys	1.9%	0.7%	4.7%	8.5%	4.6%	15.2%
Avon Park Yth. Acad.[e]	1.0	0.3	4.1	9.8	5.2	17.9
Bristol Yth. Acad.[e]	5.3	1.2	20.5	0.0	0.0	11.5
Cypress Creek Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	6.1	2.5	13.8	8.1	3.9	16.1
Desoto Dual Diagnosis Corr. Fac.	6.5	2.3	16.6	3.3	0.8	12.4
Desoto High-Risk Female Corr. Fac.[c]	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	6.2
Desoto Juv. Res. Fac.	1.0	0.3	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8
Falkenburg Acad.	2.3	0.6	8.1	4.7	1.8	11.4
Hastings Yth. Acad., Moderate Risk[e]	0.0	0.0	11.8	8.8	3.0	22.7
Jackson Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	10.1	11.1	3.8	28.4
Okeechobee Juv. Offender Corr. Ctr.[e]	2.4	0.7	7.7	7.7	4.1	14.2
Riverside Acad.[e]	0.8	0.2	3.6	16.0	8.0	29.5
Georgia[b]						
Augusta Yth. Dev. Campus	10.4%	7.2%	14.8%	5.9%	3.6%	9.7%
Bill Ireland Yth. Dev. Campus	3.7	1.8	7.4	10.1	6.8	14.7
Eastman Yth. Dev. Campus	8.4	4.7	14.6	10.3	6.4	16.0
Macon Yth. Dev. Campus[c]	7.9	5.1	12.0	1.2	0.5	3.1
Sumter Yth. Dev. Campus	12.4	8.6	17.4	11.2	7.7	16.1
Hawaii[b]						
Hawaii Yth. Corr. Fac.[d]	5.4%	2.4%	11.6%	6.3%	2.8%	13.3%
Idaho[b]						
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Lewiston[d]	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%
Juv. Corr. Ctr., Nampa[d]	3.0	1.5	6.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Juv. Corr. Ctr., St. Anthony[d]	0.8	0.4	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.4
Illinois						
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Harrisburg	6.7%	3.1%	13.9%	5.1%	2.2%	11.3%
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Joliet	5.5	3.1	9.6	8.3	5.3	12.8
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Kewanee	3.7	2.2	6.3	3.0	1.6	5.6
Illinois Yth. Ctr., St. Charles	3.0	0.8	10.2	6.4	3.1	12.8
Illinois Yth. Ctr., Warrenville[c]	2.2	0.6	8.4	0.0	0.0	8.0
Indiana[b]						
Camp Summit Boot Camp	3.6%	1.9%	6.7%	5.5%	3.3%	8.9%
Indianapolis Juv. Corr. Fac.[c]	6.5	4.7	9.0	2.2	1.3	3.6
North Central Juv. Corr. Fac.	4.8	3.6	6.3	6.7	5.2	8.5
Pendleton Juv. Corr. Fac.	16.5	12.2	22.0	15.2	11.3	20.2
South Bend Juv. Corr. Fac.	3.8	2.3	6.2	3.0	1.6	5.5
Iowa[b]						
Boys State Training School	1.6%	0.9%	2.6%	4.7%	3.5%	6.2%
Woodward Acad.[e]	1.7	1.0	2.8	4.2	3.1	5.9
Kansas[b]						
Kansas Juv. Corr. Complex	2.1%	0.9%	4.8%	9.4%	6.1%	14.1%
Larned Juv. Corr. Fac.	6.1	4.3	8.7	8.6	6.5	11.5
Kentucky						
Audubon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	11.8%	4.2%	29.0%
Green River Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	15.7	0.0	0.0	15.7
Louisiana						
Jetson Corr. Ctr. for Yth.	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	8.0%	2.9%	20.1%
Swanson Ctr. for Yth.	6.2	3.4	10.9	9.6	6.2	14.5
Maine[b]						
Long Creek Yth. Dev. Ctr.[d]	4.9%	2.8%	8.5%	8.2%	5.3%	12.5%
Maryland						
Backbone Mtn. Yth. Ctr., Swanton	27.3%	10.7%	53.9%	18.2%	5.7%	44.8%

