

PREA AUDIT REPORT INTERIM FINAL
JUVENILE FACILITIES

Date of report: September 30th , 2016

Auditor Information			
Auditor name: Jerome K. Williams			
Address: PO Box 81656 Austin, Texas 78708			
Email: Jerome.williams@tjjd.texas.gov			
Telephone number: 512-490-7671			
Date of facility visit: August 24th to August 26th, 2016			
Facility Information			
Facility name: Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center			
Facility physical address: 6500 Chimney Rock, Houston, Texas 77081			
Facility mailing address: <i>(if different from above)</i> Click here to enter text.			
Facility telephone number: 713-222-4100			
The facility is:	<input type="checkbox"/> Federal	<input type="checkbox"/> State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County
	<input type="checkbox"/> Military	<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal	<input type="checkbox"/> Private for profit
	<input type="checkbox"/> Private not for profit		
Facility type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correctional	<input type="checkbox"/> Detention	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
Name of facility's Chief Executive Officer: Obi Nweke, Facility Administrator			
Number of staff assigned to the facility in the last 12 months: 98			
Designed facility capacity: 144			
Current population of facility: 105			
Facility security levels/inmate custody levels: Secure, court ordered post-adjudicated placement and detainment			
Age range of the population: 10-17 years of age			
Name of PREA Compliance Manager: Jennifer Hunley		Title: Assistant Facility Administrators	
Email address: Jennifer.hunley@hcjpd.hctx.net		Telephone number: 713-222-4421	
Agency Information			
Name of agency: Harris County Juvenile Probation Department			
Governing authority or parent agency: <i>(if applicable)</i>			
Physical address: 1200 Congress Houston, Texas 77002			
Mailing address: <i>(if different from above)</i> Click here to enter text.			
Telephone number: 713-222-4100			
Agency Chief Executive Officer			
Name: Thomas Brooks		Title: Executive Director/Chief Juv Probation Officer	
Email address: thomas.brooks@hcjpd.hctx.net		Telephone number: 713-222-4192	
Agency-Wide PREA Coordinator			
Name: Tom Hough		Title: Quality Assurance /PREA Coordinator	
Email address: tom.hough@hcjpd.hctx.net		Telephone number: 713-222-4192	

AUDIT FINDINGS

NARRATIVE

The PREA Audit was conducted on August 24th to August 26th, 2016 at the Harris Juvenile Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center in Houston, Texas, a county-run facility. The audit was conducted by the certified PREA Auditor for Juvenile & Adult Facilities, Jerome K. Williams, assisted by George Gould, a PREA Compliance Managers in one of the State run facilities. Pictures of the Audit Notice posting were sent prior to this audit and were seen throughout the facility on colored paper.

Following the entrance meeting a thorough tour of the facility was provided by the PREA Coordinator, the Facility Superintendent, and the PREA Compliance Manager. Continuing on this first day of the audit a comprehensive listing of the youth and staff was requested and provided for the interviews with the necessary adjustments being made to compensate for schedule changes, etc. During the tour random interviews were conducted of youth and staff to ascertain their knowledge of the PREA Standards, reporting procedures, services available and their reporting responsibilities. A total of 16 youths were interviewed during this on site visit and they all acknowledged receiving PREA training, written information (i.e. handbook, Hotline numbers, observing Break the Silence posters, etc.) and were informed of related policies that outlines the facility's zero tolerance towards sexual abuse, sexual harassment and their right to be free from retaliation for reporting sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations.

A total of 8 specialized staff members were interviewed comprising of the PREA Compliance Manager, a First Responder, a staff designated to Monitor for Retaliation and a member of the Sexual Abuse Incident Review Team. A total of 15 random staff members were interviewed who were knowledgeable of their responsibilities in reporting sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations, staff negligence and the steps required in monitoring for staff and or youth for retaliation. When questioned about evidence preservation, all the staff responses reflected their knowledge of the agency's policy and their first responder duties. There were no SAFE and or SANE personnel at this facility but they were available at the Texas Children's Hospital. The personnel indicated that they are aware of the SANE protocol if the facility were bringing a youth there for a SANE examination.

The auditor reviewed blind spots, staff placement, supervisory presence and placement, reviewed their surveillance equipment to ensure that the cameras were not capturing areas where cross gender supervision could occur, toured the facility and reviewed documentation to assist in determining PREA standard compliance. Upon completion of the audit an exit meeting was held with the Facility Superintendent, the PREA Compliance Manager, the agency Trainer and the PREA Coordinator. The facility was provided with a general overview of the audit process, audit highlights which included a synopsis of the files, documentation review, and staff and youth interviews and of the facility tour. During the debriefing the auditor informed them that in the event there were standards that were not met that he would work closely with the agency's PREA Coordinator to facilitate PREA compliance within the 180 day corrective action period, if applicable. Furthermore, he informed them that once compliance is achieved that the agency will be required to post the Final Report upon issuance on the agency's website.

This report is considered to be the Final PREA Audit Report.

DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS

The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center is a designed 144 bed, post adjudicated secure, male juvenile facility for youths from ages 10 through 17 located in Houston, Texas. Its mission is to the protection of the public, utilizing intervention strategies that are community-based, family-oriented and least restrictive while emphasizing responsibility and accountability of both parent and child. We value the belief that everyone is to be treated with dignity and respect. We value the belief that each person has innate worth, dignity and the capacity for positive change. We value services that are ethical, effective and culturally competent. We value and promote a positive image of the department, the employees and our role within the community. We value an environment that promotes initiative, productivity, teamwork and professional growth. We value an atmosphere which stresses tolerance and is free of discrimination. We value developing collaborative efforts with judicial, legislative and community partners. All juveniles in detention and residential facilities are provided with educational services through the Excel Academy Charter School, funded by the Texas Education Agency and state and federal grants. The Excel Academy Charter School provides a regular school year program and a summer school program enabling youth to continuously improve their educational skills. The Excel Academy Charter School focuses on youth progression in the core academic curriculum, TAKS/STARR remediation, vocational education and life skills

On the day of the audit there were 104 youths assigned to the facility and during a youth's stay in detention, staff gathers information regarding the child's family, school, medical and psychological histories. They receive necessary medical and dental care, psychological testing and consultation, crisis stabilization and counseling, and educational assessment and instruction. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center provides for a safe, secure and stable rehabilitative environment and the youth attend classes on site that are provided by the Excel Academy Charter School. Youth also participates in group counseling, individual counseling, life-skills counseling, recreational activities, drug education, and other programs designed to assist with basic skills related to health, hygiene and rehabilitation.

This facility has 3 buildings, an inside gymnasium, outside recreational area, a food service area, 1 medical area, 8 dormitories, 8 dayrooms that are utilized multi-facedly i.e. meals, leisure time, etc., 12 classrooms, an administrative and reception area, 1 central control center, 1 Intake area, 4 visitation areas including offices for private visits, 1 supervisory and support staff office, 3 conference rooms, multi-purpose space for groups and other programming. The showers were located in the corner area of each dorm unit (pod) whereas the dorm cameras cannot view inside the shower or inside the youth's cell when they are using the restrooms or changing clothes. Shower routines are conducted by male staff on each dorm and the staff of the opposite gender do knock and announce their presence before entering the dorm area of the opposite gender especially during shower, changing and restroom routines. This practice was observed during the tour of the facility. The facility was operating safely and observably clean throughout during the days of this on site audit visit.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center is a designed 144 bed, post adjudicated secure, male juvenile facility for youths from ages 10 through 17 located in Houston, Texas. Its mission is to the protection of the public, utilizing intervention strategies that are community-based, family-oriented and least restrictive while emphasizing responsibility and accountability of both parent and child. We value the belief that everyone is to be treated with dignity and respect. We value the belief that each person has innate worth, dignity and the capacity for positive change. We value services that are ethical, effective and culturally competent. We value and promote a positive image of the department, the employees and our role within the community. We value an environment that promotes initiative, productivity, teamwork and professional growth. We value an atmosphere which stresses tolerance and is free of discrimination. We value developing collaborative efforts with judicial, legislative and community partners. All juveniles in detention and residential facilities are provided with educational services through the Excel Academy Charter School, funded by the Texas Education Agency and state and federal grants. The Excel Academy Charter School provides a regular school year program and a summer school program enabling youth to continuously improve their educational skills. The Excel Academy Charter School focuses on youth progression in the core academic curriculum, TAKS/STARR remediation, vocational education and life skills

