



Juvenile Offenders and Victims:



National Report Series

Bulletin

This Bulletin is part of the Juvenile Offenders and Victims National Report Series. The National Report offers a comprehensive statistical overview of the problems of juvenile crime, violence, and victimization and the response of the juvenile justice system. During each interim year, the Bulletins in the National Report Series provide access to the latest information on juvenile arrests, court cases, juveniles in custody, and other topics of interest. Each Bulletin in the series highlights selected topics at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking, giving readers focused access to statistics on some of the most critical issues. Together, the National Report and this series provide a baseline of facts for juvenile justice professionals, policy-makers, the media, and concerned citizens.

Office of Justice Programs
www.ojp.usdoj.gov
Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods

December 2009

Juvenile Residential Facility Census, 2006: Selected Findings

Sarah Hockenberry, Melissa Sickmund, and Anthony Sladky

A Message From OJJDP

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) developed the biannual Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC) to collect information about the facilities in which juvenile offenders are held. Facilities provide information about characteristics such as their size, structure, type, ownership, and security arrangements. They also describe the range of services they provide to youth in their care—including education, physical health, mental health, and substance abuse services. JRFC also reports the number of juveniles who died in custody over the past 12 months. This Bulletin presents findings from the 2006 JRFC—findings that are generally positive.

JRFC data indicate that the population of juvenile offenders in custody continued to decline—down 3% from 2004, a trend that may be explained by the decline in juvenile arrests. Although crowding is still a problem in many facilities, improvements continue. The proportion of residents held in facilities that were at or above the limit of their standard bed capacity dropped from 40% in 2000 to 31% in 2006. In 2006, 4% of facilities (holding 11% of juvenile offenders in custody) exceeded their standard bed capacity or had juveniles sleeping in makeshift beds.

JRFC alternates with its companion study, the biannual Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement, which describes the characteristics of youth in custody. In pursuing these data collection efforts, OJJDP supports the vital role of corrections in maintaining the safety of the community and providing essential services to confined youth.

Jeff Slowikowski
Acting Administrator



Access OJJDP publications online at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp

The Juvenile Residential Facility Census provides data on facility operations

Facility census describes 3,034 juvenile facilities

In October 2006, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) administered the fourth Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC). JRFC began in 2000 with data collections occurring every other year.

Regularly collected data include information on facility operations and services, facility security, capacity and crowding, injuries and deaths in custody, and facility ownership and operation. Supplementary information is also collected each year on specific services, such as mental and physical health, substance abuse, and education.

JRFC does not capture data on adult prisons or jails, nor does it include facilities used exclusively for mental health or substance abuse treatment or for dependent children. Thus, JRFC includes most, but not all, facilities that hold juvenile offenders. The reporting facilities may also hold adults or “nonoffenders,” but data were only included if the facility held at least one juvenile offender on the census date.

The 2006 JRFC collected data from 3,034 juvenile facilities, 2,658 of which held a total of 92,093 offenders younger than 21 on the census date (October 25, 2006). The remaining 376 reporting facilities held no juvenile offenders on that date.

JRFC is one component in a multitiered effort to describe the youth placed in residential facilities and the facilities themselves. Other components include:

- **The National Juvenile Court Data Archive**, which collects information on sanctions that juvenile courts impose.
- **The Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement**, which collects information on the demographics and legal attributes of each youth in a juvenile facility on the census date.
- **The Survey of Youth in Residential Placement**, which collected in 2003 a broad range of self-reported information from interviews with individual youth in residential placement.

On October 25, 2006, 44% of juvenile facilities were publicly operated; they held 69% of juvenile offenders

State	Juvenile facilities			Juvenile offenders			State	Juvenile facilities			Juvenile offenders		
	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private		Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private
U.S. total	2,658	1,166	1,483	92,093	63,502	28,426	Missouri	68	62	6	1,359	1,302	57
Alabama	67	13	54	1,822	806	1,016	Montana	18	7	9	227	147	52
Alaska	24	8	16	366	249	117	Nebraska	18	5	13	670	452	218
Arizona	48	17	27	1,765	1,383	292	Nevada	24	14	10	1,081	826	255
Arkansas	33	10	23	862	279	583	New Hampshire	8	2	6	194	103	91
California	248	119	129	14,855	13,209	1,646	New Jersey	53	43	10	1,579	1,467	112
Colorado	49	13	36	1,821	963	858	New Mexico	17	15	2	428	400	28
Connecticut	20	4	16	401	220	181	New York	184	46	138	3,834	1,971	1,863
Delaware	7	6	1	270	254	16	North Carolina	59	24	35	1,167	689	478
Dist. of Columbia	9	2	7	236	182	54	North Dakota	10	4	6	237	109	128
Florida	144	40	104	6,854	2,594	4,260	Ohio	95	66	29	4,352	3,983	369
Georgia	40	26	14	2,668	2,129	539	Oklahoma	48	16	31	960	675	260
Hawaii	7	3	4	134	117	17	Oregon	46	24	22	1,343	1,083	260
Idaho	22	14	8	542	489	53	Pennsylvania	151	31	120	5,316	1,312	4,004
Illinois	38	28	10	2,604	2,364	240	Rhode Island	17	1	16	297	165	132
Indiana	88	37	51	2,926	1,835	1,091	South Carolina	33	14	19	1,273	819	454
Iowa	74	15	59	1,173	361	812	South Dakota	23	7	14	514	195	297
Kansas	47	17	30	1,183	791	392	Tennessee	48	27	21	1,276	821	455
Kentucky	45	30	15	1,093	945	148	Texas	114	86	28	8,550	7,533	1,017
Louisiana	49	17	32	1,319	911	408	Utah	44	17	27	1,009	431	578
Maine	9	2	7	222	198	24	Vermont	4	1	3	54	26	28
Maryland	41	15	26	1,065	656	409	Virginia	64	60	4	2,191	2,132	59
Massachusetts	60	19	41	1,269	448	821	Washington	36	29	7	1,485	1,420	65
Michigan	80	35	45	2,741	1,379	1,362	West Virginia	28	12	16	557	371	186
Minnesota	83	23	60	1,538	879	659	Wisconsin	73	21	52	1,511	895	616
Mississippi	20	17	3	447	400	47	Wyoming	23	2	21	453	134	319

Notes: “State” is the State where the facility is located. Offenders sent to out-of-State facilities are counted in the State where the facility is located, not the State where they committed their offense. Totals include 9 tribal facilities (holding 165 juvenile offenders) located in Arizona, Montana, Oklahoma, and South Dakota.

Source: Authors’ analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Although most facilities are small and private, most offenders are held in large public facilities

Local public facilities are more numerous, but State facilities hold more youth

Local facilities (those staffed by county, city, or municipal employees) made up more than half of all public facilities but held fewer than half the juvenile offenders who were in custody in public facilities on the census date in 2006.

	Facilities		Juvenile offenders	
	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.
Total	2,658	100%	92,093	100%
Public	1,166	44	63,502	69
State	498	19	34,251	37
Local	668	25	29,251	32
Private	1,483	56	28,426	31

Note: Totals include 9 tribal facilities holding 165 juvenile offenders.

