Indiana Department of Correction, Division of Youth Services 2018 Juvenile Detention Inspection - Compliance Report



Clark County Juvenile Detention Center 609 Meigs Avenue. Jeffersonville, In 47130

Auditors Angela D Sutton, Director of Juvenile Detention Inspections, Indiana Department of Correction Kristin Herrmann, Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana Laurie Elliott, Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana

> Indiana Department of Correction Division of Youth Services 302 W. Washington St. Rm. E334, Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Department of Correction, Division of Youth Services 2018 Juvenile Detention Inspection - Compliance Report

- Facility: Clark County Juvenile Detention Center 609 Meigs Avenue Jeffersonville, In. 47130
- Inspection Date: April 18, 2018 July 11, 2018 September 26, 2018
- Auditors:Angela SuttonDirector of Juvenile Detention InspectionsDivision of Youth Services, Indiana Department of Correction(317) 914-7347, ansutton@idoc.in.gov

Kristin Herrmann Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana (317) 916-0786, <u>kherrmann@youthlawteam.org</u>

INTRODUCTION

The 2018 annual juvenile detention facility evaluations conducted by the IDOC, Division of Youth Services consisted of three on-site facility inspections; staff and youth interviews; and an audit of the state detention standards. The new Indiana Juvenile Detention Facility Standards are in the process of being adopted. Detention Facilities had the option to be audited utilizing the all of the current detention standards or the corresponding two hundred and one (201) specifically selected proposed new juvenile detention facility standards.

Clark County Juvenile Detention Center chose to be audited on the two hundred and thirty eight (238) current juvenile detention facility standards in 2018, for their 22nd annual detention inspection. Of the two hundred and thirty eight (238) standards audited, twenty-six (26) standards require mandatory compliance and the remaining two hundred and twelve are recommended standards. Compliance with 100% of the mandatory standards and 90% of the recommended standards is required to attain "Full Compliance".

FACILITY INFORMATION

Facility county:	Clark
Governing authority:	Clark County Juvenile Detention Center
Name of facility administrator:	Lyda Abell
Detention Director:	Lyda Abell
Detention facility's mission:	To provide the protection and detention of youth in
Detention facility 5 mission.	the least restrictive alternative care. It is the
	philosophy and goal of the detention center to
	provide programming that adheres to the needs of the
	residents including medical/hygiene, information,
	Education, lifeskills, counseling, drug and alcohol
	education and religious services. The detention
	center is committed to providing the highest quality
	of detention services.
Rated capacity:	14
Population on date of first audit:	8
Average daily population for the last	10
12 months:	
Average length of stay for the last 12	11 days
months:	
Year the building was built:	1991
Minor upgrades since last audit (i.e.	N/A
painting, flooring, bedding,	
furnishings):	
Major upgrades since last audit (i.e.	N/A
plumbing, electrical, security	
system):	
De-escalation techniques training:	Safe Crisis Management (SCM)
Physical force techniques training:	Safe Crisis Management (SCM)
Chemical agents permitted:	Yes
Name of food service provider:	Clark County Jail
Name of food service supervisor:	Vicki Emery/ Jennifer Pollock
Name of health care authority	Adam French, MD
individual or agency and	
license/certification:	
Name of mental health care	Dorothy Hickerson, MSW
authority individual or agency and	
license/certification:	
Education Services:	The educational program at the Clark County
	Juvenile Detention Center is provided through a
	teacher from the Greater Clark County Schools. The
	purpose is to provide students school work so they will not fall behind during their time at CCIDC
	will not fall behind during their time at CCJDC.