On the day of the audit there were 104 youths assigned to the facility and during a youth's stay in detention, staff gathers information regarding the child's family, school, medical and psychological histories. They receive necessary medical and dental care, psychological testing and consultation, crisis stabilization and counseling, and educational assessment and instruction. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center provides for a safe, secure and stable rehabilitative environment and the youth attend classes on site that are provided by the Excel Academy Charter School. Youth also participates in group counseling, individual counseling, life-skills counseling, recreational activities, drug education, and other programs designed to assist with basic skills related to health, hygiene and rehabilitation

This facility has 3 buildings, an inside gymnasium, outside recreational area, a food service area, 1 medical area, 8 dormitories, 8 dayrooms that are utilized multi-facedly i.e. meals, leisure time, etc., 12 classrooms, an administrative and reception area, 1 central control center, 1 Intake area, 4 visitation areas including offices for private visits, 1 supervisory and support staff office, 3 conference rooms, multi-purpose space for groups and other programming. The showers were located in the corner area of each dorm unit (pod) whereas the dorm cameras cannot view inside the shower or inside the youth's cell when they are using the restrooms or changing clothes. Shower routines are conducted by male staff for the male youth and by the female staff for the female youth on each dorm. Staffs of the opposite gender do knock and announce their presence before entering the dorm area of the opposite gender especially during shower, changing and restroom routines. This practice was observed during the tour of the facility. The facilities were operating safely and observably clean throughout during the days of this on site audit visit.

The Zero Tolerance and Break the Silence posters with the hot line number were displayed in each dorm area and throughout the facility and there was appropriate staff to youth ratios of 1 to 12 observed with shift supervisors being visible in the dorm units and throughout the facility. There were 128 cameras installed throughout this facility that are being monitored by the Facility Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent or other supervisory personnel. Cameras need to be placed in areas where a youth might frequent and where a staff's supervision and monitoring of the youths could be augmented including in the dorm area so as not to view into the shower and or in the toilet areas where cross gender supervision is prohibited. It was strongly recommended that cameras, as funding becomes available, be placed in other areas throughout this facility i.e. closets, hallways, classrooms, kitchen area, elevator, utility rooms, stairwells, etc. to cover the identified blind spots and to further augment the staff supervision and monitoring of the youth. The facility had the PREA Audit Notices posted on colored paper throughout the facility and provided pictures of these posting prior to the onsite visit. The 16 youth interviewed appeared to be well informed of their rights to be free from sexual abuse and sexual harassment, knowledgeable on how to report such incidents and their rights to be free from retaliation if they report a sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegation. They were also knowledgeable as to the name of the outside victim services agency Children's Assessment Center and or the Houston Area Women's Center that would provide emotional support and crisis counseling services related to sexual abuse if needed and they did mention that the name and number of this agency was posted in their dorm area. The 8 specialized staff members and the 15 random staff members and volunteer interviewed were knowledgeable regarding the facility's reporting procedures, the facility's PREA policy, were able to articulate the facility's protocol for collecting evidence, their first responder's duties and the procedures to be followed in a situation when they become knowledgeable of, suspect or are notified of a sexual abuse allegation including who conducts the sexual abuse investigations. A review of the youth's files i.e. treatment, medical, etc. did contain the required documentation including a review of their client management database, Juvenile Information Management System (JIMS), did contain the required documentation and information in accordance to the standards to demonstrate their compliance in this area. Collectively this overall review provided more insight as to their preparation for this audit and their practice towards preventing, detecting and responding to sexual abuse, sexual harassment and staff neglect policy violation. I also reviewed the Electronic Medical Record (EMR) database in the clinic regarding how they document and track sick calls, hospital visits, etc. During the past 12 months the facility reported there were zero administrative and zero criminal investigative cases, as well as zero grievances alleging sexual abuse and sexual harassment in this facility. Of the 41 standards this facility was found to have "exceeded" in 3 of the standards, "met" 38 of the standards, "did not meet" zero of the standards and had zero "not applicable" standards at the conclusion of this onsite visit. A corrective action plan need not be developed with the PREA Coordinator and the facility will receive this report as their Final Report within 30 days of last day of the onsite visit and will not have 180 days to provide any required documentation and or to institutionalize any required practices and protocols with documentation, since they have demonstrated compliance with the PREA Standards. This is their Final Report.

Number of standards exceeded: 3

Number of standards met: 38

Number of standards not met: 0

Number of standards not applicable: 0

Standard 115.311 Zero tolerance of sexual abuse and sexual harassment; PREA Coordinator

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Organizational Chart, Agency Website and Interview with the PREA Coordinator.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center does have a written Zero Tolerance policy towards preventing, detecting and responding to all forms of sexual abuse and sexual harassment. The facility’s Zero Tolerance policy does include a description of how the agency responds to allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment as well as how they will go about reducing and preventing these incidents. This policy also has definitions that pertained to PREA. The Zero Tolerance policy does have sanctions for youth, staff, volunteers and contractors who participate in the listed prohibited behaviors of sexual abuse, sexual harassment and policy violations. The facility’s Zero Tolerance policy is posted on the agency’s web site for review and there is a link further explaining PREA and Zero Tolerance. B. The facility has one dedicated PREA Coordinator who reports to the Deputy Director of Executive and Administrative Services as indicated by the organizational chart provided reflecting this position and there is a PREA Compliance Manager assigned to this facility who works in concert with her. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did indicate during his interview that she does have sufficient time to fulfill her PREA responsibilities and the PREA Compliance Manager for this facility indicated that he has sufficient time to fulfill her PREA responsibilities, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.312 Contracting with other entities for the confinement of residents

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Sample Residential and Service Contracts and Interview with the Contract Specialist.

Findings: The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance and the agency policies does require in all of their residential contracts for contracting residential facilities the PREA compliance language requirement which indicates that they will adopt and comply with the PREA standards. A. The agency’s Contract Administrator provided fourteen (14) contracts of residential providers that were reviewed during the audit process for verification. The agency’s Contract Administrator indicated during her interview that this language is included and is reviewed with each contractor prior to their annual contract renewal period. B. Monitoring of the contracts for PREA compliance, as indicated by the Contract Administrator during her interview are conducted quarterly by her office and that each contracting agency is working independently towards their PREA compliance certification to be achieved by August 2016. A listing of contracting residential providers was also given to the auditor for review along with screenshots of their PREA Final Report of the three contracting residential providers that have already achieved PREA compliance, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.313 Supervision and monitoring

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policies and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Harris County Operating Procedure- Safe Housing Staffing Plan, Staffing Plan, Memorandum, Meeting minutes, PREA Unannounced Rounds Documentation with Screen Shots, Dorm Log Book, Safe Housing Staffing Plan, Youth Rosters, Daily Population Reports, Video Monitoring, Facility Administrator, PREA Coordinator, Intermediate and Higher Level, Random Staff and Youth Interviews.