During the course of a year, more juveniles pass through local facilities than State facilities because the majority of local facilities are detention centers, where youth stay for relatively short periods of time. In State facilities, such as training schools, stays are generally longer.

Residential treatment centers and group homes outnumber other types of facilities

JRFC asks respondents to identify the type of facility (e.g., detention center, shelter, reception/diagnostic center, group home/halfway house, boot camp, ranch/forestry/wilderness camp/marine program, training school/long-term secure facility, or residential treatment center). Respondents were allowed to select more than one facility type category, although the vast majority (84%) selected only one.

Training schools tend to be State facilities, detention centers tend to be local facilities, and group homes tend to be private facilities

Facility operation	Total	Facility type						
		Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Number of facilities	2,658	730	177	62	754	115	207	919
Operations profile								
All facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Public	44	84	31	69	19	41	87	28
State	19	20	4	63	10	6	76	14
Local	25	64	27	6	9	35	12	13
Private	56	15	69	31	81	59	12	72
Facility profile								
All facilities	100%	27%	7%	2%	28%	4%	8%	35%
Public	100	52	5	4	12	4	16	22
State	100	29	1	8	15	1	32	27
Local	100	70	7	1	10	6	4	18
Private	100	7	8	1	41	5	2	45

- Detention centers, reception/diagnostic centers, and training schools were more likely to be public facilities than private facilities; however, a substantial proportion of reception/diagnostic centers were private.
- Most shelters were private facilities, as were group homes and residential treatment centers.
- Detention centers made up the largest proportion of all local facilities and approximately half of all public facilities.
- Training schools constituted 32% of all State facilities.
- Group homes accounted for 41% of all private facilities.

Note: Counts (and row percentages) may sum to more than the total number of facilities because facilities could select more than one facility type category. Totals include boot camps (34) and tribal facilities (9).

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

More than 900 facilities identified themselves as residential treatment centers and were holding juvenile offenders on the 2006 census date. Residential treatment centers made up 35% of all facilities and held 32% of juvenile offenders. More than 750 facilities identified themselves as group homes/halfway houses and were holding juvenile offenders. Group homes made up 28% of facilities and held 9% of juvenile offenders. There were 134 facilities that identified themselves as both residential treatment centers and group

homes. In fact, the group home/residential treatment center combination was the most common facility type combination. There were 730 facilities that identified themselves as detention centers—they accounted for 27% of facilities and held 36% of juvenile offenders in residential placement on the census date. Facilities identified as detention centers most commonly also identified themselves as residential treatment centers (60 facilities), training schools (36 facilities), and shelters (25 facilities).

Security features and size varied across types of facilities

Facilities varied in their degree of security

Overall, 35% of facilities said that at least some of the time youth are locked in their sleeping rooms. Among public facilities, 74% of local facilities and 59% of State facilities reported locking youth in sleeping rooms. Few private facilities locked youth in sleeping rooms (8%).

Percentage of facilities locking youth in sleeping rooms

	Percentage of facilities locking youth in sleeping rooms
Total	35%
Public	68
State	59
Local	74
Private	8

Note: Percentages are based on facilities that reported security information (84 of 2,658 facilities [3%] did not report).

Among facilities that locked youth in sleeping rooms, most did this at night (86%) or when a youth was out of control (77%). Locking doors whenever youth were in their sleeping rooms (59%) and locking youth in their rooms during shift changes (48%) were also fairly common. Fewer facilities reported locking youth in sleeping rooms for a part of each day (25%) or when they were suicidal (25%). Very few facilities locked youth in sleeping rooms most of each day (2%) or all of each day (1%). Six percent (6%) had no set schedule for locking youth in sleeping rooms.

Facilities indicated whether they had various types of locked doors or gates intended to confine youth within the facility (see sidebar). Nearly half of all facilities that reported security information said they had one or more confinement features (other than locked sleeping rooms). A greater proportion of public facilities (82%) than private facilities (24%) had confinement features.

Percentage of facilities

	No confinement features	One or more confinement features
Total	50%	50%
Public	18	82
State	17	83
Local	19	81
Private	76	24

Note: Percentages are based on facilities that reported security information (84 of 2,658 facilities [3%] did not report).

Among detention centers and training schools that reported security information, about 9 in 10 said they had 1 or more confinement features (other than locked sleeping rooms).

Facilities reporting one or more confinement features (other than locking sleeping rooms):

	Number	Percentage
Total facilities	1,295	50%
Detention center	678	94
Shelter	41	24
Reception/diagnostic center	44	72
Group home	95	13
Ranch/wilderness camp	40	35
Training school	200	98
Residential treatment center	378	43

Note: Detail sums to more than totals because facilities could select more than one facility type category.

Among group homes, fewer than 1 in 5 facilities said they had locked doors or gates to confine youth. A facility's staff, of course, also provides security. In some facilities, a remote location is a security feature that also helps to keep youth from leaving.

Overall, 19% of facilities reported external gates in fences or walls with razor wire. This arrangement was most common among training schools (45%), detention centers (42%), and reception/diagnostic centers (32%).

JRFC asks facilities about their security features

Are any young persons in this facility locked in their sleeping rooms by staff at any time to confine them?

Does this facility have any of the following features intended to confine young persons within specific areas?

- Doors for secure day rooms that are locked by staff to confine young persons within specific areas?
- Wing, floor, corridor, or other internal security doors that are locked by staff to confine young persons within specific areas?
- Outside doors that are locked by staff to confine young persons within specific buildings?
- External gates in fences or walls WITHOUT razor wire that are locked by staff to confine young persons?
- External gates in fences or walls WITH razor wire that are locked by staff to confine young persons?

Are outside doors to any buildings with living/sleeping units in this facility ever locked? If yes, why?

- To keep intruders out?
- To keep young persons inside this facility?

JRFC did not ask about security features such as resident counts (roll calls), cameras, or guard towers.

Security increased as facility size increased

Among the largest facilities (those with more than 200 residents) that provided security information, 82% lock youth in their sleeping rooms to confine them at least some of the time. The vast majority of large facilities (89%) had one or more features (locked doors or gates) intended to confine youth.

Facility size	Percentage of facilities reporting		
	Youth locked in sleep rooms	One or more confinement features	Razor wire
Total facilities	35%	50%	19%
1–10 residents	12	20	4
11–20 residents	28	45	12
21–50 residents	48	67	27
51–100 residents	50	74	33
101–200 residents	69	86	44
201+ residents	82	89	56

Although the use of razor wire is a far less common security measure, nearly 6 in 10 of the largest facilities said they had locked gates in fences or walls with razor wire.

Large facilities were most likely to be State operated

Few (11%) State-operated facilities (57 of 498) held 10 or fewer residents in 2006. In contrast, 44% of private facilities (652 of 1,483) were that small. In fact, these small private facilities made up the largest proportion of private facilities.