Appendix table 5. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching, by use of force and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching[a]					
	Force reported			No report of force		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval		Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
Massachusetts						
Fay A. Rotenberg School[c,e]	0.0%	0.0%	32.1%	0.0%	0.0%	32.1%
Metro Trtmt. Ctr.[e]	:	:	:	:	:	:
Michigan						
Maxey Training School[b]	10.6%	7.2%	15.4%	6.4%	3.9%	10.4%
Oakland Co. Children's Village[d,f]	2.2	0.5	9.0	0.0	0.0	5.3
Pioneer Work and Learn Ctr.[e]	1.6	0.6	4.4	4.3	1.8	10.1
Shawono Ctr.[b]	9.1	4.8	16.5	13.6	8.2	21.9
Starr Commonwealth, Albion[e]	0.0	0.0	4.6	4.3	1.5	11.4
Minnesota						
Minnesota Corr. Fac., Red Wing	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	2.8%	1.0%	7.4%
Mississippi						
Oakley Training School, Units 1 and 2[d]	3.6%	0.8%	14.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
Missouri[b]						
Hogan Street Reg. Yth. Ctr.	9.5%	5.2%	16.9%	4.8%	2.0%	10.8%
Watkins Mill Park Camp[d]	3.2	0.9	10.6	0.0	0.0	5.1
Montana						
Pine Hills Yth. Corr. Fac.	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	11.1%	4.8%	23.5%
Nebraska						
Yth. Rehab. and Trtmt. Ctr., Kearney	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	2.2%	0.5%	8.8%
Nevada						
Caliente Yth. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Nevada Yth. Training Ctr.	4.5	1.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	9.9
Rite of Passage, Silverstate Acad.[e]	12.6	5.6	26.1	8.0	3.3	18.2
Summit View Yth. Corr. Ctr.	7.7	1.7	28.5	7.7	1.7	28.5
New Jersey						
Juv. Medium Security Fac., Males	4.2%	0.9%	17.3%	8.3%	2.7%	23.1%
New Jersey Training School	5.3	1.7	15.4	14.8	8.6	24.4
Voorhees Res. Community Home	:	:	:	:	:	:
New Mexico						
New Mexico Yth. Diagnostic Dev. Ctr.[d]	3.6%	1.6%	8.0%	6.8%	3.8%	11.9%
New York						
Allen Res. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	18.8%	8.6%	36.2%
Berkshire Farm Ctr. and Srvcs.[e]	:	:	:	:	:	:
Brookwood Secure Ctr.	0.0	0.0	5.8	5.4	1.9	14.4
Highland Res. Ctr.	3.2	0.7	14.4	9.7	3.7	23.2
Louis Gossett Jr. Res. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	15.1	2.5	0.5	11.7
Tryon Boys Res. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	25.1	0.0	0.0	25.1
Tryon Girls Res. Ctr.[c]	0.0	0.0	19.8	0.0	0.0	19.8
North Carolina						
C.A. Dillon Yth. Dev. Ctr.	2.9%	0.7%	12.1%	5.9%	2.0%	16.4%
Dobbs Yth. Dev. Ctr.	3.8	1.4	10.4	11.5	6.4	20.0
Samarkand Yth. Dev. Ctr.[c]	12.5	7.5	20.1	12.5	7.5	20.1
Stonewall Jackson Yth. Dev. Ctr.	2.0	0.5	6.8	2.0	0.5	6.8
Swannanoa Valley Yth. Dev. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	13.4	18.8	7.5	39.5
North Dakota						
North Dakota Yth. Corr. Ctr.[d]	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%

Appendix table 5. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching, by use of force and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching[a]					
	Force reported			No report of force		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval		Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
Ohio						
Circleville Juv. Corr. Fac.	3.0%	1.4%	6.2%	7.2%	3.6%	13.9%
Cuyahoga Hills Juv. Corr. Fac.	1.9	0.8	4.4	2.7	0.8	8.3
Indian River Juv. Corr. Fac.	2.2	0.7	6.9	4.5	1.9	10.2
Juv. Res. Ctr. of Northwest Ohio[f]	0.0	0.0	3.9	4.0	1.5	10.3
Marion Juv. Corr. Fac.	3.3	1.1	9.2	8.2	4.1	15.6
Mohican Juv. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8	1.4	9.8
Ohio River Valley Juv. Corr. Fac.	1.7	0.3	7.6	12.8	7.1	21.8
Scioto Juv. Corr. Fac.[d]	0.0	0.0	40.4	0.0	0.0	40.4
Oklahoma						
Central Oklahoma Juv. Ctr.[d]	4.2%	0.8%	18.1%	12.5%	4.8%	28.6%
L.E. Rader Ctr.	13.0	6.7	23.6	14.8	7.6	26.9
Oregon[b]						
Hillcrest Yth. Corr. Fac.	3.6%	1.6%	7.9%	5.4%	2.7%	10.2%
MacLaren Yth. Corr. Fac.	3.3	1.6	6.5	4.1	2.2	7.5
Rogue Valley Yth. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.5	5.1	10.8
Pennsylvania						
Abraxas I[e]	2.5%	0.9%	6.5%	1.7%	0.5%	6.0%
Cresson Secure Trtmt. Unit[e]	8.3	1.7	32.4	25.0	9.8	50.7
George Jr. Republic[e]	5.2	2.3	11.4	5.3	2.3	11.6
Loysville Yth. Dev. Ctr.	4.1	1.5	10.4	4.1	1.5	10.6
New Castle Yth. Dev. Ctr.	1.4	0.3	5.6	2.8	0.9	7.7
North Central Secure Trtmt. Unit[d]	4.8	1.6	13.9	4.8	1.6	13.6
Pennsylvania Clinical School, Keystone[e]	0.0	0.0	8.4	0.0	0.0	8.4
St. Gabriel's Hall[e]	3.3	1.4	7.8	7.4	3.8	14.0
Summit Acad.[e]	0.7	0.2	3.3	3.1	0.9	10.5
Rhode Island[b]						
Rhode Island Training School[d]	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.3%	0.5%	3.9%
South Carolina[b]						
Broad River Rd. Complex, Birchwood	7.8%	5.4%	11.2%	8.0%	5.5%	11.5%
Broad River Rd. Complex, John G. Richards	6.0	3.5	10.0	14.9	10.5	20.8
Tennessee						
John S. Wilder Yth. Dev. Ctr.	8.2%	4.1%	15.7%	12.2%	7.0%	20.6%
Mtn. View Yth. Dev. Ctr.	5.3	2.5	11.1	6.6	3.4	12.5
Taft Yth. Dev. Ctr.	9.5	5.3	16.2	5.0	2.7	9.2
Woodland Hills Yth. Dev. Ctr.	7.6	3.9	14.5	17.4	11.2	25.9
Texas[b]						
Al Price State Juv. Corr. Fac.	3.1%	2.0%	4.8%	10.5%	8.1%	13.3%
Corsicana Res. Trtmt. Ctr.[d]	8.9	6.3	12.5	15.3	12.1	19.3
Cottrell House	15.4	6.4	32.5	0.0	0.0	10.1
Crockett State School	9.2	7.1	12.0	10.1	7.8	12.9
Evins Reg. Juv. Ctr.	7.5	4.2	12.9	12.3	8.2	18.1
Gainesville State School	8.4	5.2	13.2	7.6	4.2	13.1
Giddings State School	6.3	3.9	10.0	7.1	4.2	11.6
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 1	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.6	1.5	4.4
McLennan Co. State Juv. Corr. Fac., Unit 2	9.6	6.9	13.1	11.7	8.4	16.1
Ron Jackson State Juv. Corr. Ctr. Unit I[c]	2.2	1.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	1.1
Victory Field Corr. Acad.	11.7	8.2	16.3	15.0	11.7	19.1
West Texas State School	4.4	2.6	7.4	12.5	8.6	17.8

Appendix table 5. (cont.)

Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching, by use of force and facility, National Survey of Youth in Custody, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of youth reporting staff sexual misconduct excluding touching[a]					
	Force reported			No report of force		
	Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval		Weighted percent	95%-confidence interval	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
Virginia						
Beaumont Juv. Corr. Ctr.	4.2%	1.6%	10.7%	8.4%	3.9%	17.1%
Bon Air Juv. Corr. Ctr.[d]	7.5	2.9	17.8	15.0	7.7	27.1
Culpeper Juv. Corr. Ctr., Long Term	12.0	6.6	20.9	20.0	12.6	30.1
Hanover Juv. Corr. Ctr.	14.8	6.4	30.8	7.4	2.3	21.6
Washington						
Echo Glen Children's Ctr.[d]	3.1%	0.7%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%
Green Hill School	0.0	0.0	5.7	1.0	0.2	4.2
Maple Lane School	8.2	4.3	15.3	3.8	1.5	9.3
Naselle Yth. Camp[d]	0.0	0.0	12.8	1.7	0.4	7.3
West Virginia[b]						
West Virginia Industrial Home for Yth.[d]	3.5%	2.1%	5.6%	2.6%	1.5%	4.5%
Wisconsin						
Ethan Allen School	1.9%	0.7%	5.5%	4.3%	2.0%	8.9%
Lincoln Hills School	2.8	1.0	7.7	6.9	3.6	13.0

Note: Facilities in which there were no reports of sexual victimization of any type are not listed. See "Definition of terms" in *Methodology* for measures of sexual victimization by type. Facilities house males only unless otherwise noted.

:Not calculated. One or more youth victimized. Value suppressed to protect confidentiality.

[a]Weighted percent of youth reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

[b]State/facility granted consent *in loco parentis*. (See *Methodology* for details.)

[c]Facility houses females only.

[d]Facility houses both males and females.

[e]Private facility. Some private facilities may be state owned or under state jurisdiction.

[f]County facility.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

NCJ 228416

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJS
Permit No. G-91

This report in portable document format and in ASCII and its related statistical data and tables are available at the BJS World Wide Web Internet site: http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2113.

Office of Justice Programs

Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods
http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistics agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Michael D. Sinclair is acting director.

This Special Report was written by Allen J. Beck, Paige M. Harrison, and Paul Guerino, *BJS Statisticians*. Paige M. Harrison and Paul Guerino verified the report.

Georgette Walsh and Jill Duncan edited the report, Tina Dorsey produced the report and Jayne Robinson prepared the report for final printing under the supervision of Doris J. James.

Westat (Rockville, MD), under a co-operative agreement and in collaboration with BJS staff, designed the survey, developed the questionnaires, coordinated logistical arrangements related to interviewing, collected and processed the data, and assisted in table development. The project team included David Cantor and Andrea Sedlak, Co-Principal Investigators; Tim Smith and John Hartge, Co-Project Directors; Gary Shapiro, Senior Sampling Statistician; Greg Norman, Sampling Statistician; Alfred Bishop, Computer Systems; Debbie Alexander, Director of Recruitment/Consent Operations; Sherry Sanborne, Field Director; and an extensive project team of researchers, analysts, and programmers.

January 2010, NCJ 228416