Findings: The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy and the Safe Housing Staffing Plan Operating Procedure does require the supervision and monitoring of the youth throughout the facility. A. The daily average number of youth in this facility is 104 but the staffing plan is predicated on the average daily population total of 144 youths. B and C. The facility did provide documentation of their Staffing Plan, the Staffing Plan Assessment, a review of the facility's budget and meeting minutes during this audit to demonstrate their compliance with this standard. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum that at no time has the facility deviated from their staff-to-youth ratio of 1:12 during waking hours and 1:24 during sleeping hours, which is inclusive in their staffing plan which was corroborated by the Facility Administrator. D. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence demonstrating that she, the Facility Administrator and members the agency's leadership do review the staffing plan annually, which includes video monitoring and their commitment towards adherence to this plan. For fiscal year 2015-16 the Staffing Plan did include the hiring of full time equivalents (FTEs) in a continuing effort to bring their staff -to-youth ratio to 1:8 during waking hours and 1:16 during sleeping hours by October of 2017. E. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of logs to demonstrate that the higher level supervisors are conducting unannounced rounds on all shifts. The facility's policy does indicate that disciplinary action will occur if staff alert other staff of these unannounced rounds and during the random interviews of staff, especially with those JSO's working in the dorm and control center areas, they were able to articulate their awareness of this policy. During the visits to the dorm areas I did observe the opposite gender staff utilized the knock and announce method to announce their presence before entering the dorm and both staff and youth articulated during their interviews that this practice is occurring especially during showering, restroom and changing routines, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.315 Limits to cross-gender viewing and searches

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion

must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Youth Search Procedures, Memorandum on Cross Gender Searches, Pat Search Training PowerPoint, Search logs if applicable, Cross Gender Training Curriculum and Video, Signed Staff Training Rosters, Staff and Youth Interviews.

Findings: A and B. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy and the Youth Search Operating Procedures does prohibit cross gender viewing during rest room, changing clothes and shower routine and also prohibits cross gender pat, visual body and strip searches absence exigent circumstances. There were no cross gender pat, visual or strip searches conducted by medical personnel and or for an exigent circumstance during the last 12 months as corroborated during the staff and youth interviews. C and E. A review of the search logs as well as excerpts extrapolated from the staff and youth interviews verified that this prohibited practice does not exist in this facility including searching or physically examining a Transgender or Intersex youth to determine their genitalia. There were no identified Transgender or Intersex youth in this facility at the time of this audit. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum that further demonstrated that this practice is prohibited. D. The random youth interviewed were able to definitively articulate that the male staff and the female staff do knock and announce their presence before entering the opposite gender housing unit (dorm), that they are able to shower, use the restroom, dress and change clothing without being observed by the opposite gender and that at no time have a staff of the opposite gender pat searched their person. The cameras on each dorm are in position whereas a youth cannot be viewed by the opposite gender during shower, restroom and the changing of clothing and only the Facility Administrator and supervisory staff have access to viewing them. A copy of the training curriculum on searches was provided by the agency's PREA Coordinator and reviewed which also emphasized that all searches would be conducted professionally and in a respectful manner consistent with the security needs of the facility. The random staff definitively articulated that this practice is occurring during their interviews though this was not observed during the facility tour. F. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide a copy of the training curriculum as evidence to demonstrate that the staffs were trained in cross gender pat searches including the signed training rosters, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.316 Residents with disabilities and residents who are limited English proficient

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Requesting Interpreter Services Operating Procedure, Intake and Orientation Documentation, Memorandum on Interpreters, Youth Handbook, Posters and Keeping Safe Brochure in English and Spanish, Staff Interpreter's Listing, Interpreter's Agreement and Request Form and Staff Listing of Interpreters, Excel Academy Charter School, Intake, Random Staff and Youth Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center did provide to the auditor the Zero Tolerance policy, the Requesting Interpreter Services Operating Procedure as well as written PREA material in English and Spanish i.e. brochures, etc. which the Intake staff provides to the youth during intake and orientation. B. The agency does have a procedure in place for the acquisition of Interpreting and Translation Services through the Communication Access Ability Group and the Excel Academy Charter School for those youth who may be deaf, speech impaired, limited in English proficiency, blind and or low vision, or who are psychiatric or intellectually disabled which was corroborated by the PREA Compliance Manager during her interview. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide the auditor with a copy of the procedure and Claim Form for these interpreting services for his review. He also provided the auditor with a listing of the facility staff to be utilized as interpreters for Limited English (Spanish) speaking youth or other languages as applicable. The facility did have a Limited

English speaking youth in the facility during this audit which was interviewed with a staff interpreter being present. The agency's PREA Coordinator did indicate that there were no other interpreting services required of any youth of this facility in the last 12 months. C. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that they do not utilize youth interpreters, youth assistants or youth readers for any PREA-related activity in this facility. The facility PREA Compliance Manager did provide a copy of the Youth Orientation Manual in Spanish that is given to those youth who are of Spanish descent or who limited in English proficiency, even though an interpreter would be provided them, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.317 Hiring and promotion decisions

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Volunteer and Contractor Policy and Agreements, Criminal Records and Child Abuse Registry Check Documentation, Harris County Applicant/Employee PREA Disclosure Forms, Application Packet, Training Records and Interview with the Deputy Director of Human Resources.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance and Human Resources policies does consider any incident of sexual abuse and sexual harassment in determining whether to hire, promote or enlist the services of contractors who have contact with the youth. These policies do state that providing false information will be grounds for termination for omitting information of misconduct and it also provides that a former employee's misconduct would be provided to another agency for substantiated findings of sexual abuse and sexual harassment. B. Regarding volunteers and contractors, these policies does state that their services will be terminated and the finding, as it pertains to a contractor will be reported to their licensing authority. During the interview with the Deputy Director of Human Resource it was revealed that the agency does conduct criminal background checks and child abuse registry checks prior to hiring and promotions. C, D and E. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of FAST and Child Abuse registry checks demonstrating that they did conduct background checks and child abuse registry checks on all of their current employees, volunteers and contractors during the last 12 months which are also performed every two years by the agency and or twice within five years exceeding the standard. F. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum regarding an employee's self reporting requirements and that omissions regarding misconduct shall be grounds for termination. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide sample reference check forms that staff, volunteers and contractors complete for the background checks. He also provide documented evidence to support that 100% of their staff, volunteers and contractors have had background and child abuse registry checks performed during the last 12 months. There were 27 new hires during this reporting period and 8 service contractors whereas background and child abuse registry checks were conducted thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.318 Upgrades to facilities and technologies

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Onsite Facility Visit, Memorandum on Monitoring Technology, Facility Schematics reflecting the camera locations and viewing of Control Room/Facility cameras.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center agency's PREA Coordinator indicated that they have not made any substantial expansions, modifications or any renovations in this facility since August 20, 2012 but has installed and or update their video monitoring system since August 20, 2012. The Facility Superintendent indicated during his interview that they have 128 cameras throughout the facility and in the dorms they would be positioned whereas a youth cannot be viewed by the opposite gender during shower, restroom and the changing of clothing which is limited according to the cross gender supervision standard. B. It was recommended by this auditor that if funding becomes available that cameras be purchased for placement in the facility including identified blind spots on the dorms, in the classrooms, and other identified areas throughout the facility to further augment the staff's supervision, monitoring and in the prevention, detection and response to sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations further demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.321 Evidence protocol and forensic medical examinations

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Memorandum from Houston Police Department (Houston PD for BBRC and Pasedena PD for YV), The Children's Assessment Center Memorandum of Understanding and Working Protocol, Medical and Mental Health Staff, and PREA Coordinator and PREA Compliance Manager's Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline their protocol for conducting investigations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment as well as requesting information from the respective external investigative entities, as applicable, on the progress of each investigation. B. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide a copy of and stated that they follow the National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adult/Adolescents 2013 for obtaining usable evidence for administrative and criminal investigations. The facility and the Texas Juvenile Justice Department is responsible for conducting administrative investigations for the agency and the Houston Police Department is responsible for conducting criminal investigations of sexual abuse. C. The Texas Children's Hospital and or the Children's Assessment Center is where a youth would receive routine and emergency medical care including where they would also be taken by local law enforcement in the event a forensic examination (SANE) for sexual abuse incident is required. D. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum of understanding demonstrating that they have obtained emotional support and crisis counseling services from the Children's Assessment Center and or the Houston Area Women's Center, if and when needed. In the last 12 months the facility's PREA Compliance Manager indicated that there have been no SANE examinations required which was also confirmed by the medical personnel interviewed including the medical file review. E. The agency's PREA Coordinator did indicate and demonstrated by providing an employee roster that they do have a qualified staff members available to serve as an advocate if needed for a victim of sexual abuse. F. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence requesting that the Houston Police Department follow the requirements of the National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adult/Adolescents 2013 for obtaining usable evidence for criminal investigations or similar protocol (MultiDisciplinary Team Working Protocol of the Children's Assessment Center for Sexual Assault Forensic Exeminations) of which they indicated that they would, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.322 Policies to ensure referrals of allegations for investigations

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Referrals of Sexual Abuse/Harrassment Allegations for Criminal Investigations, Incident Reports, Copy of Administrative Investigative Case, Agency Website, and the Investigator's Interview.