Facility size	Facility operation		
	State	Local	Private
Total facilities	498	668	1,483
1–10 residents	57	132	652
11–20 residents	83	150	348
21–50 residents	168	209	286
51–100 residents	79	110	138
101–200 residents	66	51	46
201+ residents	45	16	13

Note: Data for the 9 tribal facilities are not displayed. Tribal facilities ranged in size from 1–10 residents to 21–50 residents.

More than half of facilities were small (holding 20 or fewer residents), although nearly half of juvenile offenders were held in large facilities (holding more than 100 residents)

Facility size	Number of facilities	Percentage of facilities	Number of juvenile offenders	Percentage of juvenile offenders
Total facilities	2,658	100%	92,093	100%
1–10 residents	843	32	4,369	5
11–20 residents	584	22	7,083	8
21–50 residents	667	25	19,109	21
51–100 residents	327	12	18,840	20
101–200 residents	163	6	20,830	23
201+ residents	74	3	21,862	24

- Although the largest facilities—those holding more than 200 residents—accounted for only 3% of all facilities, they held 24% of all juvenile offenders in custody.
- Inversely, although the smallest facilities—those holding 10 or fewer residents—accounted for 32% of all facilities, they held only 5% of all juvenile offenders in custody.

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Small group homes holding 20 or fewer residents were the most common type of facility

Facility size	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Number of facilities	730	177	62	754	115	207	919
Total facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1–10 residents	17	50	18	66	6	0	18
11–20 residents	21	32	13	21	12	7	25
21–50 residents	34	12	15	9	39	26	32
51–100 residents	17	4	21	3	33	20	17
101–200 residents	8	1	21	1	9	26	7
201+ residents	3	1	13	1	1	20	1

- 66% of group homes and 50% of shelters held 10 or fewer residents. For other facility types, this proportion was less than 20%.
- 20% of training schools and 13% of reception/diagnostic centers held more than 200 residents. For other facility types, this proportion was less than 4%.

Note: Facility type counts sum to more than 2,658 facilities because facilities could select more than one facility type category. Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

State-operated facilities made up just 19% of all facilities, and they accounted for 61% of facilities holding more than 200 residents. Private facilities constituted

56% of all facilities, and they accounted for 77% of facilities holding 10 or fewer residents.

Facility crowding affected a substantial proportion of youth in custody

Many juvenile offenders were in facilities with more residents than standard beds

Facilities reported both the number of standard beds and the number of make-shift beds they had on the census date. Occupancy rates provide the broadest assessment of the adequacy of living space. Although occupancy rate standards have not been established, as a facility's occupancy passes 100%, operational functioning may be impaired.

Crowding occurs when the number of residents occupying all or part of a facility exceeds some predetermined limit based on square footage, utility use, or even fire codes. Although it is an imperfect measure of crowding, comparing the number of residents to the number of standard beds gives a sense of the crowding problem in a facility. Even without relying on makeshift beds, a facility may be crowded. For example, using standard beds in an infirmary for youth who are not sick or beds in seclusion for youth who have not committed infractions may indicate crowding problems.

Thirty-one percent (31%) of facilities said that the number of residents they held on the 2006 census date put them at or over the capacity of their standard beds or that they relied on some makeshift beds. These facilities held more than 31,100 residents, the vast majority of whom were offenders younger than 21. Thus, 30% of all residents held on the census date and 31% of offenders younger than 21 were held in facilities operating at or above their standard bed capacity. In comparison, such facilities held 32% of all residents in 2004, they held 34% in 2002, and they held 40% in 2000. In 2006, 4% of facilities reported being over capacity (having fewer standard beds than they had residents or relying on makeshift beds). These facilities held 11% of juvenile offenders.

Compared with other types of facilities, public detention centers and reception/diagnostic centers were more likely to be over standard bed capacity

Facility type	Percentage of facilities at their standard bed capacity			Percentage of facilities over their standard bed capacity		
	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private
Total	27%	17%	36%	4%	9%	1%
Detention center	12	10	22	12	13	6
Shelter	15	13	16	0	0	0
Reception/diagnostic center	13	9	21	8	12	0
Group home	42	26	46	1	1	0
Ranch/wilderness camp	24	23	25	1	0	1
Training school	16	15	28	10	10	4
Residential treatment center	33	26	36	3	6	1

The largest facilities were the most likely to be crowded

Facility size	Number of facilities	Percentage of facilities under, at, or over their standard bed capacity			Mean number of makeshift beds
		<100%	100%	>100%	
Total facilities	2,658	68%	27%	4%	8
1–10 residents	843	67	33	0	2
11–20 residents	584	65	32	3	2
21–50 residents	667	69	26	6	4
51–100 residents	327	72	18	9	6
101–200 residents	163	73	17	10	16
201+ residents	74	72	9	19	22

Note: A single bed is counted as one standard bed and a bunk bed is counted as two standard beds. Makeshift beds (e.g., cots, roll-out beds, mattresses, and sofas) are not counted as standard beds. Facilities are counted as over capacity if they reported more residents than standard beds or if they reported any occupied makeshift beds. Facilities could select more than one facility type category. Totals include data from 9 tribal facilities.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

28 States held fewer juvenile offenders in 2006 than in 2004

Overall, the juvenile offender custody population dropped 3% from 2004 to 2006. States with declines held an average 9% fewer juvenile offenders on the census date in 2006 than in 2004—ranging from 33% in New Mexico to less than 5% in 12 States.

Among the 18 States that had more juveniles in residential placement in 2006 than in 2004, the average growth was 11%. Half of these States had increases of 10% or more (Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, North Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming). Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania reported virtually no change in their custody population between 2004 and 2006.

Public facilities were more likely than private facilities to be crowded

Among publicly operated facilities, 9% exceeded standard bed capacity or had residents occupying makeshift beds on the 2006 census date. For privately operated facilities, the proportion was 1%. However, a larger proportion of private facilities (36%) compared to public facilities (17%) said they were operating at 100% capacity.

State-operated public facilities had a somewhat greater proportion of facilities that exceeded capacity (11%) than did locally operated facilities (7%).

Facility operation	Percentage of facilities at or over their standard bed capacity		
	≥100%	100%	>100%
Total	32%	27%	4%
Public	25	17	9
State	32	21	11
Local	20	13	7
Private	37	36	1

Note: Total includes 9 tribal facilities holding 165 juvenile offenders.

Use of makeshift beds varied widely

About 120 facilities reported having occupied makeshift beds, averaging 8 such beds per facility. Many facilities rely on makeshift beds, while many others operate well below standard bed capacity. On average, there were 9 unoccupied standard beds per facility. This average masks a wide range: 1 facility with 166 residents had 72 standard beds and 94 residents without standard beds; another facility with 690 standard beds had 209 residents, leaving 481 unoccupied beds.