INSPECTION FOR COMPLIANCE WITH 201 DETENTION STANDARDS

Standards:	Safety; Security; and Food Service & Hygiene
On-site Visit	
conducted	 <u>One hundred and one (101) Total Standards audited</u> Nineteen (10) mendeters standards
	 Nineteen (19) mandatory standards Eighty two (82) recommended standards
4-18-18	 Two (2) Non- applicable standards
	 Two (2) Non-compliant standards
Auditors:	Angela Sutton and Kristin Herrmann
	č
Facility Tour:	The tour was conducted by Assistant Director Jennifer Snawder. The
X 7 (1 X (center was clean, orderly, and well-maintained.
Youth Interviews:	Two (2) youth were interviewed, 1 female and 1 male.
	Youth interviews consisted of questions regarding facility safety and
	sanitation, living area temperatures, emergency and sick call
	procedures, staff supervision, restraint use, food allergies and food
N. (L.D.	quality.
Youth Responses:	One youth reported that the facility is not very clean, and both youth reported that there are bugs in the facility. One youth reported that staff
	has sprayed in an attempt to get rid of the bugs. Both youth reported that
	there is an issue with the plumbing. Both youth reported that the
	temperatures in the living and sleeping areas are comfortable and that if
	it is cold, they can receive extra blankets in the winter. Both youth
	reported going through a fire drill since being at the facility, and both
	were knowledgeable of the procedures. Both youth stated they were aware of how to obtain medical care at the facility. However, one youth
	reported requesting medical care for his eczema and wasn't seen for a
	week. The other youth requested medical care and received no response
	from medical but staff gave ibuprofen. Both youth reported they receive
	3 meals a day, with at least 2 being hot meals. Both youth stated the
	food is good. Both youth stated they receive "clean" (Kristin: I'm not
	sure why there are quotes around clean) clothes every day and clean bedding weekly. One youth reported that you don't have to switch out
	the bedding if you don't want to. Neither youth had been placed in
	restraints since being at the facility, been in a fight, or placed in
	isolation. One youth reported that there was a time when he was afraid
	of his roommate because he felt he was going to fight him in his sleep.
	The other youth reported having a roommate that she was afraid of,
	reported it, and rooms were switched a couple of days later. Neither youth had any suggestions on how the facility could be improved.
	journad any suggestions on non the factory could be improved.
	Youth comments were shared with facility administrators.

Staff Interviews:	Administrator, Control room operator and line staff were interviewed.
	Security Staff interviews consisted of questions regarding emergency and count procedures, handling toxic chemicals, sanitation procedures, log documentation, transportation procedures, restraint procedures and distribution of clean linen, clothing and hygiene items.
Staff Responses:	Line staff/control room staff reported that there is one staff assigned to evacuate handicapped youth but the other line staff was not sure about the procedure. All staff are trained in Safe Crisis Management, which is utilized as a de-escalation technique and physical handling. Staff utilize their discretion to determine when mechanical restraints are to be utilized, according to one line staff. The other staff reported that restraint use is approved by the supervisor. Both staff stated the restraints are removed as soon as the youth calms down. One staff reported that youth are assessed by medical only if an injury occurs as a result of restraint use. The other staff reported that medical assesses all youth following restraint use. Both staff reported that restraints are not used often. The facility does not have an immediate room release, therefore all youth have to be released using keys in the event of an emergency. Both staff were able to explain the emergency evacuation procedures, and their answers were consistent. Toxic chemicals are kept in a locked storage cabinet, and there is an inventory and log. Administrator- Flame resistant furniture is ordered from Bob Barker, a correctional manufacturer. The facility exceeded its capacity during this audit cycle. When this happens, the Director contacts the judge to discuss which, if any, youth can be released. Weekly generator tests are conducted on the generator by the building authority. The administrator reported that restraint use does not need approval and staff can use restraints at their discretion. Medical is not notified immediately once the restraints are removed.
Non-compliant Standards:	6-3-2.92- Facility Capacity
Action Plan:	6-3-2.92-Create a plan so that the facility does not exceed capacity at any time in 2019.
Standards:	Justice & Order; Medical: and Mental Health
On-site Visit conducted 7-11-18	 <u>Seventy-five (75) Total Standards audited</u> Seven (7) mandatory standards Sixty-eight (68) recommended standards Zero (0) Standards were identified as non-applicable. Zero (0) mandatory standards were left open for further action
	• Zero (0) recommended standards were left open for further action.

Auditors:	Angela Sutton and Kristin Herrmann
Facility Tour:	The facility tour was conducted by Assistant Director, Jennifer Snawder.
Youth Interviews:	Youth were asked questions regarding their intake/orientation process, rules, reward system, attorney contact, grievances, and mental health/medical responsiveness.
Youth Responses:	Both youth reported they were able to make a call to notify their parents upon arrival and both received a copy of the rule book. However, both youth reported that no one discussed the rules with them. One youth reported the book was in their room when they arrived. Both youth received a medical and mental health screening. Both youth reported that they are able to write letters to their families as often as they like. Both youth reported there is not a facility reward system. Both youth reported that they have never filed a grievance while at the facility. One youth reported that they received counseling services through their community counselor. The other youth had never requested or received any mental health treatment while at the facility. Both youth were aware of how to contact medical; however, neither youth had requested medical treatment. When asked what could be done to improve the facility, one youth suggested that the incentive program should be improved because it seems like the youth with bad attitudes receive the same incentives as the youth who behave.
Staff Interviews:	Line staff, mail room, visitation staff and the Facility Administrator were interviewed.
Staff Responses:	All staff interviewed were knowledgeable about policy and procedure. There were no inconsistencies in responses. Mail room- Youth are allowed to seal their own outgoing legal mail. The stamps are removed from legal mail before it is given to the youth to open. Youth are provided 2 envelopes and stamps per week by the facility, and their families can provide more. Youth can write unlimited letters to whomever they choose to write to, unless restricted by probation. Intake Officer –Youth are provided a student handbook, and staff assist youth with literacy issues by reading the manual to them. Youth who are under the influence of drugs are sent to the hospital for clearance before being accepted. Once they return, they are monitored for 24 hours. Medical, mental health and dental screenings are conducted by intake staff. The staff are not health care trained to conduct the screening. Line Staff- The facility ensures juveniles aren't discriminated against by allowing all youth to participate in all programs. Youth are allowed to write a grievance whenever they want. Grievances are handled by the

Director and Assistant Director. Youth are allowed three (3) free phon calls a week, and they can earn another on Sunday. Staff are present when youth make phone calls. Suicide prevention training is held once year during facility in-service.	
	Visitation-Visitation is held twice a week on Sunday and Wednesday. Visits last 30 minutes each. Parents can request a special one (1) hour visit through the Assistant Director. Youth are allowed to hug their family at the beginning and end of the visit.
Non-compliant Standards:	All standards are compliant.
Recommended Action:	None

Standards:	Administration; Programs; and Education
On-site Visit conducted 9-26-18 Auditors:	 Sixty-four (64)Total Standards audited Zero (0) mandatory standards Sixty-four (64) recommended standards Two (2) standards were identified as non-applicable. Zero (0) recommended standards were left open for further action. Angela Sutton and Kristin Herrmann
Facility Tour: Youth Interviews:	The facility tour was conducted by Jennifer Snawder. Youth were asked questions regarding the intake process, recreation, education, leisure activities, library services and safety.
Youth Responses:	Both youth reported that they were searched upon admission. Both reported their personal property was stored in a bag. They reported that they signed an itemized property sheet. Both youth received a shower, were given clean clothing in their size, and were allowed to contact their guardians. Both youth reported that they receive one (1) hour of large muscle movement every day. Both youth reported that staff are good role models for the youth. When asked if they had any suggestions to improve the facility, both youth said no.
Staff Interviews:	Training coordinator, education, intake officer and facility administrator were interviewed.
Staff Responses:	Staff answers were consistent with policy Training- The training program is coordinated by the Assistant Director. Most training is conducted through online classes. The training coordinator reviews the classes and selects the applicable training based on facility needs. The facility employs CPR and personal protection

	trainers in-house. Education- Youth are allowed to continue their education through online programs and by completing bookwork from their home school. Youth attend year round school. The teachers are certified. Youth are enrolled in the school program the same day they arrive or the next day.
Non-compliant Standards:	All standards are compliant.
Recommended Action:	None

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) – <u>Conditions of Confinement, Facility Self-Assessment</u>-Ensuring safe and humane conditions of confinement for youth held in secure juvenile detention facilities is one of the Eight Core Strategies in JDAI.

Clark County Juvenile Detention Center participated in a Conditions of Confinement review during this audit cycle with representatives from Clark County.

CONCLUSION

Clark County juvenile Detention Center is in full compliance with the 2018 Indiana Detention Center Standards Audit performed by the Indiana Department of Correction, Division of Youth Services.

A certificate of compliance will accompany this report, which becomes public information ten (10) days from the date of mailing.

Please contact me at (317) 914-7347 should you have any questions concerning this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela D. Sutton, MA

Director of Juvenile Detention Inspections Indiana Department of Correction/Division of Youth Services

cc: Christine Blessinger, DYS, Executive Director of Youth Services Kellie Whitcomb, Director of Reentry & External Relations Honorable Vicki Carmichael, Circuit Court Lyda Abell, Director pursuant to 210 IAC 8-1-5(f) File