Findings: A and B. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy and Referrals of Sexual Abuse/Harrassment Allegations for Criminal Investigations do require that all allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment are to be reported to the Facility Administrator and to be investigated. It further describes that their Internal Investigators and the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD) are charged with conducting the administrative investigations and that the Houston Police Department will conduct all criminal investigations referred to them. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide the auditor with a copy of their Incident Report that is shared with the Houston Police Department and the Texas Juvenile Justice Department in the event of an Administrative and or Criminal investigation. The facility reported zero allegation of sexual harassment that resulted in administrative investigations and zero allegations for sexual abuse during the last 12 months. The facility reported zero allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment incidents resulting in a criminal investigation. The auditor did review and observe on the agency's website that the facility does have their internal administrative investigation policy posted for review as required, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.331 Employee training

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, New Hire Training Schedule and PowerPoint, PREA Training Curriculum and PowerPoint, Signed Staff Training Rosters and Acknowledgement Forms, Training Certificates, Random Staff and PREA Coordinator Interviews, and review of dorm log book for searches.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does require that the facility provide PREA related training to all its employees who may have contact with youth. The agency

PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence demonstrating various PREA trainings have been provided to the staff i.e. training curriculums on LGBTI, communication boundaries, trauma informed care, etc. He also provided the training curriculum utilized for the cross gender pat down search training as required for all of their security staff. B. The agency's PREA Coordinator did indicate during her interview that their PREA Refresher training occurs annually and the certification training for their JSO's which also includes PREA, occurs every two years. C. The agency's PREA Coordinator indicated that the number of facility staff trained during the last 12 months were 98 with 100% of them being trained. During the staff interviews, they were able to articulate that the required elements of this standard (a) (1-11), and (b) were being met through the new hire orientation/training, on the job training and refresher training sessions. The staff seemed well versed and trained in the areas of PREA regarding their reporting duties, they were knowledgeable of their first responder responsibilities and what individuals and or entities conduct the administrative and or criminal investigations. D. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of signed trainee training rosters with the course title and descriptions for each training class for the auditor's review. The agency's PREA Coordinator did indicate during his interview that they also provide Trauma Informed Care, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation training and refresher training to all of the facility staff annually, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.332 Volunteer and contractor training

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, PREA Questionnaire, Volunteer and Contractor's PREA Training PowerPoint Curriculum, PREA Training Acknowledgement Form, Training Rosters and or Certificates, PREA Coordinator, Volunteer, Contractor's Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does require that all volunteers and contractors who have direct access to youth are notified and trained on understanding their reporting responsibilities regarding PREA. B. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence of the PREA curriculum utilized for training their volunteers and contractors and did provide signed training rosters and acknowledgment forms to demonstrate their compliance with this standard. C. The agency's PREA Coordinator also provide written evidence demonstrating that the number of volunteers and contractors trained in PREA during the last 12 months were 164 thus verifying that 100% of them were trained as indicated in the PREA Questionnaire. The volunteer interviewed did indicate that she received the PREA training, discussed how informative it was to her and what her reporting responsibilities are if an alleged sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegation was made known to her, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.333 Resident education

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Youth Intake and Orientation Manual, Keeping Safe PREA Video, Brochures, End the Silence Posters, Juvenile Information Management System (JIMS) Client Management Database, PREA Resident Education Acknowledgement Forms, PREA English and Spanish Education Materials, Interpreting Request Form, Communication Access Ability Group Agreement, Harris Independent School District Agreement, Retaliation Log review, Random Staff, Mental Health Specialist and Youth Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does state that the youth be provided with an orientation packet of information in English and in Spanish upon Intake inclusive of PREA information, that they do watch the Keeping Safe PREA video as part of their comprehensive education and be given additional PREA brochures and other information i.e. hotline number, phone location, etc. during this time. The Zero Tolerance policy does indicate that this information be provided to the youth in an age appropriate manner as demonstrated in the Youth Orientation Manual, which was also translated into Spanish. A review of this material verified that this standard is being met. The date and time of the youth’s intake, orientation and when this information is provided is documented in the youth’s file through JIMS, which is their client management database, as reviewed by the auditor. B. The comprehensive PREA education does occur within 10 days of a youth’s Intake. C. The facility admitted and educated 550 youth from the 262 youth who came into Intake during the last 12 months. D and E. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence demonstrating that Harris County will provide services to those youth who are hearing, vision impaired, psychiatric and disabled; that the teachers from the Harris County Independent School District and the designated facility staff will provide assistance for those youth who are intellectually, psychiatric disabled and limited in English proficiency. F. During the facility tour, random interviews were conducted of the youth and they acknowledged receiving the PREA information during the Intake and Orientation process, acknowledged that they have watched the Keeping Safe PREA video, which the facility shows to every youth during the Orientation process and they were able to articulate their knowledge regarding what PREA is, how to report allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment and how that they have a right to be free from retaliation. The agency’s Zero Tolerance policy, PREA related posters, brochures with the hot line numbers for reporting incidents of sexual abuse and sexual harassment and the victim intervention program were all prominently displayed throughout the facility and in the Youth Orientation Manual, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.334 Specialized training: Investigations

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, NIC’s Specialized Investigator’s Training Curriculum, Internal Investigator’s Specialized Training Roster, Certificates and the Investigator’s Interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does indicate that they and the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD) are the entities, as applicable, that will conduct their administrative investigations and that the Houston Police Department is the outside law enforcement entity who conducts the criminal investigations for sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations. B. The agency’s internal investigator indicated during his interview that he has received the specialized investigator’s training, interview training, training on Miranda and Garrity warning, evidence collection, etc. to assist him in conducting sexual abuse and sexual harassment investigations even though criminal investigations would be referred to outside law enforcement. The Harris County Burnett

Bayland Rehabilitation Center has 2 investigators assigned for their facility and a total of 8 assigned for the agency. C. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide copies of their investigator's training records that reflected receipt of their specialized interviewing training when conducting sexual abuse investigations which was corroborated during the investigator's interview, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.335 Specialized training: Medical and mental health care

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Children's Assessment Center and the Houston Area Women Center's Agreement, PREA Training Roster, NIC Specialized Training Certificates for Medical and Mental Practitioners, PREA Training Acknowledgement Forms, Medical and Mental Health Staff Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does states that they do not conduct forensic medical exams on a youth for sexual abuse but if applicable, that they will refer the alleged victim to the Children's Assessment Center or to the Houston Area Women's Center where the examination would occur free of charge to the youth. B. The medical staff in this facility indicated that by policy and practice, during the interview, that they do no conduct SANE examination nor has the Children Assessment Center and or the Houston Area Woman's Centers had a referral from them to conduct a SANE examination for this facility in the last 12 months. C. All of the 25 medical and 24 mental health personnel for the agency, specifically those assigned to this facility, indicated during their interviews that they have received specialized training in PREA and did provide certificates of their specialized training to the agency's PREA Coordinator, which was reviewed by this auditor, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.341 Screening for risk of victimization and abusiveness

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Juvenile Information Management System (JIMS) Client Management Database, Electronic and Hard Copy of the PREA Behavioral Screening Form, Resident Safety and Vulnerability Monthly Review Form and Instructions Guide, Residential Services Placement Site Recommendation, Intake Staff Interview, Youth Interviews, and the PREA