Nationwide, 847 juvenile facilities (32%) were at or over standard capacity or relied on makeshift beds

State	Total facilities	Number of facilities under, at, or over capacity			Percentage of juvenile offenders in facilities at or over capacity		State	Total facilities	Number of facilities under, at, or over capacity			Percentage of juvenile offenders in facilities at or over capacity	
		<100%	100%	>100%	100%	>100%			<100%	100%	>100%	100%	>100%
U.S. total	2,658	1,811	728	119	20%	11%	Missouri	68	47	16	5	21%	6%
Alabama	67	46	20	1	24	5	Montana	18	13	5	0	28	0
Alaska	24	11	11	2	56	7	Nebraska	18	17	1	0	1	0
Arizona	48	37	9	2	14	16	Nevada	24	22	2	0	1	0
Arkansas	33	22	11	0	35	0	New Hampshire	8	6	2	0	27	0
California	248	134	108	6	16	9	New Jersey	53	43	6	4	8	17
Colorado	49	34	13	2	26	8	New Mexico	17	15	2	0	10	0
Connecticut	20	13	7	0	13	0	New York	184	124	58	2	21	0
Delaware	7	4	2	1	13	30	North Carolina	59	37	15	7	20	23
Dist. of Columbia	9	4	4	1	14	32	North Dakota	10	9	1	0	19	0
Florida	144	98	38	8	23	6	Ohio	95	64	20	11	10	14
Georgia	40	26	8	6	24	14	Oklahoma	48	23	25	0	44	0
Hawaii	7	5	1	1	1	61	Oregon	46	33	10	3	9	15
Idaho	22	16	5	1	9	11	Pennsylvania	151	109	37	5	42	3
Illinois	38	27	10	1	44	13	Rhode Island	17	9	8	0	28	0
Indiana	88	66	18	4	12	2	South Carolina	33	25	7	1	13	10
Iowa	74	52	22	0	25	0	South Dakota	23	18	5	0	31	0
Kansas	47	28	18	1	23	2	Tennessee	48	31	16	1	20	2
Kentucky	45	29	12	4	23	22	Texas	114	82	13	19	5	42
Louisiana	49	30	18	1	24	3	Utah	44	22	18	4	26	17
Maine	9	9	0	0	0	0	Vermont	4	3	1	0	9	0
Maryland	41	24	14	3	28	10	Virginia	64	51	9	4	8	7
Massachusetts	60	43	16	1	28	2	Washington	36	27	7	2	23	17
Michigan	80	45	34	1	30	7	West Virginia	28	19	8	1	25	4
Minnesota	83	66	16	1	23	5	Wisconsin	73	57	15	1	12	9
Mississippi	20	18	2	0	4	0	Wyoming	23	18	4	1	5	15

Note: A single bed is counted as one standard bed and a bunk bed is counted as two standard beds. Makeshift beds (e.g., cots, roll-out beds, mattresses, and sofas) are not counted as standard beds. Facilities are counted as over capacity if they reported more residents than standard beds or if they reported any occupied makeshift beds. Facilities could select more than one facility type category. "State" is the State where the facility is located. Offenders sent to out-of-State facilities are counted in the State where the facility is located, not the State where they committed their offense. Totals include 9 tribal facilities (holding 165 juvenile offenders) located in Arizona, Montana, Oklahoma, and South Dakota.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most juvenile offenders were evaluated for educational needs and attended school while held in facilities

Facilities that screened all youth for educational needs held 77% of the offenders in custody

As part of the information collected on educational services, the JRFC questionnaire asked facilities about their procedures regarding educational screening.

In 2006, 81% of facilities that reported educational screening information said that they evaluated all youth for grade level and educational needs. An additional 8% evaluated some youth. Only 10% did not evaluate any youth for educational needs.

Of the 172 facilities in 2006 that screened some but not all youth, 70% evaluated youth whom staff identified as needing an assessment; 63% evaluated youth for whom no educational record was available; 56% evaluated youth with known educational problems; and 12% evaluated youth who came directly from home, rather than from another facility.

In 2006, those facilities that screened all youth held 77% of the juvenile offenders in custody. An additional 3% of juvenile offenders in 2006 were in facilities that screened some youth.

Most facilities use previous academic records to evaluate educational needs

The vast majority of facilities (90%) that screened some or all youth for grade level and educational needs used previous academic records. Some facilities also administered written tests (70%) or conducted an education-related interview with an education specialist (60%), intake counselor (39%), or guidance counselor (24%).

The smallest facilities were the least likely to evaluate all youth for grade level

Education screening	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1–10	11–20	21–50	51–100	101–200	200+
Total facilities	2,658	843	584	667	327	163	74
Facilities reporting	2,129	615	466	571	268	144	65
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	81	69	80	89	86	92	95
Some youth screened	8	15	8	5	4	2	2
No youth screened	10	17	11	6	10	6	3

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most facilities evaluated youth for grade level between 24 hours and 7 days after arrival

When youth are evaluated for educational needs	Number of juvenile facilities			As a percentage of facilities that evaluated youth for grade level		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
				evaluated	evaluated	evaluated
Total facilities	2,658	1,734	172	100%	91%	9%
Less than 24 hours	402	390	12	21	20	1
24 hours to 7 days	1,496	1,377	119	78	72	6
7 or more days	239	200	39	13	10	2
Other	89	59	30	5	3	2
No youth evaluated (or not reported)	752	–	–	–	–	–

Note: Facilities sum to more than 2,658 because they were able to select more than one time period.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Group homes and small facilities were the least likely to report that youth in their facility attended school

Facility type	Total	Percentage of facilities with youth attending school		
		All youth	Some youth	No youth
Total facilities	100%	65%	15%	21%
Detention center	100	74	12	14
Shelter	100	64	18	19
Reception/diagnostic center	100	66	23	11
Group home	100	54	16	30
Ranch/wilderness camp	100	60	21	19
Training school	100	66	25	9
Residential treatment center	100	71	12	17
Facility size				
1–10 residents	100%	57%	14%	28%
11–20 residents	100	67	13	21
21–50 residents	100	72	13	15
51–100 residents	100	66	16	18
101–200 residents	100	67	21	12
200+ residents	100	61	27	12

Note: Row percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most facilities reported that all or some youth in their facility attended school

Eighty percent (80%) of facilities reported that at least some youth in their facility attended school either inside or outside the facility. Facilities reporting that all youth attended school (65% of facilities) accounted for 67% of the juvenile offender population in residential placement. Group homes were the least likely to report that all youth attended school (54%) and the most likely to report that no youth attended school (30%). Facilities with 21–50 residents were most likely to report that all youth attended school (72%), while facilities with 1–10 residents were least likely (57%) to have all youth attend school. Facilities reporting that no youth attended school (21%) accounted for 14% of all juvenile offenders in residential placement.

Facilities offer a variety of educational services

Facilities that provide both middle and high school-level education housed 78% of all juvenile offenders. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of all facilities provided high school-level education, and 73% provided middle school-level education. Most facilities also reported offering special education services (69%) and GED preparation (63%). A much smaller percentage of facilities provided vocational or technical education (32%) and post-high school education (21%).

Most facilities provided middle and high school level education

Education level	Facility type							
	All facilities	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Elementary level	46%	70%	58%	65%	29%	42%	50%	43%
Middle school	73	84	80	87	61	74	82	76
High school	78	84	80	89	69	81	90	82
Special education	69	72	67	81	62	76	88	73
GED preparation	63	62	63	68	56	70	86	68
GED testing	43	29	39	53	44	56	82	48
Post-high school	21	10	16	32	25	17	55	24
Vocational/technical	32	11	27	45	36	45	70	40
Life skills training	55	50	44	56	50	70	0	65

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most youth offenders were housed in facilities that provided physical healthcare services in 2006

In 7 of 10 facilities, youth received a physical health examination while in custody

Facilities were asked about physical health services (including but not limited to examinations) provided to youth in custody. Among facilities that reported physical health information, 99% said that some or all youth offenders receive physical healthcare services inside or outside of their facility. These facilities housed 86% of all youth offenders.

Of facilities reporting physical health information, most (71%) provided physical examinations to all youth offenders (accounting for 77% of youth offenders held at such facilities). Another 24% (accounting for 19% of youth offenders held at reporting facilities) reported providing physical health examinations to some offenders. Of those facilities that reported providing physical exams to some offenders, 67% reported providing exams to youth who were in the facility for a certain period of time, 47% to youth who displayed symptoms of illness or injury, 40% to youth with an existing health problem, 31% to youth with no available healthcare record, and 11% to youth who came directly from home.

Percentage of facilities with youth receiving physical exam

	All youth	Some youth	No youth
Total	71%	24%	5%
Public	65	28	6
State	79	19	2
Local	54	36	10
Private	77	20	4

Note: Total includes 9 tribal facilities holding 165 juvenile offenders and is based on facilities that reported physical examination information.

Although most facilities provided all youth with a physical examination in 2006, smaller facilities were most likely to provide no examinations

Physical examination	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	200+
Total facilities	2,658	843	584	667	327	163	74
Facilities reporting	2,098	595	461	565	268	144	65
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	71	66	69	70	79	76	86
Some youth screened	24	26	26	25	20	20	12
No youth screened	5	8	5	4	1	3	2

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Shelters and detention centers were less likely than other facility types to provide all youth with a physical examination

Facility operation	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	730	177	62	754	115	207	919
Facilities reporting physical exam	630	139	58	514	91	188	759
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth examined	52	42	76	74	74	83	85
Some youth examined	40	50	22	22	12	14	14
No youth examined	8	8	2	4	14	3	1

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Private facilities were more likely than public facilities in general to report providing physical exams to all youth; however, State facilities were the most likely to report that all youth receive physical

exams. Conversely, local facilities were least likely to report that all youth receive physical exams and most likely to report that no youth receive physical exams.

Most facilities used a doctor or nurse to conduct physical exams

More than 8 in 10 facilities that reported providing a physical exam for some or all youth said that a doctor performed some or all of these exams. Fifty-three percent (53%) reported that a nurse performed some or all exams. A number of facilities also reported that nurse practitioners and physician's assistants performed some or all exams (38% and 28%, respectively). Only 1% of facilities reported that another individual performed the exams.

Fewer facilities reported providing youth with dental, vision, or gynecological exams

Facilities were asked if they provided dental, vision, or gynecological exams for residents either inside or outside of the facility. The proportion of facilities providing such exams to all youth was less than the proportion providing physical exams to all youth. Fewer than 5 in 10 facilities reported that all youth in their care receive a dental exam. Even fewer reported that all youth receive a vision or gynecological exam. Among facilities that housed girls in the prior month, fewer than 2 in 10 provided gynecological exams to all girls in the facility.

Percentage of facilities with youth receiving exam

Exam type	All youth	Some youth	No youth
Dental	48%	44%	9%
Vision	41	46	13
Gynecological	17	68	15

Note: Analysis of facilities providing gynecological exams included only those that reported housing girls during the month of the census.

Most facilities provided tuberculosis testing, while a smaller proportion provided Hepatitis B and C testing

Testing service	Percentage of facilities			
	Testing not provided	All youth tested	As recommended by health professional	At youth's request
Tuberculosis	7%	38%	38%	18%
Sexually transmitted diseases (STD)	7	15	50	48
Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)	9	4	43	58
Pregnancy	5	17	71	66
Hepatitis B	18	9	48	30
Hepatitis C	15	6	55	33

Note: Only facilities that reported housing girls during the month of the census were included in analysis for pregnancy testing.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most reporting facilities said they provided vaccinations to some or no youth

Youth vaccinated	Percentage of facilities vaccinating for:							
	Measles, mumps, rubella	Tetanus/diphtheria	Polio	Chicken pox	Flu	Meningitis	Hepatitis A	Hepatitis B
All youth	15%	15%	13%	12%	14%	11%	11%	16%
Some youth	47	50	45	45	44	42	44	46
No youth	38	35	42	42	42	47	45	38

- In 2006, the split between facilities that vaccinated some or no youth was similar, and facilities were least likely to vaccinate all youth.
- The largest proportion of facilities reported vaccinating some youth against tetanus/diphtheria (50%).
- Facilities that reported vaccinating all youth were most likely to vaccinate against hepatitis B (16%), followed closely by measles, mumps, and rubella (15%) and tetanus/diphtheria (15%).

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Percentage of youth in facilities providing exams to:

Exam type	All youth	Some youth	No youth
Dental	54%	41%	5%
Vision	47	44	9

Note: These data did not support analysis of the percentage of youth offenders who received gynecological exams.

Of the facilities that reported providing gynecological exams, 83% said exams were provided to girls "as deemed necessary" by a nurse/doctor, 63% to girls who requested an exam, 51% to girls known or thought to be pregnant, and 24% to girls known to have been sexually active.

Most facilities reported screening youth for substance abuse problems

Facilities that screened all youth held 56% of the juvenile offenders in custody

In 2006, 64% of facilities that reported substance abuse evaluation information said that they evaluated all youth, 20% said that some youth were evaluated, and 15% did not evaluate any youth.

Of the 435 facilities that evaluated some but not all youth, 88% evaluated youth that the court or a probation officer identified as potentially having substance abuse problems, 78% evaluated youth that facility staff identified as potentially having substance abuse problems, and 62% evaluated youth charged with or adjudicated for a drug or alcohol-related offense.

Those facilities that screened all youth held 56% of the juvenile offenders in custody. An additional 15% of juvenile offenders were in facilities that screened some youth.

The most common form of evaluation was a series of staff-administered questions

The majority of facilities (74%) that evaluated some or all youth for substance abuse problems did so by having staff administer a series of questions that ask about substance use and abuse, 58% evaluated youth by visual observation, 54% evaluated youth by using a self-report checklist inventory that asks about substance use and abuse, and 41% said they used a standardized self-report instrument such as the Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory.