Coordinator's Interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline that the screening of youth during intake must occur within 72 hours of admission. B, C and D. The screening instrument, which is in their client management database called JIMS, that is automated, does contain all of the eleven screening elements (1-11) required of this standard and contains questions which covers the youth own perception of vulnerability as well as any observations of the intake staff regarding a youth's gender non-conforming or perceived vulnerable appearance. The Intake staff interviewed did indicate that they also have a process, in accordance with policy, for the re-assessment of a youth, a hard copy of this form was provided for the auditor's review. E. During the Intake staff interview she indicated that information obtained by them during the initial screening i.e. sensitive information, does have limited dissemination to prevent exploitation to the detriment to the youth, that appropriate controls are in place, that it is password protected and that the policy does indicate who have access to it. Furthermore, a review of the documentation provided during the pre-audit and on site documentation review process further demonstrated their compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.342 Use of screening information

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Protective Isolation Operating Procedure, Memorandum on Protective Isolation Usage, Seclusion Logs, Intake Officer Interview, Behavioral Screening Instrument and Instruction, and the Mental Health Specialist interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy and Protective Isolation Procedures were provided to the auditor regarding the usage of the screening information. The facility's Intake staff was able to demonstrate how the screening instrument is used to make an informed housing assignment which is discussed weekly during their multidisciplinary meetings. B. The facility Zero Tolerance policy does prohibit the placement of youth in isolation due to risk of sexual victimization and the agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum indicating that seclusion (isolation) has not been used for sexual abuse and or sexual harassment victims and or perpetrators in the last 12 months, which was corroborated during the interview with the Mental Health Specialist. C and D. A copy of the Behavior Screening form was provided to the auditor for review and he was informed by the Intake Staff that housing assignments are not based on a youth's LGBTGNC status, perceived status or identification status as an indicator of likelihood of being sexually abusive. This facility did not have any identified Transgender or Intersex youth in their population during this on site audit. E, F and G. The facility Zero Tolerance policy does allow, when applicable for an Intersex and Transgender youth to shower separately and to be reassessed twice a year to review any threats to safety experienced by the youth with serious considerations being given with respect to their safety as applicable. H and I. During the last 12 months the facility did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum and reported that there were zero youth placed in isolation as a result of their risk to sexual victimization, that zero youth were denied daily access to services and that the average time of a youth being in isolation for a risk to sexual victimization was zero, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.351 Resident reporting

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)

- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance, Incident Report and Grievance Policies, Agency Memorandum on Civil Immigration, PREA Posters, Hotline Numbers, Notice to Employees, Interns and Volunteers, PREA Coordinator, Random Staff and Youth Interviews, and the Third Party Reporting Policy.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does provide for multiple internal ways (i.e. sick call, grievance, trusting adult) and several external numbers for a youth to privately report an allegation of sexual abuse and sexual harassment. B. One such number for reporting an allegation is to the Texas Juvenile Justice Department’s 1-877-STOP-ANE which is a toll free number posted in each dorm and throughout the facility, as observed during the facility tour. C. Interviews conducted with the facility’s staff and the youth demonstrated their knowledge of, unimpeded access to and the facility’s staff compliance with this standard including that they do accept, document and immediately report all verbal reports of sexual abuse and sexual harassment from a youth to the appropriate upper level supervisory and or administrative staff. D. The facility’s PREA Compliance Manager did state that the youth would be provided with a grievance form from staff without question according to policy as one tool for reporting an allegation. E. The staff and youth indicated during their interviews that they can report a sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations privately; confidentially, anonymously and or through a 3rd party. The staff indicated that they can use the same 1-877-STOP-ANE number for making such reports or can privately report it to their supervisor. The facility’s Zero Tolerance policy does state that they do not detain youth solely for civil immigration purposes and the agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum corroborating that this has not occurred, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.352 Exhaustion of administrative remedies

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Retaliation Monitoring Form, Youth Grievance Operating Procedure and Logs, Memorandum on Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies and Grievances, applicable Investigation Case Log and cases that exceeded 90 days or Required an Extension of 70 days, Disciplinary Action Records for Bad Faith filings as applicable, Youth Handbook, Investigator’s, Random Staff and Youth Interviews.

Findings: A, B and C. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy and Youth Grievance Operating Procedure does not imposes a time limit regarding the filing an allegation for sexual abuse, it also states that a youth cannot resolve a sexual abuse grievance with the alleged staff person informally, and that it will not be referred to the alleged staff member for resolution. D. The facility’s Zero Tolerance policy does state that it shall issue a final decision within 30 days of the initial filing. E. The facility’s Zero Tolerance policy also state that a 3rd party can file a grievance on behalf of a youth and that a youth will be monitored for retaliation up to 90 days or until the investigation is closed or is Unfounded. F. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did show the auditor the grievance lock

boxes where a youth could file their grievance during the facility tour and did provide him with a copy of the Youth Handbook that describes the youth the grievance procedure including the filing of emergency grievances. G. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that disciplinary action can be taken against a youth if a grievance is filed in bad faith. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that there were zero grievances filed in the last 12 months for sexual abuse and sexual harassment, that zero emergency grievances filed in the last 12 months, and that there were zero sexual abuse and sexual harassment grievances and or administrative/criminal investigations that were not completed within 90 days or that required extensions up to 70 days in the last 12 months, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.353 Resident access to outside confidential support services

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Visitation Policies, Texas Children's Hospital, Houston Area Women's Center and the Children's Assessment Center's Memorandum of Understanding, Youth Handbook, Memorandum on Civil Immigration, PREA Posters and other PREA-related documentation in English and Spanish (Keeping Safe Brochure), Facility's Schematics of Visitation Area, Random Staff, Youth and PREA Coordinator Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline how a youth would have access to outside confidential support services and legal representation. The facility does provide the youth with information regarding their access to outside and other services, visitation, 3rd party reporting, 1-877-STOP ANE hotline information during their Intake and Orientation session. They are also provide a copy of the Youth Handbook which contains the toll free and or local phone numbers for reporting PREA allegation and related services. B and C. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum of agreement from Children's Assessment Center and the Houston Area Women's Center for the provision of emotional support and crisis counseling services as needed for victims of sexual abuse. The youth interviewed could recall being given this information on outside support services during the Orientation process with some having this knowledge from a previous placement, they articulated that that they could communicate with outside service providers privately and that this conversation would be confidential. D. The facility does provide the youths with reasonable and confidential access to their parents, legal guardians and lawyers for visitation, as indicated during the staff and youth interviews, and the identified visitation space was reflected on the facility schematics, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.354 Third-party reporting

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance

determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance, Youth Grievance and Third Party Reporting Policies, Agency Website Screen Shot, Random Staff and Youth Interviews, Copy of the Youth Grievance and Community Grievance Form, Parent and Public Guide for Recognizing and Reporting in English and Spanish, the PREA Compliance Manager and PREA Coordinator's Interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does establish the method outlined to receive a 3rd party report of sexual abuse and sexual harassment on behalf of a youth and that this information is also available on the Harris County Juvenile Probation's website. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence for the link to this website which was visited by the auditor for review. He also provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum that demonstrates how they receive a 3rd party report for sexual abuse and sexual harassment and provided the auditor with a copy of the Parent brochure on PREA in English and in Spanish, which is mailed to them. This policy and practice was corroborated during the PREA Coordinator, PREA Compliance Manager, Random Staff and Youth interviews, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.361 Staff and agency reporting duties