The largest facilities were the least likely to evaluate all youth for substance abuse problems

Substance abuse screening	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	200+
Total facilities	2,658	843	584	667	327	163	74
Facilities reporting	2,128	615	466	570	268	144	65
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	64	57	71	65	62	74	54
Some youth screened	20	22	16	21	28	14	12
No youth screened	15	21	13	13	10	12	34

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

More than half of facilities reported evaluating youth for substance abuse within their first day at the facility

When youth are evaluated for substance abuse	Number of juvenile facilities			As a percentage of facilities that evaluated youth for substance abuse		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
	Total facilities	2,658	1,364	435	100%	76%
Less than 24 hours	952	839	113	53	47	6
24 hours to 7 days	876	679	197	49	38	11
7 or more days	345	219	126	19	12	7
Other	184	63	121	10	4	7
No youth evaluated (or not reported)	859	—	—	—	—	—

Note: Facilities sum to more than 2,658 because they were able to select more than one time period.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Drug testing was a routine procedure in most facilities in 2006

As part of the information collected on substance abuse services, facilities were asked if any youth were required to undergo drug testing after arrival in their facility. The majority of facilities (76%) reported that at least some youth were required to undergo drug testing. Of facilities that reported that all or some youth were tested, the reason for testing was most commonly due to a request from the court or probation officer (60% for facilities that tested all youth, 73% for facilities that tested youth suspected of recent drug or alcohol use, and 71% for facilities that tested youth with substance abuse problems).

Circumstances of testing	Percentage of facilities
All youth	
After initial arrival	24%
At each reentry	19
Randomly	31
When drug use is suspected or drug is present	55
At the request of the court or probation officer	60
Youth suspected of recent drug/alcohol use	
After initial arrival	32%
At each reentry	27
Randomly	40
When drug use is suspected or drug is present	62
At the request of the court or probation officer	73
Youth with substance abuse problems	
After initial arrival	26%
At each reentry	25
Randomly	41
When drug use is suspected or drug is present	57
At the request of the court or probation officer	71

Substance abuse education was the most common service provided at all reporting facilities

Substance abuse service	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	200+
Total facilities	2,658	843	584	667	327	163	74
Facilities reporting	1,814	514	396	486	235	123	60
Substance abuse education	96%	96%	95%	96%	97%	100%	97%
Case manager to oversee treatment	47	49	43	46	40	58	62
Treatment plan for substance abuse	72	73	73	71	69	82	73
Special living units	9	3	6	8	10	28	50
None of above services provided	1	1	2	2	1	-	-

■ Of the facilities holding between 101 and 200 residents that reported providing substance abuse services, all provided substance abuse education and were more likely than smaller facilities to have special living units in which all young persons have substance abuse offenses and/or problems.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

The majority of facilities that provided counseling or therapy were most likely to provide these services on an individual basis

Service provided	Total	Facility type						
		Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	2,658	730	177	62	754	115	207	919
Facilities reporting counseling	1,297	277	86	26	376	74	131	532
Individual	89%	84%	88%	85%	94%	91%	87%	89%
Group	87	79	88	92	88	96	91	91
Family	43	29	57	38	49	28	34	50
Facilities reporting therapy	1,566	327	103	40	461	81	153	658
Individual	93%	94%	97%	95%	91%	95%	95%	93%
Group	88	79	93	80	90	95	92	92
Family	51	41	62	53	51	31	43	58

■ In 2006, group homes were most likely to provide individual counseling, while shelters were most likely to provide individual therapy.

■ Ranch/wilderness camps were the most likely to provide counseling and therapy on a group basis.

■ Family counseling or therapy was the least likely option that all facility types provided.

Note: Counts (and row percentages) may sum to more than the total number of facilities because facilities could select more than one facility type category. Totals include boot camps (34) and tribal facilities (9).

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most juvenile offenders are held in facilities that evaluate all youth for suicide risk on their first day

Facilities that screen all youth for suicide risk hold 88% of the juvenile offenders in custody

As part of the information collected on mental health services, the JRFC questionnaire asks facilities about their procedures regarding screening youth for suicide risk.

In 2006, 84% of facilities that reported information on suicide screening said that they evaluated all youth for suicide risk. An additional 4% said that they evaluated

some youth. Some facilities said they did not evaluate any youth for suicide risk (12%).

Suicide screening

Total facilities	2,658
Facilities reporting	2,126
All reporting facilities	100%
All youth screened	84
Some youth screened	4
No youth screened	12

In 2006, a larger proportion of public than private facilities said that they evaluated all youth for suicide risk (90% vs. 77%).

In 2006, among facilities that reported suicide screening information, those that screened all youth for suicide risk held 88% of juvenile offenders who were in residential placement—up from 81% in 2002 and 78% in 2000. An additional 4% of juvenile offenders in 2006 were in facilities that screened some youth.

Suicide screening 2000 2002 2006

Total juvenile offenders	110,284	102,388	92,093
Offenders in reporting facilities	104,956	100,110	79,477
Total offenders	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	78	81	88
Some youth screened	16	12	4
No youth screened	6	7	8

Suicide screening was common across facilities of various sizes

Suicide screening	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	200+
Total facilities	2,658	843	584	667	327	163	74
Facilities reporting	2,126	614	464	571	268	144	65
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	84	75	88	88	85	88	89
Some youth screened	4	4	3	4	6	3	5
No youth screened	12	21	9	8	10	8	6

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Most facilities use trained counselors or professional mental health staff to conduct suicide screening

A little more than half (51%) of facilities that screened some or all youth for suicide risk reported that mental health professionals with at least a master's degree in psychology or social work conducted the screenings. Approximately 40% used neither mental health professionals nor counselors trained by a mental health professional to conduct suicide screenings.

The majority (75%) of facilities reported screening youth by incorporating 1 or more questions about suicide in the medical history or intake process; 39% also reported using a form or questions that a county or State juvenile justice system designed to assess suicide risk. Slightly more than one-third (34%) of facilities also reported using the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument (MAYSI); 28% reported using the MAYSI full form and 6% used the MAYSI suicide/depression module. Less than 1% of

Ranch/wilderness camps and group homes were the least likely to screen youth for suicide risk

Suicide screening	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	730	177	62	754	115	207	919
Facilities reporting	637	145	58	525	93	188	762
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	97	83	91	71	59	91	84
Some youth screened	2	4	3	5	3	2	5
No youth screened	2	13	5	25	38	7	11

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

facilities also used the Voice Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children.

Of facilities that reported screening youth for suicide risk, 88% reassessed youth at some point during their stay. Most facilities (92%) reported rescreening on a case-by-case basis or as necessary. An additional 33% of facilities also reported that rescreening occurred systematically based on a variety of factors (for example, length of stay, facility events, or negative life events). Less than 1% of facilities did not reassess youth to determine suicide risk.

All facilities used some type of preventive measure once they determined a youth was at risk for suicide

Facilities that reported suicide screening information were asked a series of questions related to preventive measures taken for youth determined to be at risk for suicide. Of these facilities, 66% reported placing at-risk youth in sleeping or observation rooms that are locked or under staff security. Aside from using sleeping or observation rooms, nearly 9 in 10 facilities (85%) removed personal items that could be used to attempt suicide, a little more than 8 in 10 (83%) facilities reported using line-of-sight supervision, and approximately 7 in 10 (71%) facilities reported using one-on-one or arm's length supervision. Equal proportions of facilities (38% each) reported removing the youth from the general population as well as using special clothing designed to prevent suicide attempts. Twenty-two percent (22%) of facilities used restraints to prevent suicide attempts and 21% of facilities used special clothing to identify youth at risk for suicide.

In 2006, the majority (88%) of juvenile offenders in facilities that screened for suicide risk were in facilities that conducted suicide screenings on all youth on the day they arrived

Suicide screening	When suicide risk screening occurs					Never or not reported
	Total	Less than 24 hours	24 hours to 7 days	7 days or more	Other	
Number of facilities:						
All	2,658	1,657	164	11	36	790
All youth screened	1,782	1,620	137	9	16	—
Some youth screened	86	37	27	2	20	—
Percentage of facilities that screened:						
Total	100%	89%	9%	1%	2%	—
All youth screened	95	87	7	0	1	—
Some youth screened	5	2	1	0	1	—
Number of juvenile offenders:						
In all facilities	92,093	65,743	5,644	170	1,529	19,007
In facilities that screened all youth	70,153	64,524	4,788	79	762	—
In facilities that screened some youth	2,933	1,219	856	91	767	—
Percentage of juvenile offenders:						
In facilities that screened all youth	100%	90%	8%	0%	2%	—
In facilities that screened some youth	96	88	7	0	1	—
In facilities that screened some youth	4	2	1	0	1	—

■ More than 9 in 10 facilities (94%) that reported screening for suicide risk said they conducted the screenings for all youth by the end of the first week of the youth's stay at the facility. A large portion (87%) said they conducted screenings for all youth on the youth's first day at the facility. These facilities accounted for 88% of juvenile offenders held in facilities that conducted suicide screenings.

■ Very few facilities that reported screening for suicide risk reported that they conducted the screenings at some point other than within the first week of a youth's stay (2%). Facilities that conducted screenings within other time limits gave varying responses. For example, some facilities reported that screenings occurred as needed or as deemed necessary. Other facilities reported that screenings occurred when the youth indicated suicidal behavior or expressed suicidal thoughts. A small number of facilities indicated that screenings occurred before the youth was admitted.

Note: Percentage detail may not add up to total due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Half of juvenile offenders are in facilities where in-house mental health professionals assess all youth

In approximately 6 of 10 facilities, in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth held

In addition to information on suicide screening, facilities provided information about their procedures for evaluating youth's mental health needs.

Among facilities that reported mental health evaluation information in 2006, 58% said that in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth to determine their mental health needs. The remaining 42% said in-house mental health professionals evaluate some, but not all youth. In 2006, all facilities said that they evaluated at least some youth (either inside or outside the facility) during their stay. In other words, there were no facilities that said that no youth were evaluated.

In 2006, a greater proportion of privately operated than publicly operated facilities said that in-house mental health professionals evaluated all youth (76% vs. 44% of facilities reporting mental health evaluation information). However, in a greater proportion of public facilities than private facilities (56% vs. 24%), some youth were evaluated by in-house mental health professionals.

Evaluation by in-house mental health professional

	Facility type	
	Public	Private
Total reporting facilities	899	727
All reporting facilities	100%	100%
All youth screened	44	76
Some youth screened	56	24
No youth screened	—	—

The smallest facilities were most likely to have in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth for mental health needs in 2006

Mental health evaluation	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	200+
Total facilities	2,658	843	584	667	327	163	74
Facilities reporting	1,627	332	352	484	256	140	63
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth evaluated	58	70	54	51	63	61	54
Some youth evaluated	42	30	46	49	38	39	46
No youth evaluated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Group homes and residential treatment centers were more likely than other types of facilities to have in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth for mental health needs in 2006

Mental health evaluation	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	730	177	62	754	115	207	919
Facilities reporting	525	87	52	300	71	181	676
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth evaluated	28	29	60	73	68	67	74
Some youth evaluated	72	71	40	27	32	33	26
No youth evaluated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Facilities also identified themselves according to the type of treatment they provided (if any). Facilities that said they provided mental health treatment inside the facility were more likely than other facilities to have a mental health professional evaluate all youth (63% vs. 27% of those reporting mental health evaluation information).

Evaluation by in-house mental health professional	Onsite mental health treatment?	
	Yes	No
Total reporting facilities	1,429	198
All reporting facilities	100%	100%
All youth screened	63	27
Some youth screened	37	73
No youth screened	—	—

The most common approach to mental health evaluation in 2006 was to screen all youth by the end of their first day or first week at the facility

When youth are evaluated for mental health needs	Number of juvenile facilities			As a percentage of facilities that evaluated youth for mental health needs		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
	Total facilities	2,658	949	678	100%	58%
Less than 24 hours	584	447	137	36	27	8
24 hours to 7 days	616	415	201	38	26	12
7 or more days	116	64	52	7	4	3
Other	311	23	288	19	1	18
No youth screened (or not reported)	1,031	–	–	–	–	–

- In 53% of facilities that reported information on their mental health evaluation procedures, all youth were evaluated for mental health needs by an in-house mental health professional by the end of their first week in custody.

Note: Percentage detail may not add up to total due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

In 2006, 32% of juvenile offenders were in facilities that had in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth on the day they arrived at the facility

When youth are evaluated for mental health needs	Number of juvenile offenders			As a percentage of juvenile offenders in facilities that evaluated youth for mental health needs		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
	Total juvenile offenders	92,093	40,544	31,378	100%	56%
Less than 24 hours	31,155	22,804	8,351	43	32	12
24 hours to 7 days	21,402	13,291	8,111	30	18	11
7 or more days	4,880	3,248	1,632	7	5	2
Other	14,485	1,201	13,284	20	2	18
No youth screened (or not reported)	20,171	–	–	–	–	–

- Facilities reporting that all youth were evaluated by the end of their first week held 50% of juvenile offenders who resided in facilities that reported information on their mental health evaluation procedures.

Note: Percentage detail may not add up to total due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

Facilities reported 15 deaths of juvenile offenders in custody over 12 months—4 were suicides

Juvenile offenders rarely die in custody

Juvenile facilities holding juvenile offenders reported that 15 youth died while in the legal custody of the facility between October 1, 2005, and September 30, 2006. These deaths occurred in 13 facilities: 11 facilities reported single deaths and 2 facilities each reported 2 deaths. One facility had 2 deaths that resulted from accident(s) on the same day.

Routine collection of national data on deaths of juveniles in custody began with the 1988/89 Children in Custody Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities. Either accidents or suicides have always been the leading cause of death. Over the years 1988–1994, there were an average of 46 deaths reported nationally per year, including an annual average of 18 suicides. Over the years 2000–2006, those averages dropped to 25 deaths overall and 9 suicides. In 2006, the number of suicides that occurred at residential facilities was at the lowest level since OJJDP first started collecting data from JRFC in 2000.