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Houston Area Women’s Center and the Children’s Assessment Center’s Memorandum of Agreement, Intake Officer, PREA Allegation Investigation Report, Medical and Mental Health Practitioners, Facility Administrator, PREA Coordinator, PREA Compliance Manager and Random Staff Interviews, Referral Form to Outside Law Enforcement Investigative Entity, and the First Responder Interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does require that all staff to immediately report to the Facility Superintendent any suspicion, knowledge, or information of an allegation of sexual abuse, sexual harassment, retaliation and staff policy violation for neglect of their responsibilities that may have contributed to the incident or retaliation, including 3rd party reports. The agency’s PREA Coordinator also provided other related policies regarding their internal processes, personnel action and the first responder’s responsibilities and duties of the staff including referrals to be made to the Children’s Assessment Center and or the Houston Area Women’s Center program for mental health assessment and treatment as necessary. B and D. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that all staff are mandatory reporters which was also corroborated during the random staff interviews and it does indicate and direct the facility staff, including medical and mental health personnel, as being mandatory reporters of child abuse, to immediately report the alleged information, complete a serious incident report and forward it to the Facility Superintendent. C. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does prohibits the staff from revealing any information related to the sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegation to anyone other than to the extent necessary which was also corroborated during the random staff and first responder interviews. E and F. The Facility Superintendent or designee then reports the allegation to their Internal Investigators, Texas Juvenile Justice Department and to the Houston Police Department as appropriate and applicable. During the random staff interviews they all demonstrated their knowledge regarding their reporting responsibilities including notification to their immediate supervisor, the Facility Superintendent, to local law enforcement, to the internal investigators, to the alleged victim’s parent, legal guardian, lawyers and to the court of jurisdiction if applicable, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.362 Agency protection duties

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Isolation Policies, Seclusion Log, Memorandum on the Agency's Protection Duties, Facility Administrator and Random Staff Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline their internal processes regarding the agency's protection duties when informed that a youth is subject to a substantial risk of imminent sexual abuse. During the specialized and random staff interviews they were able to articulate their knowledge of these protections and that no youth had been placed in isolation for a substantial risk of sexual abuse. The agency's PREA Coordinator also provided written evidence in the form of a memorandum indicating that they had zero youth in isolation during the last 12 months who were subject to any type of substantial risk of imminent sexual abuse while in their facility, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.363 Reporting to other confinement facilities

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Memorandum on Allegation Notification to Other Facilities, Facility Administrator, PREA Coordinator, Intake Officer, Juvenile Information Management System (JIMS) and Internal investigator's Interviews, Investigative Administrative and or Criminal Case review if applicable.

Findings: A. and B The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline the staff's requirement of reporting to other confinement facilities within 72 hour of being informed during Intake of an allegation being made by a youth of sexual abuse and sexual harassment and that it will be documented in the youth's electronic file (JIMS). The interview conducted with the Intake staff as well as with other specialized staff demonstrated their knowledge and understanding of this reporting requirement and the need for policy adherence. C. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum indicating that they had documented zero reported cases of having to report to another confinement facility an allegation of sexual abuse that occurred within the past 12 months, which was also corroborated by the Facility Superintendent during his interview. During the random staff interviews they too were able to articulate the notification protocol for reporting to other confinement facilities. D. The agency's PREA Coordinator did

provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that during the last 12 months they did not receive an allegation of a sexual abuse incident that had occurred at another facility but in their policy it states that if one did occur notification would be made within 72 hours and that they would ensure that an investigation would occur, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.364 Staff first responder duties

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Memorandum on First Responder Duties, First Responder, Non-Security Staff, Random Staff, PREA Compliance Manager and PREA Coordinator Interviews, and a review of the Investigative Cases if applicable.

Findings: A and B. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center has established a Zero Tolerance policy that outlines the first responder duties for responding to sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations. The facility reported there were zero allegation of sexual harassment and zero allegations of sexual abuse, whereas the collection of evidence was not applicable and if it had it would have been collected in the appropriate time frame i.e. witness statements, video footage, etc. Furthermore, that there was zero times that the crime scene and or evidence needed to be preserved, zero times it was requested of a victim not to take any action, zero times it requested of the abuser not to take action, zero times that non-security staff had to respond, and that in this instance was the security staff (JSO) notified and had responded to an allegation. All of the random and specialized staff interviewed was able to articulate their knowledge, understanding, responsibilities and duties as a first responder including informing the victim and the abuser not to destroy evidence by washing, eating, changing clothes, drinking, defecating or brushing teeth. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written documentation in the form of a memorandum reporting that there were zero allegations of sexual harassment and zero allegations of sexual abuse allegation made during the past 12 months and that the first responder would have acted in accordance with the agency's policy and the facility's protocol, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.365 Coordinated response

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Coordinated Response to a Sexual Abuse Operating Procedure, Copy of Facility's PREA Audit Report

Written Plan for Coordinated Response to Sexual Abuse Allegation, PREA Allegation Investigation Report, Sexual Abuse Review Team Member and the PREA Coordinator's Interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy and the Coordinated Response to a Sexual Abuse Operating Procedure does outline the procedure for specific staff's response to allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment in this facility. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy, as corroborated by the interviews with a member of the Sexual Abuse Review Team and with the agency's PREA Coordinator, indicated that they understood the process for reporting sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations, the responsibilities of the facility administrator, supervisor/manager on duty, medical and mental health personnel, the investigator and the responsibility of a first responders thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.366 Preservation of ability to protect residents from contact with abusers

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Human Resource Policies, Memorandum on Collective Bargaining Agreement, PREA Coordinator and Deputy Director of Human Resources Interviews.

Findings: A and B. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance and Human Resource policies does state that they do not enter into collective bargaining agreements and that the facility's policy does allow for an alleged staff abuser to be removed from contact with a youth pending an investigation or of a determination of whether and what extent discipline is warranted. This was corroborated by the Deputy Director of Human Resources, the agency's PREA Coordinator during their interviews as well as written evidence in the form of a memorandum thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.367 Agency protection against retaliation

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Retaliation Policies, Internal Investigator's Interview, Protective Against Retaliation Policy and Monitoring Forms, Communication Access Ability Group and Houston Area Women's Center Memorandum of Agreement and

interviews with the PREA Coordinator and Mental Health Specialist.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline their response to retaliation and the protection for all youth and staff members who report an allegation of sexual abuse and sexual harassment and or who cooperate with an investigation. The facility has designated specific staff, including a staff member from psychology, who would be responsible for monitoring youth and staff against retaliation for reporting a sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegation. B. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that they employ multiple protective measures to protect a youth from changing housing assignments, removing them from the facility to another, removing the abuser or alleged staff member from contact with the victim, including providing emotional support to the victim. C and D. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that a youth's conduct would be monitored up to 90 days against retaliation, including periodic status checks, that they would promptly remedy any such retaliation, and will provide treatment services as needed. E. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that they will protect any other individual who cooperates with an investigation who may express fear of retaliation also. F. The facility's obligation to monitor shall terminate if the allegation is determined to be Unfounded. The facility reported zero times where protective measures were required to protect staff and or youth against retaliation in the last 12 months which was corroborated by the Mental Health Specialist, the agency's PREA Coordinator during their interview as well as in a memorandum attesting to this practice, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.368 Post-allegation protective custody

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Isolation Policies, Memorandum on Post Allegation Protective Isolation, Seclusion Logs, Random Staff, Facility Administrator, PREA Compliance Manager and PREA Coordinator Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does state the prohibition of the use of segregation and or seclusion housing to protect a youth who have alleged sexual abuse and sexual harassment. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum indicating that there were zero youths who were held in isolation (seclusion) who alleged sexual abuse and sexual harassment or who suffered sexual abuse in the last 12 months. The agency's PREA Coordinator, PREA Compliance Manager and the Facility Superintendent all stated during their interviews that they do not use seclusion to protect a youth from sexual abuse or sexual harassment, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.371 Criminal and administrative agency investigations

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance

determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Investigative Policies, Internal Investigator Interviews, Investigator’s Training Record, Memorandum on Referrals for Prosecution, Administrative Investigative Case, PREA Allegation Investigation Report and Cover Sheet, Outside Law Enforcement Entity, PREA Compliance Manager, and the PREA Coordinator Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline that they and the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD) will conduct all administrative investigations and that the Houston Police Department will conduct all criminal investigations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment. B. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence of their investigators training records to corroborate this practice and policy. C. The facility’s Internal Investigators described during their interview the gathering process i.e. evidence, videos, interviews, etc. and that they review prior complaints and reports of sexual abuse of the alleged perpetrator when conducting an investigation. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum indicating that there were zero case where sexual abuse and zero sexual harassment allegations had occurred in this facility, zero sexual abuse and sexual harassment incidents that had occurred in another facility, which if it had, they would have been investigated by the appropriate entities. D and F. The facility reported 1 sexual abuse case and zero sexual harassment cases, that have been closed in accordance with the agency’s policy. G, H, I and J. The facility’s PREA Compliance Manager also reported that there were zero substantiated investigative cases that had been referred for prosecution and that if it had been referred that they would retain these case files as long as the abuser is incarcerated or as long as the staff was employed, 5 years plus according to their policy and applicable law. K. The facility’s Zero Tolerance policy state that an employee's termination or the departure of the victim and or perpetrator's being out of the control of the facility shall not cause the investigation to be terminate and that polygraphs are not utilized. M. During the investigator’s interview they described how they would remain in contact with the outside investigative entities as applicable, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.372 Evidentiary standard for administrative investigations

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Investigation Policy, the Investigator, Facility Administrator and PREA Coordinator’s Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does state that the standard used for proof when determining substantiation of an allegation for sexual abuse and sexual harassment in an administrative investigations is the preponderance of evidence as corroborated during the investigator, the agency’s PREA Coordinator’s interview as well as in a memorandum attesting to this practice, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.373 Reporting to residents

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Memorandum on Investigation Completed by Outside Agency, Youth PREA Notification Documentation Sample Form, Administrative Investigative Cases and the Investigator’s Interview.

Findings: A and B. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline the facility's responsibility in notifying a youth regarding the initiation and the outcome of an administrative and or criminal investigation for sexual abuse. C and D. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy also outlines the notification process for a staff on youth allegation and a youth on youth allegation. The facility has reported zero allegations of sexual abuse and zero allegations of sexual harassment during the past 12 months, and if one had occurred the facility would provide written documentation informing the youth of the outcome, and that no investigation was required to be completed by an outside investigative entity. E. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum verifying that zero notifications was given to a youth at the conclusion of an the investigation, whether it was a youth on youth or staff on youth; and a sample copy of that notification form was provided. There were zero notifications made and documented for any sexual abuse allegations. This auditor recommended to the facility as a “best practice” that they notify the youth when an administrative investigation is initiated and concluded for sexual harassment. The facility’s investigator also reported during his interview that there have not been any indictments, any referrals for prosecution or convictions of an abuser for sexual abuse and sexual harassment in the last 12 months, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.376 Disciplinary sanctions for staff

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Human Resource Policy, Memorandum on Disciplinary Sanctions for Staff, Disciplinary Action Letter (if applicable), Referrals to Law Enforcement Entity Documentation, and Human Resource Specialist Interview.

Findings: A and C. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline the steps to be taken to discipline a staff for sexual abuse and sexual harassment and that sanctions for this violation will be commensurate with the nature and circumstances of the act committed. B. The agency’s PREA Coordinator reported during his interview and provided written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that there have not been any staff disciplinary actions taken during the past 12 months due a to violation of the agency’s policy of sexual abuse and sexual harassment and that termination would be the presumptive disciplinary sanction. D. The Deputy Director of Human Resources reported during her interview that there were zero referrals made to a law enforcement or relevant licensing entity for sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegations in the last 12 months, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.377 Corrective action for contractors and volunteers

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance, Volunteer and Contractor's Policies, Volunteer and Contractor's Disciplinary Letter (if applicable), Memorandum on Corrective Action for Volunteers and Contractors, Referral to Local Law Enforcement and Licensing Entity (if applicable), Facility Administrator, PREA Compliance Manager and PREA Coordinator Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does prohibits volunteers and contractors from contact with youth who have engaged in sexual abuse and outlines the steps to be taken when disciplining volunteers and contractors for sexual abuse and sexual harassment violations. B. The agency's PREA Coordinator reported during his interview and provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that there were zero cases where a volunteer and or a contractor received disciplinary action during the past 12 months due to violation of the agency's policy of sexual abuse and sexual harassment. The agency's PREA Coordinator also provided written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that there were zero reports made to local law enforcement or to a relevant licensing body for a contractor or volunteer engaging in sexual abuse with a youth, which was corroborated by the facility's PREA Compliance Manager during her interview, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.378 Disciplinary sanctions for residents

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Isolation Policies, Memorandum on Disciplinary Sanction for Residents, Administrative and or Criminal Investigative Cases, Youth Handbook, Intake Staff, PREA Coordinator and Facility Administrator's Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does prohibits denying a youth large muscle exercise, daily visits, educational programming, access to other programs as a disciplinary sanction for engaging in sexual abuse and it outlines the process for taking disciplinary action against a youth when they participate in sexual misconduct with another youth, staff, volunteer or contractor in the facility. B and E. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does outline the formal due process hearing that must occur following an administrative finding whereas the sanctions are to be commensurate with the nature and circumstances of the abuse

committed including when a finding of sexual contact with a staff proves that they did not consent to such contact. C and D. The disciplinary process, according to their Zero Tolerance policy includes if the youth's mental disabilities and mental illness contributed to the behavior when determining sanctions and if therapy, counseling or other interventions shall be considered for the youth to participate in. This policy and standard adherence was corroborated by the Facility Administrator, PREA Coordinator and Intake staff during their interview. F. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that they do not impose disciplinary sanctions if a youth makes a report of sexual abuse and sexual harassment in good faith. G. The facility reported zero administrative findings of a youth on youth sexual abuse and sexual harassment, zero criminal findings of a youth on youth sexual abuse and sexual harassment and zero instances where disciplinary sanctions was imposed for a sexual abuse and sexual harassment for a substantiated allegation. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does prohibit all forms sexual abuse, sexual harassment and sexual misconduct in the facility. During this reporting period the agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum that zero youths were placed in isolation as a disciplinary sanction for a youth on youth sexual abuse and sexual harassment allegation in the past 12 months, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.381 Medical and mental health screenings; history of sexual abuse

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Mental and Medical Screening Instrument Form, Juvenile Information Management System (JIMS) Client Management Database Review, Electronic Medical Records Database, Prior Sexual Victimization Referral Forms and or Listing (as applicable), Youth Mental Health Files and Follow Up Documentation, Memorandum on Medical and Mental Health Follow Up with 14 Days of Intake and Informed Consent, Medical, Mental Health Practitioners, PREA Compliance Manager, PREA Coordinator and Random Staff Interviews, and Facility's Schematics for Medical Clinic.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outlines the procedure to follow for medical and mental health screenings consisting of the youth's history of sexual abuse, if applicable. The Medical and Mental Health staff interviewed stated that their electronic files do contain some of this information that is not accessible to non-treatment staff. B. The facility's PREA Compliance Manager did not identify any youth who had disclosed a prior sexual victimizations in the past 12 months which occurred either at another confinement facility or in a community setting, and their Zero Tolerance policy does indicate that medical and mental health follow up assessments would be offered to these and other youths within 14 days of Intake and or when prior sexual victimization was alleged to have occurred. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum attesting to this practice. C. The Medical and Mental health staff stated during their interviews that they do maintain secondary information in their treatment files, which are kept in an office under lock and key whereas only they have access to them. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that all staff are considered mandatory reporters of child abuse according to their State law which includes medical and mental health practitioners. D. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy also states how informed consent is to be obtained from a youth, unless they are under the age of 18, when sexual abuse does not occur in an institutional setting, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.382 Access to emergency medical and mental health services

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the

relevant review period)

- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Residential Facilities Mental Health Services and Hospitalization and Outside Medical Services Operating Procedures, Memorandum on Access to Emergency Medical and Mental Health Care, Harris County Juvenile Probation Department's Health Services Division Health Service Plan, Medical and Mental Health Practitioners Interviews, Youth Medical and Mental Health Files and Electronic Medical Record review.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center reported that there were zero cases of sexual abuse requiring medical attention at this facility during the past 12 months and that the facility's Zero Tolerance policy, Residential Facilities Mental Health Services Operating Procedure and the Harris County Juvenile probation Department's Health Services Division Health Service Plan does outline how a youth will have access to these emergency services in a timely, unimpeded manner. B and C. The Zero Tolerance policy does indicate that if no qualified medical or mental health practitioner is on duty the first responders responsibilities are to protect the victim, notify the appropriate on call medical and mental health practitioner, and that the victim is offered timely information and access to emergency contraception and STI prophylaxis. D. The agency's PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that access to emergency medical and mental health services would be provided at the Texas Children's Center Hospital and that these treatment services shall be provided at no cost to the victim whether they name the abuser or cooperates with the investigation. There were zero sexual abuse cases to review that required a youth emergency access to medical and mental health services in the last 12 months according to the medical and mental health staff during their interviews, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.383 Ongoing medical and mental health care for sexual abuse victims and abusers

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor's analysis and reasoning, and the auditor's conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance and Medical and Mental Health Treatment Policies, Memorandum on Ongoing Medical and Mental Health Care, Sick Call Referral Form, Treatment Referral Form if applicable, Medical and Mental Health Practitioners Interviews.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline the procedure for a sexual abuse victim and or abuser being offered an evaluation who have been victimized including receiving ongoing medical and mental health care. B, D, E, F and G. The facility did not identify any youth requiring ongoing medical and mental health care as a sexual abuse victim and or abuser, but did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating the these services would be provided to these youth who have been adjudicated and who are assigned to their post detention facility, that these services are provided free of charge to the youth as well as other treatment i.e. STI's as deemed appropriate by the medical and mental health practitioner will be offered. This is an all-male facility and pregnancy tests would not be required. C. The Medical and Mental Health staff stated during their interviews that their mental health and medical services are consistent with the community level of care and at no cost to the victim whether they name the abuser or cooperates with the investigation. H. The facility's Zero Tolerance policy does state that they will attempt to conduct an evaluation on the committed

youth abuser within 60 days of learning of the abuse history and offer treatment when deemed appropriate by the mental health practitioner. The facility reported that there were zero youth identified as a sexual abuse victim and or abuser who required ongoing medical and mental health services during the last 12 months, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.386 Sexual abuse incident reviews

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Sexual Abuse Review Team Initial and Ongoing Meeting Minutes, Monthly Meeting Notification (if applicable), Memorandum on Sexual Abuse Incident Review Report (SAIR), PREA Allegation Investigation Report, Administrative and or Criminal Investigative Case review (as applicable), Interviews with a Sexual Abuse Review Team member and the PREA Coordinator.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline the process for conducting sexual abuse reviews for substantiated and unsubstantiated cases of sexual abuse with the understanding that a review would not be held for Unfounded cases. B and C. The facility’s sexual abuse team is represented by the Facility Superintendent, the PREA Compliance Manager, a Shift Supervisor, a designated Investigator, a Mental Health practitioner (psychologist), which is convened within 30 days of the conclusion of an administrative and or criminal investigation for sexual abuse. D and E. The Team considers the six (6) elements pertaining to the review of the allegation and then submits its findings to the Facility Superintendent. The meeting is facilitated by the Facility Superintendent and the PREA Compliance Manager as Co-Chair, who prepares the minutes and report recommendations for improvement as applicable. The facility needed not to provide written evidence to indicate that there was a sexual abuse review in last 12 months because there were no sexual abuse allegations made. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence that their initial meeting had occurred and that a memorandum is generated monthly to demonstrate that the sexual abuse review team remains active. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide a memorandum of this facility’s initial meeting held on August 10th, 2016 and memorandums after the month of the initial meeting indicating that there were no sexual abuse allegations that were substantiated or unsubstantiated which would require the SART Team to convene. A recommended “best practice” by the auditor to the PREA Coordinator was that the facility’s PREA Compliance Manager continue to generate an email monthly to all the Sexual Abuse Review Team members to keep them apprised if there are any sexual abuse substantiated or unsubstantiated findings that need reviewing for that month. The facility’s PREA Compliance Manager reported zero allegations of sexual abuse during the last 12 months and that zero reviews was conducted, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None

Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.387 Data collection

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, DOJ Survey for Sexual Victimization for 2014 and 2015, Administrative and Criminal Investigative Cases, Sexual Abuse and Sexual Harassment Aggregate Data for 2014-2015, PREA Aggregated Data Form for Harris County and Contract Facilities Incident Based and Aggregated Data Form, Trends, Implemented Recommendations and the PREA Coordinator’s Interview.

Findings: A. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center, the Harris County Juvenile Probation Department’s Operating Procedures and the Zero Tolerance policy does outline the procedure for collecting uniform data on all allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment at all their facilities including private contractors as applicable including using a standardized instrument to demonstrate compliance with this standard. B and C. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence of their annual DOJ Survey of Sexual Victimization for 2014 and 2015, the PREA Aggregated Data Form for Harris County and the Contract Facilities Incident Based and Aggregated Data Form, as the standardized instrument utilized for capturing this aggregate data annually, which was corroborated through his interview, provided and viewed on the agency’s website. D and E. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did indicate during his interview that he reviews, collects all the data including investigative reports and files, including those from private facilities in which they contract for the confinement of its youth, identifies trends, implements recommendations and documents the reason for not doing so locally. The agency’s PREA Coordinator also stated that upon request, this information has been provided to DOJ no later than June 30th of each year or as otherwise directed by BJA, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.388 Data review for corrective action

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, DOJ Survey for Sexual Victimization for 2014 and 2015, Harris County Juvenile Probation Department and the Contract Facilities Aggregated Sexual Abuse and Sexual Harassment Data, Data Collection Memorandum for Corrective Action, Agency’s Website and PREA Compliance Manager and PREA Coordinator Interviews.

Findings: A and B. The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline the review of aggregate sexual abuse and sexual harassment data, including that of their private contractors, how they will assess it to improve the effectiveness of the agency’s policies, practices and training, to identify problems and to provide directions for taking corrective action. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did provide written evidence in the form of a memorandum stating that a review of the data collected, identification of trends, problem areas, and subsequent corrective action to be taken in accordance with these standards does occur. C and D. The agency’s PREA Coordinator did indicate during his interview that he prepares a report from these findings, comparing the current year’s data with the prior year data, redacting any information that may present a clear and specific threat to the safety and security of the facilities, obtains approval from the agency’s head, makes this report available on the agency’s website or other means and provides a copy to the Department of Justice upon their request, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

Standard 115.389 Data storage, publication, and destruction

- Exceeds Standard (substantially exceeds requirement of standard)
- Meets Standard (substantial compliance; complies in all material ways with the standard for the relevant review period)
- Does Not Meet Standard (requires corrective action)

Auditor discussion, including the evidence relied upon in making the compliance or non-compliance determination, the auditor’s analysis and reasoning, and the auditor’s conclusions. This discussion must also include corrective action recommendations where the facility does not meet standard. These recommendations must be included in the Final Report, accompanied by information on specific corrective actions taken by the facility.

Policy and Evidence reviewed: Zero Tolerance Policy, Agency’s Website, DOJ Survey for Sexual Victimization for 2014 and 2015, Data Collection Memorandum, Data Collection and Storage Policy, Review of Sexual Abuse and Sexual Harassment Incidents and the interview with the PREA Coordinator.

Findings: The Harris County Burnett Bayland Rehabilitation Center Zero Tolerance policy does outline that all sexual abuse data is under their control, that all personal identifiers are redacted and that this information collected is retained securely. A review of this Zero Tolerance policy, the interview with the agency’s PREA Coordinator, a review of the agency’s website and a review of the referenced documents corroborated this practice. Furthermore, the facility’s Zero Tolerance policy does state that all sexual abuse data is retained securely and will be maintained for at least 10 years after the date of the initial collection, thus demonstrating compliance with this standard.

Corrective Action Findings: None
Resolution: N/A

AUDITOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that:

- The contents of this report are accurate to the best of my knowledge.
- No conflict of interest exists with respect to my ability to conduct an audit of the agency under review, and
- I have not included in the final report any personally identifiable information (PII) about any inmate or staff member, except where the names of administrative personnel are specifically requested in the report template.

Jerome K. Williams

September 30th, 2016

Auditor Signature

Date