Generally, deaths did not occur in the first month of a youth's stay

With the exception of 1 suicide that occurred 9 days after the youth was admitted to the facility, no youth died within the first 3 weeks of their stay. Two suicides occurred around the 7-week mark and the remaining suicide did not occur until 319 days (approximately 46 weeks) after admission. After the suicide reported on the ninth day, the first death (an accident) occurred 24 days after admission. One juvenile had been in custody for 1,254 days

During the 12 months prior to the census, accidents were the most commonly reported cause of death in custody

Cause of death	Total	Inside the facility			Outside the facility		
		All	Public	Private	All	Public	Private
Total	15	6	2	4	9	1	8
Suicide	4	4	1	3	0	0	0
Illness/natural	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Accident	10	1	0	1	9	1	8
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

■ The death from illness was not AIDS related.

Note: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. One late-reporting facility recorded a homicide in January 2007. This death is not included in the table.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

In 2006, the death rate was generally higher for private facilities than for public facilities

Cause of death	Deaths per 10,000 juveniles held on the census date, October 25, 2006		
	Total	Public facility	Private facility
Total	1.6	0.5	4.2
Suicide	0.4	0.2	1.1
Illness/natural	0.1	0.2	0.0
Accident	1.1	0.2	3.2

Type of facility	Deaths per 10,000 juveniles held on the census date, October 25, 2006		
	Total	Public facility	Private facility
Detention center	0.9	1.0	0.0
Residential treatment center	1.1	0.0	4.1
Group home	6.1	0.0	7.8

■ The death rate in 2006 (1.6) was substantially lower than that in 2000 (2.8). There were 30 reported deaths of youth in custody in 2000 and, as with 2006, accidents were the most commonly reported cause (followed closely by illness/natural death and suicides).

Note: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. One late-reporting facility recorded a homicide in January 2007. This death is not included in the table.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

(almost 3.5 years) when he or she died as a result of an accident. The overall median number of days since admission for deaths of juveniles in custody was 63.

Residential treatment centers reported the most deaths in 2006 (7 of 15) as well as the most suicides (3 of 4). The remaining four deaths that occurred at residential

Of the total deaths in custody, 6 of 15 deaths involved white males

Cause of death	Total		White		Black		American Indian/ Alaskan Native		Asian/Pacific Islander		Other race/ ethnicity	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	11	4	6	3	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Suicide	3	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Illness/natural	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Accident	7	3	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. One late-reporting facility recorded a homicide in January 2007. This death is not included in the table.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2006* [machine-readable data file].

treatment centers were accidents. Group homes accounted for 5 of the 15 deaths; all were accidents. Detention centers accounted for 3 of the 15 deaths; 1 death was an accident, 1 was a suicide, and 1 was the result of an illness other than AIDS. On average, deaths at residential treatment centers occurred within 39 weeks of a youth's stay, deaths at group homes occurred within 16 weeks of a youth's stay, and deaths at detention centers occurred within 4 weeks of a youth's stay. Stays in detention centers tend to be short, which explains the much lower average when compared with residential treatment centers and group homes.

JRFC asks facilities about deaths of young persons at locations inside and/or outside the facility

During the year between October 1, 2005, and September 30, 2006, did ANY young persons die while assigned to a bed at this facility at a location either INSIDE or OUTSIDE of this facility?

If yes, how many young persons died while assigned beds at this facility during the year between October 1, 2005, and September 30, 2006?

What was the cause of death?

- Illness/natural causes (excluding AIDS)
- Injury suffered prior to placement here

- AIDS
- Suicide
- Homicide by another resident
- Homicide by nonresident(s)
- Accidental death
- Other (specify)

What was the location of death, age, sex, race, date of admission to the facility, and date of death for each young person who died while assigned a bed at this facility?

The Juvenile Residential Facility Census includes data submitted by tribal facilities

The 2006 JRFC collected data from 9 tribal facilities (down from 10 in 2004). The tribal facilities were in Arizona, Montana, Oklahoma, and South Dakota. Although 1 tribal facility fell out in 2006, the number of offenders held in tribal facilities rose from 120 in 2004 to 165 in 2006. OJJDP is working with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to ensure higher representation of tribal facilities in the CJRP and JRFC data collections.

Of the 9 tribal facilities, 6 were owned and operated by tribes. One facility was tribe owned but privately operated. Two facilities did not report ownership; of these, 1 was privately operated, and 1 was tribe operated.

All 9 tribal facilities identified themselves as detention centers. They held from 1 to 31 residents with more than half (56%) holding between 1 and 20 residents. On the

census day, 7 facilities were operating below their standard bed capacity, 1 was operating at capacity, and 1 exceeded capacity. Standard bed capacities ranged from 12 to 106; 6 facilities had fewer than 35 beds.

Eight of the 9 tribal facilities reported locking youth in their sleeping rooms. Among tribal facilities that locked youth in their room, 5 did so during shift changes, 4 locked youth in rooms when they were out of control, and 3 reported that youth were locked in their room all day.

Of the 9 tribal facilities, 3 (holding a total of 82 offenders) reported that they evaluated all youth for grade level and educational needs and 5 (holding 78 offenders) did not evaluate any youth. Three tribal facilities (holding 62 offenders) reported that all

youth in their facility attend school and 5 facilities (holding 78 offenders) reported that no youth attend school.

Four of the 9 tribal facilities (holding 87 offenders) reported physical health information. Three of the 4 reporting facilities (holding 40 offenders) reported that all youth in their facility receive a physical exam. Three of the 4 facilities reported that some youth receive a dental exam, and 1 facility reported that no youth receive a dental exam. One tribal facility reported that all youth receive a vision exam, and 1 reported that no youth receive a vision exam. All 4 tribal facilities that reported physical health information held girls on the census date. Of these, 3 reported that some girls receive a gynecological exam, and 1 reported that no girls receive an exam.



Sources

National Center for Health Statistics. 2007. *Estimates of the July 1, 2000–July 1, 2006, United States Resident Population From the Vintage 2006 Postcensal Series by Year, County, Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin*. [Released 8/16/2007.] Prepared under a collaborative arrangement with the U.S. Census Bureau. Available online from www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/bridged_race.htm.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2001, 2003, 2005, and 2007. *Juvenile Residential Facility Census* for the years 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006 [machine-readable data files]. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau (producer).

Resources

OJJDP's **Statistical Briefing Book** (www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb) is a comprehensive online resource covering various topics related to delinquency and the juvenile justice system. The **Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Databook**, accessible through the Briefing Book, contains a large set of predefined tables detailing the characteristics of juvenile offenders in residential placement facilities.

This Bulletin was prepared under cooperative agreement number 2005–JF–FX–K022 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the U.S. Department of Justice.

Acknowledgments

This Bulletin was written by Sarah Hockenberry, Research Assistant, Melissa Sickmund, Chief of Systems Research, and Anthony Sladky, Senior Computer Programmer, at the National Center for Juvenile Justice, with funds provided by OJJDP to support the National Juvenile Justice Data Analysis Project.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance; the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the Community Capacity Development Office; the National Institute of Justice; the Office for Victims of Crime; and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART).