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01. INTRODUCTION

In the middle of the night, next to garbage cans overflowing with liquor and beer bottles, my sister and I sat alone in a “time-out.” I was five; Melissa was eight. It wasn’t our first time being left alone, so I trusted Melissa to protect me like she always did and fell asleep. But my big sister couldn’t remove the fear that struck when I heard they were taking us away. Flashing cop lights illuminated the room as we hurriedly stuffed clothes, books, and toys into garbage bags. We entered the foster care system. In some homes, there was sexual, physical, or psychological abuse; in others, love. But it almost didn’t matter. Even kindness hurt because nothing ever lasted. At any moment, we could be—and were—pulled from class or beds late at night and brought to a new home or school, placed someplace new with strangers for family. Whenever the news of a move came, we packed our garbage bag and silently prayed our next home wouldn’t be worse.

Melissa was sexually abused at our first home. We moved. The following family was kind and loving to Melissa but cruel to me. We moved. At one house, I learned how to ride horses and spent hours with their prize mare. One foster mother forced Melissa and me to eat on the floor with the dogs rather than at the dinner table with the “real family.” At one home, I was sexually exploited by a foster sibling. It took every ounce of power in me to share what was happening to me with my sister. Once I did, she—age 10—rushed into action. She told our therapist, whom she knew was, because of her own experience, a mandated reporter, and demanded they call the police. The police came. We moved. This reaction might seem commonsense to a child reporting sexual abuse, but as I have learned, it is exceptional.

The system kept my sister and me together initially. We had each other, but we lived with constant fear and uncertainty, especially during the good times, knowing it wouldn’t last. When I was seven, my sister and I were reunited with our biological mother, and this time, we couldn’t help but hope. But it wasn’t long before she relapsed. I hid from the late-night parties on the shelf in my closet; the door closed, flashlight in hand, with stuffed animals and the Boxcar Children as my companions. My sister, always the protector, would stay up all night to stop our mother’s boyfriend from beating her to death. Melissa missed half of her fourth-grade year. I was the teacher’s pet. We re-entered the foster care system. Three years later, we were separated.
At age 13, wanting a way out of the cycle and amidst a legal change incentivizing adoption for youth in care, I asked my social worker about adoption. I saw education as my exit, adoption as my way to college, and finally, some cute clothes. I couldn’t bring myself to hope for love, security, family. On my first visit to my parents’ home, I dropped a glass of milk. I cried when I saw the shattered glass and milk on the floor; sure, they would never adopt me now. They laughed, hugged me, and said, “There’s no reason to cry over spilt milk.” Kindness as a response to my mistakes felt foreign. Even after I knew I loved them, it was a while before I could call them Mom and Dad. I was officially adopted at 15, and we celebrated with ice cream and lemonade. I found the family I had been afraid to even hope for. I began to experience things I had only ever dreamed of, staying up late to watch the fireworks on the fourth of July, out-of-state camping trips, and even a trip to France with my high school French club. Family, love, community, and adventure.

When my sister was 13, she decided that moving might as well be on her terms. Melissa called our social worker late one night and told her that she would run away if they did not get her. For the rest of her time in foster care, my sister was in group homes and institutional placement settings. For her, it was the lesser evil, given all she had endured. She had little to look forward to or hope for and—like most teenagers—made bad decisions. My sister cycled through increasingly secure placements before being placed in the Iowa Juvenile Home. There, she experienced abuse, months-long solitary confinement, and education deprivation. And although she brought her complaints of abuses, rights violations, and other administrative suggestions to weekly “grievance conferences” with the director, nothing changed. We had little to no contact. After 27 houses and 13 group homes, institutions, and other detention facilities, Melissa was discharged to our biological father without any transition services. Months later, just barely 18, my sister became a statistic—one of the 40–50 percent of former foster youth who become homeless¹ and one of over 90 percent of youth with five or more placements that enter the justice system at some point in their lives.²

In 2014, fifteen years after my sister was discharged, the Iowa Juvenile Home was shut down, following an investigative exposé by the Des Moines Register. The Register recounted a pattern of confining girls in isolation cells for periods of weeks or months, inappropriate restraints, and inadequate education for at least the preceding seventeen years, 1997–2014. Despite the horrors she experienced at the Iowa Juvenile Home before the facility shut down, my sister went with a few girls she knew from her time there to say goodbye to the “home” she had known the longest.

While that facility closed, the abuses didn’t stop—they just shifted elsewhere. After closure, two residents were transferred to a facility called Copper Lake School in Wisconsin.³ Media later exposed extensive abuse at Copper Lake, followed by a federal investigation and class-action lawsuit.⁴

This longstanding cycle, abuses brought to light, often by news media or lawsuits, prompting overdue changes at the facility level until the same problems are uncovered at another facility and attention shifts, plays out across the country. Wide-spread systemic abuse, including physical and sexual violence, is well-documented, in addition “to legally sanctioned abusive practices, such as solitary confinement — often for 22-24 hours per day — strip searches, shackles, and chemical sprays.”⁵ These abuses compound the trauma caused by isolation and separation from families, friends, and communities, leaving youth unseen, unheard and unprotected.

Hid, a youth advocate with Juveniles for Justice, wrote in the powerful Broken Bridges report: “If people really knew what I faced behind those walls, they would understand how horrible it was for me.”⁶ At any point in time, the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems confine over 48,000 youth.⁷ The dependency system confines another 43,000 children in group homes and institutional placement.⁸ The persistence of abuses in these facilities proves the urgent need for system reimagining. Accordingly, I unequivocally echo the calls of colleagues and community members to end the incarceration of children in any congregate care or institutional facility. I use these terms interchangeably throughout this report to mean any youth placement with caregivers who work in shifts.
This report focuses on grievance procedures for youth in facilities. By grievance protections, I mean a set of mechanisms designed to allow the full expression of children’s rights, explicitly educating youth on their rights, supplying an effective process to assert their rights, and ensuring a response that protects their rights. I focused on grievance protections because what happens in response to youth speaking out against trauma and violence leaves a lasting impact. Indeed “communicating fully is the opposite of being traumatized.” In my own experience, through realizing I had rights that I could assert, I began to feel like I deserved to be seen, heard, and protected. I found hope. Every child deserves to know that is true, but it is hard to believe when it’s not the truth you live. I hope that this research will help inspire us to begin thinking about the various structural mechanisms that silence and disempower youth in these systems so that we can actively dismantle them.

This report proceeds in three parts. First, I recount history and background essential to understanding the current system’s failures and the need for reform. Second, I explain the purpose and need for adequate grievance protections, and I describe how I developed the core components of youth-centered grievance protections: See Youth, Hear Youth, Protect Youth. Then, organized around those core components, I comprehensively analyze existing grievance protections across the country. Finally, to help jurisdictions begin to design their youth-centered grievance protections, I include an expert-developed, youth-design curriculum to use in partnership with local youth and community organizations. The purpose of this report is not to offer an answer, a model or template grievance protection. Rather, taken together, the history, state statutory and regulatory review and curriculum aim to supply the resources necessary for policy-makers and advocates to empower and include local youth with lived experience in imagining and implementing effective youth-centered grievance protections.
HISTORY & BACKGROUND

SECTION 01
01. HISTORY & BACKGROUND

Before doing a historical analysis of these systems, I wrote that I thought the foster care system was like a lottery, where some children win, and some children lose. Although that description disrupted the narrative that those who succeed are “extraordinary” rather than questioning why successful outcomes from these systems are so extraordinary, it still felt incomplete. I dug deeper because my pain only has a purpose if it can make a real difference. Not just for children who look like me or manifest their trauma like me, but for every child.

Without critically examining the historical creation and use of incarceration and confinement as a solution, any changes made will necessarily be cosmetic, disconnected, or incomplete. I begin this report by briefly discussing the history of these two systems for two reasons. First, we must take the time to see, hear, and process the harms we have perpetuated as a country against children if we ever hope to stop the cycle of violence we have created. Second, I hope to amplify the interconnectedness between the dependency and delinquency systems. Despite shared beginnings, their histories, problem analysis, and suggestions for reform are often recounted separately. By illustrating these systems’ overlapping origins, I aim to help unify the fight for reform in these systems.

So how did we get here? Where did we go wrong? The problem is, we’ve never gotten it right. Racism, oppression, and commodification of children are woven into the very fabric of our justice and child welfare systems. These concepts are still deeply embedded in today’s governance of institutional placements. This historical overview is necessarily limited in scope and is not comprehensive. I focus on the early development of institutions as a “solution” for youth and on the experiences of Black children and white children. Although I include some discussion of the history and harms of institutions to Indigenous and Mexican youth, I acknowledge that this report does not provide a complete picture of the experiences of these or other marginalized people. I hope that by highlighting the experiences of some youth during the era incarceration was imagined, this historical overview will supply a foundation for understanding the “solution” we are invested in and help us avoid the problematic thinking that created these systems of oppression when reimagining what could be.

2 Throughout this paper, I use the terms institutions, facilities, and congregate care interchangeably to describe any out of home placement, staffed by shift workers.

3 Throughout this paper I generally use the term “Black,” with a capitalized B, when describing individuals from the African Diaspora. At times, I use “African American” if the author of a particular source uses that term to describe themselves. Language is powerful, and it is my intention throughout this paper to utilize humanizing and inclusive language. Please accept my sincere apology if I fail to honor your experience, history or the person behind the stories, statistics and experience. I am dedicated to the life-long journey of learning to use my words for healing not harm. To read more about the vocabulary of race and racism See generally John Eligon, A Debate Over Identity and Race Asks, Are African-Americans ‘Black’ or ‘black’?, available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/26/us/black-african-american-style-debate.html

4 Within “white” I am including Irish, Italian, and other Southern or Eastern European immigrants whom the courts revisionist history later amalgamated into as “white.” See generally John Tehranian, Performing Whiteness: Naturalization Litigation and the Construction of Racial Identity in America, 109 YALE L.J. 817 (2000).
1.1. A Brief History of the Institutionalization of Youth

1.1.1 Origins of Oppression: Children and the Slave Trade

Historians estimate “children comprised over 12 percent of the Africans transported to the Americas between 1663 and 1700”; that figure increased to 23–28 percent between 1701 and 1809. However, that is probably a low estimate because age was not determinative of “childhood” for those kidnapped, enslaved, and forcibly emigrated. Instead, there was a mix of subjective and inconsistently applied categories in records, including terms that negated Black children’s childhood, such as “man-boy” and “woman girl.” Eventually, height became a “standard” determinant, with dominant white narrative classifying Black children taller than four feet four inches (the approximate size of an average ten-year-old) as “adults.” This “standardized definition” of childhood originated from space allotment calculations made for the slavers’ shelf-like sleeping platforms.

The brutality, family separation, adultification, forced labor, and other trauma these children endured form the backdrop against which our modern systems’ treatment of Black children developed. Although their stories are unique, I share one account to illustrate the atrocities children experienced in the American slave trade.

Olaudah Equiano, born a chief’s son, in Guinea, was kidnapped, separated from his family and community, enslaved, and forcibly emigrated to the United States. Olaudah wrote about his experiences after buying back the right to have his freedom recognized, with the hope his story could save others from the pain he endured.

Olaudah was the youngest of seven and his mother’s favorite. At age 11, he and his sister were kidnapped. At first, they had each other; it was not much, but at least they had that:

---

5The following section about the history of institutionalization of youth draws heavily on the research and analysis of James Bell and the W. Hayward Burns Institute for Youth Justice, Fairness and Equity. In which, I have attempted to weave in additional history, specifically the origins of the child welfare system. Which draws heavily on the research and analysis of Dorothy Roberts.

6“I was named Olaudah, which, in our language, signifies vicissitude or fortune also, one favoured, and having a loud voice and well spoken.” LAUDAH EQUINO OR GUSTAVUS VASSA, THE INTERESTING NARRATIVE OF THE LIFE OF OLAUDAH EQUINO, OR GUSTAVUS VASSA, THE AFRICAN: WRITTEN BY HIMSELF 31 (1789), https://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/equiano1/equiano1.html..
The only comfort we had was in being in one another's arms all that night, and bathing each other with our tears. But alas! we were soon deprived of even the small comfort of weeping together. The next day proved a day of greater sorrow than I had yet experienced; for my sister and I were then separated, while we lay clasped in each other's arms. It was in vain that we besought them not to part us; she was torn from me, and immediately carried away, while I was left in a state of distraction not to be described. I cried and grieved continually; and for several days I did not eat but what they forced into my mouth.

They were reunited once, only to be almost immediately separated.

One evening, to my great surprise, whom should I see brought to the house where I was but my dear sister! As soon as she saw me, she gave a loud shriek, and ran into my arms—I was quite overpowered: neither of us could speak; but, for a considerable time, clung to each other in mutual embraces, unable to do anything but weep.

Olaudah recalled one family he thought might adopt him. To him, their kindness almost felt like a cruel trick, given hope and joy "only to render the reverse more poignant." Arriving at the port, he was at first too awed by the sea and the ship to be afraid. But astonishment turned to terror as he boarded. He saw a "multitude of Black people of every description chained together," dejected, and next to a boiling copper pot. He fainted with horror and anguish, convinced the slavers were going to eat him. Olaudah eventually learned that he was going "to these white people's country to work for them." That small comfort did little to assuage his overwhelming grief. "I now wished for the last friend, death, to relieve me;...could I have got over the nettings, I would have jumped over the side, but I could not...."

In addition to the horrors of enslavement, young people like Olaudah were subject to legal systems designed to protect the institution of slavery. Breaking with English common law, the Virginia Assembly in 1662 decreed that Black youth inherited the legal status of their mothers, enslaved or emancipated, rather than that of their fathers. This protected white slavers against financial repercussions for the horrifically common practice of raping enslaved Black girls and women. It also set up an infrastructure of inheritable "race" based enslavement. In contrast, servitude was never inheritable on the basis of race for "white" children.

After the transatlantic slave trade was outlawed, domestic slavers continued to rip Black children from their families. During the Second Middle Passage—when the spread of the cotton trade, many enslaved people were sold farther South—30 percent of people sold interstate were children under the age of 15. Slavers traded even more children locally. Although some attempts were made to prevent the separation of families, Black parents had no custody rights over their children, whom our legal systems viewed and treated as the slaver's property.

Young children were often the first to be sold in times of financial crisis. They were considered especially suitable candidates for hiring purposes, based on their perceived work and reproductive capacity. Furthermore, slavers noticed that repeated dislocation left children "ripe for learning the art of submission." One in every three children born into slavery were forcibly separated from their family and community and sold between 1820 and 1860.

Even emancipation did not end these experiences. After having their freedom recognized, "the first act of many Black parents was to try to reclaim and reunite with their children." However, judges had the legal authority to force free Black children into an apprenticeship, often with their prior enslaver as "guardian," until adulthood (which was now defined by age rather than height). Although these placements were functionally re-enslavement, the courts frequently saw them as beneficial to the child, reasoning that the slaver "was in a better position to teach the child 'the habits of industry' than were [the child's] recently free parents." A Union soldier wrote a letter to his wife in 1864 saying that every day, he saw another "poor woman who has walked perhaps ten or twenty miles to try to procure the release of her children taken forcibly away from her and held to all intents and purposes in slavery."

In 1866, three hundred Black parents sent a petition to President Andrew Johnson exclaiming, "our homes are invaded and our little ones seized at the family fireside, and forcibly bound to masters who are by law expressly released from any obligation to educate them in either secular or religious knowledge." According to historian
Peggy Cooper Davis, the “painful stories of family disruption told by former slaves motivated the Fourteenth Amendment rights that guarantee family autonomy.”

The criminal justice system destroyed other Black families, which substituted convict leasing, in slavery’s stead, “to provide cheap forced labor to mines, farms, timber camps, turpentine makers, railroad builders and entrepreneurs.” In 1868, in one Louisiana count “of 222 convicts . . . 116 were under the age of twenty five [sic].”

In an analysis of a Philadelphia census by W.E.B. DuBois, more than 18 percent of all Black prisoners were children. One child, Mary Gay, was six years old when she was labeled a “convict” for allegedly stealing a hat. A court sentenced Mary to thirty days plus court costs. The harm and injustice of convict leasing went beyond the labor exploitation and denials of due process and was experienced by some as “worse than slavery.” “A report by journalist Ida B. Wells on the convict leasing system found starvation, disease, rape and whippings were part of the daily experience.”
Exploitation mars the intersecting beginnings of both dependency and delinquency systems. However, the abuse and exploitation of white youth were fundamentally different. During the early decades of our country’s history, all children except affluent white children were expected to work from a young age. Indeed, many young Europeans immigrated to colonial America as indentured servants. Many colonial laws were modeled after British “poor laws,” with the express purpose of preventing children from becoming a burden on society. One such law provided public funds to employ children in order to ‘accustom them to labor’ and ‘afford a prophylactic against vagabonds and paupers.’ Accordingly, starting around age 13, white “orphan boys were sent to apprentice in a trade while orphan girls were sent into domestic work.” They would remain “in apprentice” until the age of majority, which was typically 18 for women and 21 for men. According to Alexander Hamilton, it was a good investment to get cheap labor from children “who would otherwise be idle.” These priorities were “combined in legislation that authorized overseers to apprentice the children of paupers to farmers and artisans who agreed to train and care for them in their homes.” After emancipation, it was these apprenticeship laws the courts exploited to re-enslave Black children, with the explicit removal of the requirement to educate apprentices. Similarly, in 1823, the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons appointed a task force to develop “the best means of putting a stop to commitments of young children as vagrants.” The task force issued a report a year later recommending a youth facility “made sufficiently strong for their safe keeping, until suitable places can be obtained for binding them out [as] apprentices, at such a distance from the city as will, in all probability, break off all connections with their former associates.” Nothing came of the recommendation until it garnered the help of the Society of Women Friends. In December 1828, the Philadelphia House of Refuge admitted its first youth, 13-year-old William Coombs. It was the third such institution of its kind, soon replicated around the country. Although used as an alternative to the criminal system, it is clear that it housed youth in need. Records indicate that of the 117 children at Philadelphia’s House of Refuge, “41 had lost their fathers, 19 their mothers and 27 were orphans.” Notes from the records describe many parents still living as “worse than none, being intemperate and careless.”

The primary focus of the House of Refuge was ensuring children did not fall into idleness. Work hours ranged from six and a half to eight and a half per day. Schooling was secondary, with three and a half hours of instruction per day. Free laborers complained to the Philadelphia House of Refuge about the sale of the children’s labor because they found it difficult to compete against the “injuriously” low wages. Meanwhile, born out of the need for funding, the Philadelphia House of Refuge and its successor Glen Mills continuously operated as private institutions receiving public funds.

As states increasingly invested in institutions as the solution to various social welfare problems, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision of Ex Parte Crouse in 1838 was instrumental in establishing the state’s power to confine children.

Mary Ann Crouse was sent to the Philadelphia House of Refuge by her mother because her
“vicious conduct . . . rendered her control beyond [her mother’s] power.”72 Outraged, Mary’s father challenged the constitutionality of her detention without a court order. The court refused to release Mary Ann, stating, “The House of Refuge is not a prison, but a school.”73 The ruling implied that youth might fare better under state supervision than the supervision of “unworthy” parents.74 “The court then introduced the doctrine of parens patriae, giving states legal authority to determine the fate of children and families that came to its attention.”75

One commentator recalled children at the Philadelphia House of Refuge selling the flowers through the windows to those passing by: “It was a sad sight—free children on the one side and the imprisoned ones, of the same age, in their coarse clothing, on the other. And yet here was a growth from the old times of dungeons and underground cells, of cruelty and inhumanity.”76 Placement at institutions like the House of Refuge was initially off-limits to Black children. But in 1850, the Philadelphia House of Refuge created a separate department for children of color. When admitted, “Black children … were, on average, one-and-a-half to two years younger” than their white peers, and “endur[ed] longer sentences and harsher treatment.”77 Black children “also suffered a disproportionately high death rate and, upon discharge, . . . [were provided] fewer opportunities for advancement.”78

Elisha Swinney, superintendent of the colored department at the House of Refuge in Philadelphia, explained, “In this department, we have difficulties to meet that are not found among the White children … We cannot say, you may attain to such a high calling or position in life; to that of a physician, lawyer, legislator, governor…. There are few opportunities given them whereby they might prove themselves.”79

Recognizing the limitations and disparities, Black women at the time began to organize to develop alternatives.80 For example, Frances Joseph-Gaudet established the first kindergarten for Black children in 1899.81 Frances also led the movement to set up the first juvenile court in New Orleans.82

At around the same time that houses of refuge appeared in northern cities, other types of institutional placements for youth were also being developed—for a very different purpose. In 1819, the Civilization Act Fund established Indian boarding schools, institutions intended to “save” indigenous children from genocidal westward expansion through forced assimilation.83

The first and most famous of these off-reservation boarding schools was the Carlisle School in Pennsylvania, established in 1879 by Captain Richard Pratt. Pratt, whose infamous motto was “kill the Indian, save the man,” felt it necessary to remove children from the reservation to destroy their knowledge of their native language and traditions, which he believed would otherwise hinder their assimilation into the white culture.84

Between 1860 and 1978, countless indigenous youth were ripped from their families and placed in 357 known Indian boarding schools.85 Survivors recounted a “culture of pervasive physical and sexual abuse” and scarce food and medical attention, and many students died.86

“Almost immediately our names were changed to those in common use in the English language … I was told to take a pointer and select a name for myself from the list written on the blackboard. I did, and since one was just as good as another, as I could not distinguish any difference in them, I placed the pointer on the name Luther.” —Luther Standing Bear, My People, the Sioux, 1928, concerning his first experiences at Carlisle Indian Industrial School in 1879.87

Institutional settings for youth perceived as having a disability also became prevalent during this era. One example is the Whitter state school in southern California, which experimented with an early form of predictive analytics to differentiate between “normal” youth and “feeble-minded” youth. Mexican children were disproportionally labeled feeble-minded, justifying institutional confinement and even sterilization.88 While the rise of institutional settings dominated this era, it was not the only reform that took hold.

In the 1870s alone, there were between 20,000 to
30,000 homeless children. Many of the children were Irish, Italian, and other Southern or Eastern European immigrants and whom the courts had not yet racialized as “white.” These children “begged outright or perform[ed] small services like shining shoes and selling newspapers” and “were often arrested for vagrancy or petty theft.”

Charles Loring Brace, a wealthy white philanthropist, argued that sending the children into the heartland of the United States would expose them to “the civilizing influences of American life.” More than altruism, Brace was motivated by the fear that these children could cause societal upheavals like the revolutionary uprisings that were breaking down class barriers in Europe.

Accordingly, Brace classified these children as part of the “dangerous class.” Brace formed the Children's Aid Society (“the society”). In 1854, with funding from New York’s wealthiest families, Brace and other organizers began gathering children and sending them west. Between 1854 and the 1930s, the Children's Aid Society “emigrated” over 200,000 children on “orphan trains.” However, not all children sent on orphan trains were orphans. For example, Hazelle Latimer recounted:

I'd just finished eating, and this matron came by and tapped us along the head. “You're going to Texas. You're going to Texas.” When she came to me, I looked up. I said, “I can't go. I'm not an orphan. My mother's still living. She's in a hospital right here in New York.” “You're going to Texas.” No use arguing.

Once at their destination, the society would take children to large public gatherings, where potential adoptive parents would inspect and select a child (or children) to take home (with the explicit expectation that the children would work). As one flyer said: “They may be taken at first upon trial for four weeks, and afterward, if all the parties are satisfied, under indenture — girls until 18 and boys until 21 years of age.”

In their annual reports, the Children's Aid Society “highlighted the productive capacity of the children,” including accolades such as “the child does nearly as much as a man” and “was earning his keep.”

The best of all Asylums for the outcast child is the farmer's home,” Brace wrote. Brace called the orphan trains “Emigration as a cure for Pauperism.” In his memoir, Brace wrote that “[t]he demand labor on this land is beyond any present supply,” and since farmers needed every set of hands they could find, he felt it made sense to send children west instead of locking them up on the East Coast. Brace’s cause received support from abolitionists who “saw this ‘free labor’ of children as a donation to the cause of ‘freedom’ in the fight against slave labor in the West.”
By the turn of the 20th Century, a new "progressive" era was underway, one marked by ambitious—but incomplete and inequitable—reform. There were two primary shifts during this period. First, there was the growth and formalization of child-serving systems. Second, there was a growing concern about the treatment of white children in institutions and a focus on child well-being.

The rapid growth of formalization, regulation, and oversight for child-serving systems marked the first quarter of the twentieth century. In 1885, the practice of "placing out," or placing children in families rather than institutions, started to be regulated. Pennsylvania passed the first child welfare licensing law, making it a misdemeanor "to care for two or more unrelated children without a license."107 In 1899, Julia Lathrop and Lucy Flowers, two white women, drafted "An Act for the Treatment and Control of Dependent, Neglected and Delinquent Children."108 The Illinois Act109 established the world's first juvenile court, which opened on July 3, 1899, in Chicago, Illinois, to address "the child's need and not the deed."110 The Act also clearly defined when to classify children as dependent (neglected) and delinquent.111

By 1912, 22 states had created youth courts, and the federal government established the Children's Bureau.112 Although due process issues plagued the early juvenile courts in general (they were later referred to as a "kangaroo court" by the U.S. Supreme Court),113 white children were given access to a modern courtroom with a juvenile court judge presiding.114 However, the emerging notions of justice, including due process, and well-being, were rarely and unevenly available to Black children.115 The physical conditions of youth facilities vividly demonstrate the disparities in youth "justice."116 For example, in Tennessee, "[w]hite facilities were rich with resources, including . . . several classrooms for educational and vocational training, a gymnasium, a garden, housing, and more."117 The facility for Black children, however, "was a small cottage devoid of resources."118

As the reliance on youth facilities grew, so did the reports of abuse and maltreatment and calls for reform. By 1910, there were more than 1000 youth facilities in the United States, and "their average size had grown considerably."119 However, partly through increasingly available data demonstrating that orphanages and other institutions "sickened and killed alarming numbers of children," the understanding spread that "a poor home is often better than a good institution."120 The first White House Conference on Children and Youth, convened in 1909, focused on the harms of institutional placement for children.121 This trend was part of a growing consensus recognizing child maltreatment as a social problem that needed to be addressed by social welfare, such as support for families, particularly widows and single mothers.122

The violence and exploitation Black children endured and their impact on Black families spurred early reform efforts, led primarily by Black women, referred to as the "black child-saving movement."123 Julia Britton Hooks, an African American musical prodigy known as the "Angel of Beale Street," was a prominent movement member.124 In an influential essay, Hooks wrote: "There is in every child [this] divine principle awaiting development, [this] precious germ awaiting unfolding."125 At the first national meeting in 1899 of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, a presentation on "The convict Lease System as It Affects Child Nature" had a "profound impression on the over one hundred delegates representing forty-six clubs from sixteen states."126 M. Louise Jenkins, a prominent Atlanta club member, described the movement as "a struggle to 'save black children from the slavery of an iniquitous justice system.'"127
The racist origins, reliance on institutions, and uneven reforms of the youth-focused systems are all still with us. Youth—still predominately youth of color—are sent to institutional placements, are still subject to horrific abuses and maltreatment behind closed doors and are still ignored or silenced by the systems intended to support them. An in-depth look at Pennsylvania’s experience with institutional placements shows the cyclical nature of abuse in facilities and the urgency of reforms that allow youth in these facilities to speak out and be heard.

On October 13, 2016, David Hess was murdered at Wordsworth Academy in West Philadelphia, a residential facility for children in foster care. Before losing consciousness, David, a 17-year-old Black child, was violently punched in the ribs while one staff held his legs and another put him in a headlock with a forearm on his neck. Using their foot, one employee attempted chest compressions. David died later that night. In the ten years preceding David Hess’ murder, police were summoned to Wordsworth more than 800 times. A Philadelphia Inquirer investigation “revealed at least 49 sex crimes had been reported at Wordsworth in the last decade, including a dozen rapes and 23 accounts of sexual abuse.”

Between 2017 and 2018, ChildLine—Pennsylvania’s child abuse reporting hotline—received 18 reports of abuse at South Mountain, a secure facility for justice-involved youth. One such complaint came from a nurse who reported several injuries, including bruising, bleeding, facial fracture, slurred speech, and dizziness, that resulted from a restraint. According to a subsequent lawsuit filed by Disability Rights Pennsylvania, the youth said no one spoke to him to investigate the complaint. The court returned him to the same facility under the care of staff members who had put him into the hospital. Such incidents were far from isolated; the lawsuit alleges widespread staff abuse, escalation, instigation, intimidation, and failure to keep youth safe. Yet, according to Pennsylvania’s Department of Human Services, at the time, each report of abuse was determined to be “unfounded.”

On August 31, 2018, The Philadelphia Inquirer reported on an incident of staff abuse at Glen Mills School—the modern incarnation of the original Philadelphia House of Refuge. The Inquirer reported that a 6-plus foot tall, 280-pound counselor at the school picked up 17-year-old A.W. “by the neck of his sweater, lifted him clear over the back of a couch, and slammed his body onto the floor. Two other counselors held the boy’s legs down while [the counselor] choked him with his sweater and punched him in the chin.” Glen Mills called it an “isolated incident.” “We immediately self-reported an isolated incident involving staff that did not uphold our stringent ethical standards and protocols,” said the executive director in an emailed statement. Then Philadelphia DHS Commissioner Cynthia Figueroa commended Glen Mills leadership’s “100 percent ownership and accountability.”

Six months later, the Inquirer unveiled 40 years of evidence of abuse. Concluding the Glen Mills School “failed to protect the youth entrusted to its care, placed youth at risk of serious physical injury, permitted youth to sustain physical injuries by their acts and failure to act and … engages in a culture that instills fear in youth through coercion and intimidation.” In addition to prevalent and persistent abuse, Glen Mills routinely denied youth their right to an education. Following those revelations, the state finally revoked the facility’s license.
In August 2020, the Inquirer again exposed 25 years of abuse, this time at Devereux, a facility for youth with behavioral health challenges. Their investigation identified 41 children who had been raped or sexually assaulted by Devereux staff members; some of the children were as young as 12, and some had IQs as low as 50. One lawsuit alleges that, although children often complained to Devereux staffers or social workers, their complaints were either ignored or put them at further risk of harm. In one horrific instance, a female resident, age 14, was sexually assaulted by her roommate. When she reported the abuse to a Devereux staffer, the staff punished her for “complaining” by raping her in solitary confinement. Afterward, they returned her to the room with her abusive roommate.

“These incidents are heartbreaking and unacceptable,” said Deveraux in a company statement; “Every provider in the field must deal with the issue of employees who, despite thorough training, support, and supervision, do the wrong thing in complicated situations.”

Public examples of abuse must be seen within the larger context rather than idiosyncratic or merely the fault of any individual “bad actor” or “bad factor.” Children in institutions are regularly and routinely subject to abuse, neglect, and educational deprivation. Juvenile Law Center’s Youth Advocate Program’s (YA) Youth Advocates have repeatedly shared stories of being taken from their family, community peers, and support networks and being violated, restrained, abused, and isolated without access to appropriate educational services from an array of Pennsylvania institutional placements. They shared their stories in the hope of making a difference. One report, Broken Bridges, inspired me to pursue this project. I have included several youth advocate insights from YA’s extensive advocacy publications and testimony.

“I believe that we don’t need generation after generation to fall apart due to a broken system, so it is important for us to share our testimonies to fix the damaged system,” said Alex, Youth Advocate. Keema wrote, “I want people to get a visual of what’s happening in the system and better understand the perspectives of the kids that have been through care because there’s so many different experiences and it’s important to know each story. I wish I had the help that was supposed to be given.”

1.2.2 Law and Policy

The Pennsylvania dependency and delinquency courts place youth in many types of institutional placements, licensed under the same regulations. The regulations require private facilities to comply, while state-run facilities are trusted to comply voluntarily. Examples of regulated facilities include group homes, residential treatment facilities, inpatient mental health service facilities, and secure residential facilities (which are similar to a youth prison). Pennsylvania has five state-run facilities: three youth development centers (YDCs) and two youth forestry camps (YFCs). Counties can contract with
“Grievance protections” are the set of mechanisms designed to allow the full expression of children’s rights; specifically educating youth on their rights, supplying an effective process to assert their rights, and ensuring that their rights are protected.

In 2019, Pennsylvania placed over 12% of youth in a congregate setting upon first entering the foster care system and over 25% of youth in institutions upon reentry. On September 30, 2019, over 1,700 Pennsylvania foster children lived in 506 residential facilities run by various legal entities. Black children were placed in foster care over two and half times over their rate in the general population.

In 2018, Pennsylvania courts ordered 7,623 secure detention admissions and 2,965 delinquency placements. A 2020 Pennsylvania juvenile justice task force documented disproportionate placement rates and duration, particularly for Black, non-Hispanic youth. Black, non-Hispanic males spent the longest time under court supervision, 42 months on average, compared to 38 months on average for all children.

Institutional care is expensive. Juvenile Law Center Staff Attorney, Malik Pickett, recounting the data findings for the Pennsylvania Juvenile Task Force, wrote that “in 2019, juvenile detention … was the most expensive service type, with an annual cost of $220,193 per youth.” The second was “[s]tate-run facilities (YDCs/YFCs) [with] an average yearly price of $193,720 per youth.” Private, secure residential facilities averaged $125,842, and other non-secure private facilities averaged $107,468 per youth yearly. In 2019, Pennsylvania spent 80% (approximately $281 million) of their total juvenile delinquency expenditure ($349 million) on private and state-run out-of-home placements. Pennsylvania spent the remaining 20% (roughly $68 million) on in-home services that would allow youth to remain in their communities.

Despite Pennsylvania’s significant investment in institutional placements, it has not similarly invested in ensuring that young people have an avenue to speak out and be heard about their treatment at these facilities. Pennsylvania’s youth grievance protections primarily trust the individual facilities to self-regulate.

Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (DHS) also has a child abuse reporting hotline, Child Line. This hotline receives reports of abuse from all mandated reporters, as well as concerned citizens. However, ChildLine has been ineffective at investigating DHS and its subcontractors. Pennsylvania DHS had reports of abuse from each of these facilities. Although it had more access, opportunity, and obligation to investigate the facilities thoroughly, it took external oversight and transparency through damning media coverage before our children were removed from these facilities. Our children deserve better. As Estelle Richman, co-chair of Philadelphia’s task force to address issues in youth institutional placements and former Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, said, “the Philadelphia Inquirer should not be our ombudsperson.”

---

*“Grievance protections” are the set of mechanisms designed to allow the full expression of children’s rights; specifically educating youth on their rights, supplying an effective process to assert their rights, and ensuring that their rights are protected.*
Unchecked, recurrent, or systemic maltreatment in facilities is not unique to Pennsylvania. In 2011, No Place for Kids, a groundbreaking report by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, detailed, clear evidence of decades of widespread maltreatment in state youth correctional facilities. It identified 52 lawsuits since 1970 that resulted in a court-sanctioned remedy to systemic problems with violence, physical or sexual abuse by facility staff, and excessive use of isolation or physical restraints. In an update four years later, the Foundation found “a flood of new revelations of abuse and maltreatment.” An extensive survey or update like No Place for Kids is beyond the scope of this report.

However, I have included a brief overview of news coverage of abuses across the country. Media has served as a necessary, albeit insufficient, oversight mechanism over facilities, with news sources, not state-regulated oversight processes, unveiling facilities’ egregious instances of abuse. However, news media coverage is inherently episodic. Occasional and intermittent exposure of individual instances of abuse or violent facilities captures attention momentarily without examining the national and historic pattern of abuse in facilities and interlocking oppressions endured by youth that amplifies harm. Relying on media alone allows the malignancy of racial disparities, abuse, and mistreatment in facilities to flourish.

Librarian Mary Jo Vortkamp compiled an extensive search, although not exhaustive, of national news coverage on instances of abuses in facilities between 2017 to 2020. Her review uncovered reports of abuses in fifty-five facilities, both private and state-run, in forty-four different states. She also found seven lawsuits or official reports detailing pervasive statewide maltreatment of youth in institutional care. Reflecting on her research, Vortkamp wrote: “As this database was developed, more and more articles continued to appear across the country. Incidents like this are probably happening in a town near you.” Cases she uncovered included:

---

9 Mary Jo Vortkamp is a Children’s Librarian, community connector and children’s advocate in Detroit, Michigan. A native of Detroit she holds a Bachelor of Arts in English and a Master’s Degree in Library and Information Science. She works with many local organizations and youth in her day job as a Children’s Librarian for the Detroit Public Library. In addition, she is a founding board member and Board Chair of the Detroit Phoenix Center, a Detroit nonprofit organization that “provides critical resources, support and a safe, nurturing and inclusive environment to high risk and homeless youth in Detroit.” DETROIT PHOENIX Center, http://www.detroitphoenixcenter.org/ (last visited June 15, 2021). She continues the proud tradition of working with youth that she inherited from her family and community growing up. mary313franklin@gmail.com.

10 Research method: Searched newspaper source plus database for juvenile detention and various synonyms from 2017 to 2020. For states where nothing was found, searched Google for Juvenile Detention and abuse and broadened searches out from there if nothing was found. Articles were then copied in case they disappeared, or the reader did not have access to the database. Note: the time range 2017 to 2020 is referencing article publication date, and therefore some articles referenced incidents of abuses that occurred outside of this range.
• Sixteen-year-old Gynna McMillen died alone, in isolation, after six employees failed to check on her and falsified reports to show otherwise.\textsuperscript{183} A report following Gynna’s death by the Center for Children’s Law and Policy excoriated Kentucky’s “near-total absence of mental health care in the detention centers; chronic staff shortages and inadequate employee training;” extensive use of room isolation; “a lack of special education for youths with learning disabilities;” and “few opportunities for residents to file grievances that could reveal abuses.”\textsuperscript{184}

• In Michigan, Cornelius Fredericks died after at least seven male staff members sat or laid on his chest for nearly 12 minutes.\textsuperscript{185} The restraint was in response to Fredericks purportedly throwing a sandwich in the cafeteria.\textsuperscript{186}

• Over 400 complaints were received in ten years regarding a single South Dakota facility.\textsuperscript{187} One state report noted that youth placed at the facility were physically restrained an average of 150 times per month over three months, an average of 5 physical restraints per day.\textsuperscript{188}

• One Sequel facility in Kansas became covered in graffiti after shutting down, hinting at the horrors that happened behinds its walls: “Pray for victims,” “We want justice,” “Rape School,” “Youth were abused here...systematically (sexually) (and mental).”\textsuperscript{189}

• In Alabama, now-retired police captain Charles Kennedy received desperate notes from boys at a local facility, “some scribbled on tiny pieces of scrap paper;” one said that staff “treat us like dogg’s plz make this stop before it’s to LATE!!”\textsuperscript{190} After the facility operator fled Alabama amid allegations of abuse, he set up facilities in Missouri and Texas. Kennedy said: “It’s like whack-a-mole. They’ll pack up and run before anybody can do anything because they know they can’t withstand an investigation.”\textsuperscript{191} Four years later, the facilities were shut down, and the operators were charged with human trafficking.\textsuperscript{192} Kennedy is now fighting for expanded oversight measures to keep children safe.\textsuperscript{193}

• In Montana, Disability Rights Montana reported excessive use of isolation, citing one 17-year-old child who spent 99 days in solitary confinement in less than a year, with the longest stretch lasting 71 days straight.\textsuperscript{194}

• A facility in New Mexico, housing children as young as seven, shut down after accusations of failing to protect youth from physical and sexual abuse by staff and other youth. Reports cited “internal fight clubs” and a rampant spread of HIV among staff and children.\textsuperscript{195}

• One facility in Alaska had a 15% rate of sexual victimization\textsuperscript{11} (predominately perpetrated by staff\textsuperscript{196}). “What's surprising is how many kids were saying these things were happening without us knowing it,” said a facility superintendent. One supervising officer was found guilty on seven counts of sexual abuse, as well as solicitation.\textsuperscript{197}

• In Washington, a lawsuit details a “culture of sexually inappropriate behavior by both guards and staff,”\textsuperscript{198} with “[r]etaliation and suppression of complaints … common.”\textsuperscript{199} Staff “actively attempted to prevent” a child “from making [a] complaint, including refusing to allow [him] to call the PREA hotline number.”\textsuperscript{200} Other staff “refused to submit his reports.”\textsuperscript{201}

• In California DJJ, ombudsperson outreach data revealed a concerningly low number of staff complaints at one facility, O.H. Close, given the large population and high rates of “violence, injuries, and use of force” at the facility. The resulting investigation found two practices silencing youth grievances. First, the facility printed staff misconduct grievance forms in a different color from the standard grievance form (blue vs. white), “making it easily distinguishable from afar, including the distance from the guard station to the grievance form box.”\textsuperscript{203}

\textsuperscript{11} The Alaskan facility, McLaughlin Youth Center’s 15% sexual victimization rate, was slightly above the 12% national rate for similar facilities. Lisa Demer, 1 in 7 Kids Report Sex Abuse at McLaughlin, ANCHORAGE DAILY NEWS (Sept. 29, 2016), https://www.adn.com/alaska-news/article/1-7-kids-report-sex-abuse-mclaughlin/2010/01/08/.
02. YOUTH GRIEVANCE PROTECTIONS

The persistence of youth abuse, mistreatment, and rights violations in institutions vividly proves the need for system transformation. One piece of that reform effort—and the focus of this report—is developing adequate grievance protections for youth in institutions. This Section explains what grievance protections are (and why they are essential) and analyzes the existing grievance protections in each state and the District of Columbia. I organize my analysis around three core components critical to adequate youth-centered grievance protection. Specifically: (1) see youth, (2) hear youth, and (3) protect youth.

An adequate grievance protection is a set of mechanisms designed to allow the full expression of children’s rights, explicitly educating youth on their rights, supplying an effective process to assert and protect their rights. In this way, grievance protections are a vehicle for youth legal empowerment. Youth legal empowerment can lessen the oppression incurred through system involvement and begin to return agency to youth. “Timely and meaningful” youth participation can help “build resilience and competencies in children and support several developmental processes.”209 “Resilience is the product of agency: knowing that what you do can make a difference.”210 At their best, youth-centered grievance protections do just that by empowering youth “to challenge abusive behaviour and protect themselves.”211 But that is rarely the experience of children encaged by our delinquency or dependency systems. And what happens after a youth tries to report abuse, mistreatment, or discontent leaves a lasting impact.

At the outset, it is important to note that grievance protections alone—while necessary and the focus of this report—are by no means sufficient to protect the safety and well-being of our children in state custody. One essential precondition for an adequate grievance protection is the existence of underlying substantive rights. For example, without an underlying right to be safe from abuse or neglect, the right to file a grievance will do little to interrupt the violence youth experience. So, although not discussed in depth in this report, the need for substantive rights cannot be overstated.12 The limited focus of this report excludes the consideration of youth in adult facilities or immigration detention. Youth held these facilities are, at times, at even greater risk of harm and must be specifically considered and protected. Similarly, youth involved with the dependency or delinquency system outside institutions, such as youth in foster homes, kinship care, or probation, recount experiencing similar abuses to children in facilities, with less oversight and opportunities to report the abuse. This mirrors my experiences. Although not specifically discussed, the absence of youth-centered protections is harmful to youth involved with any system.

---

12 For an example of the complicated and intersecting rights that system involved youth may have, please see Juvenile Law Center’s Know Your Rights Guide, for youth involved with the dependency system. Jennifer Pokempner, Know Your Rights Guide: Introduction and Chapter List, JUVENILE LAW CENTER, https://jlc.org/resources-know-your-rights-guide-introduction (last visited June 2, 2021).
As Duane, a youth advocate with Juvenile Law Center’s Youth Advocacy Program testified:

Even in foster homes, I was not heard. For example, my case manager came to my foster home; the foster parents wouldn’t allow me to speak to them. My case manager allowed them just to silence me. My foster parent said I could be lying or what I’m saying wasn’t probably accurate - so my case manager listened to the foster parents instead. I came out to talk to my caseworker, and my foster parent screamed and said, “No one asked you to come out of your room, so you better go back in your room, we will call you if we need you to say something.” My foster parent did that in my case manager’s presence, and she did not do anything about it or reach out to hear my side of the story. I didn’t even know that my case manager left because my foster parents did not call me out of my room. They didn’t hear both sides of the story—treated me like my voice wasn’t going to be heard - as if it wouldn’t make a difference if I said anything. I was not allowed to speak my mind or say what I had to say.212

My hope is that as more jurisdictions adopt adequate youth-centered grievance protections and more youth stories can break through the physical and psychological barriers to being heard, our collective moral imagination will sharpen; prompting a greater system reimagination—one that starts with those in need, youth themselves, showing us where to begin.
2.1 Youth Experiences

Youth advocates with Juvenile Law Center described the harmful effects of absent and inadequate grievance protections in testimony advocating for a Philadelphia youth ombuds to receive, investigate and respond to complaints of abuse, mistreatment, or other rights violations in institutional placements.

• Mark wrote: “To send in a grievance and get no response was definitely scary. It was really worrisome. It made me feel like this is what life was. At the moment it made me start to question things, made me start to just accept it in a way.”

• Duane’s written testimony read: “Being in the system at a young age, my voice was taken away. I was not heard. I was censored or shut down because of the experience that brought me into the system. We are children. We are youths. We have our moments. I did not know how to communicate my thoughts and feelings . . . . When I realized that no one was listening to me, I lost hope and was silent about it.”

• Keema wrote that after being harmed by an older foster sibling, “I didn’t say anything even though I knew what was going on, but I couldn’t do anything about it. I couldn’t open my mouth to get the words out because I had already experienced it and something in me just wouldn’t let me speak. Nobody knew what was going on, I never opened up about it because I didn’t have anybody who would listen. I wish I had someone to go to.”

These insights and experiences are far from isolated or abnormal. My sister was similarly silenced. Despite how strong and protective her voice was for me; it was powerless to protect her once behind institutional walls. Recently, the Young Women’s Freedom Center in California published an extraordinary report, Through Their Eyes. The report “illuminates the experiences of fifty-one system-impacted . . . youth,” using their revolutionary research method “Youth Participatory Action Research.”

The report is a resounding “call to action to abolish systems of harm and envision communities that nurture all young people.” A thread woven throughout the community experts’ experiences was not being heard, despite attempts to complain:

• I heard people say that no one believed them. People lodged complaints of abuse that occurred in group homes to their social workers. Nothing came of it. Others attempted to address the harassment they experienced while incarcerated. Nothing came of that. The adults around these young people did not take their disclosures seriously. No one attempted to interrupt the cycles of institutional violence these youth experienced, to protect the dignity of their childhood. Instead, they were criminalized and adultified.

13 Young Women’s Freedom Center is a leadership and advocacy organization led by system-involved cis and trans young women and girls, trans young men and boys and gender expansive youth of color who have grown up in poverty, worked in the underground street economy and have been criminalized by social services such as foster care, welfare and the mental health systems.”

14 The term Community Experts, used in place of “research participant” or “subject,” was created by Jocelyn Mati, a lead youth participatory action researcher at Young Women’s Freedom Center to emphasize the intellectual contributions of the people who shared their experiences. See ALEZANDRA MELENDREZ, YOUNG WOMEN’S FREEDOM CENTER, THROUGH THEIR EYES: STORIES OF REFLECTION, RESISTANCE, AND RESILIENCE ON JUVENILE INCARCERATION FROM SAN FRANCISCO CIS AND TRANS YOUNG WOMEN & GIRLS, TRANS YOUNG MEN & BOYS AND GENDER EXPANSIVE


15  Young Women’s Freedom Center is “a leadership and advocacy organization led by system-involved cis and trans young women and girls, trans young men and boys and gender expansive youth of color who have grown up in poverty, worked in the underground street economy and have been criminalized by social services such as foster care, welfare and the mental health systems.”

ALEZANDRA MELENDREZ, YOUNG WOMEN’S FREEDOM CENTER, THROUGH THEIR EYES: STORIES OF REFLECTION, RESISTANCE, AND RESILIENCE ON JUVENILE INCARCERATION FROM SAN FRANCISCO CIS AND TRANS YOUNG WOMEN & GIRLS, TRANS YOUNG MEN & BOYS AND GENDER EXPANSIVE
International law makes clear the obligation on legal systems to take the concerns and views of youth seriously. Unfortunately, the United States has failed to ratify the treaty that sets forth a comprehensive framework on the fundamental rights of children, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). The CRC is one of the most ratified human rights treaties in history, with 196 signatories; the United States is the only U.N. country missing. Article 12 of the CRC recognizes children’s “right to express their views and have them taken seriously in accordance with their age and maturity.” At the time of implementation, Article 12 prompted concerns from members: “children lack competence; they lack knowledge and judgement; involving them in decisions is to place too heavy a burden on them; . . . giving children a voice will lead to excessive demands, bad behavior, disrespect for elders; participation will expose children to risk of harm.” Once enacted; however, countries abiding by the treaty have found the opposite, and have realized that “children – even very young children – given the time and opportunity, demonstrate not only that they have views, experiences, and perspectives to express, but that their expression can contribute positively to decisions that affect the realization of their rights and wellbeing.”

In other words, when we give children space, time, and opportunity to speak, they can, and creating that space for them to speak helps keep youth safe and well.

Under U.S. law, youth struggle to have their right to be heard recognized. Although the United States Constitution and state law impose affirmative duties of care and protection upon states that extend to youth in institutional placements, the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA) severely limits youth’s abilities to enforce those rights. The PLRA requires any individual to “exhaust” administrative remedies before they can file a claim in federal court. This administrative exhaustion requirement means that if the youth do not follow all the technical requirements of the grievance process used by their institution, they risk having their case dismissed entirely. Indeed, that is what happened to a child in Texas who was sexually assaulted; a youth in Kentucky who staff hit, shocked with a stun gun, and then led down the hall by his testicles; and a “North Dakota youth who was beaten with ‘padlock-laden socks;’ suffered a seizure, deprived of medical care, and then beaten again and raped.” The PLRA also “limit[s] the type of relief youth can get from the courts for injuries in . . . facilities; prevent[s] youth from bringing lawsuits for emotional injuries without physical injuries; and limit[s] attorneys’ fees,” creating barriers for young people seeking attorneys to represent them.
The PLRA exacerbates the stiff obstacles youth already face to enforcing their rights under states’ onerous, unprotective, and ineffective grievance procedures. Grievance protections for youth in institutions, where they exist, can be found in code, regulations, administrative guidance, agency policies, or some mixture. My research is limited to state codes, regulations, and administrative guidance. I have excluded dependency and delinquency agency policy from the scope of my research. I made this decision because of the lack of independence and changeability of agency policies. The risk of maltreatment and impact of harm on youth necessitates clear and codified protections. States generally govern youth grievance protections based on which system (delinquency or dependency) has placed the child in the facility. However, some states jointly regulate or have a mix of joint and separate regulations. Other states use an ombuds or another type of central reporting office in addition to or in place of grievance protections. An independent ombuds with the power to investigate youth grievances, enforce youth rights, and publicly report on rights violations can be a vital part of youth-centered grievance protections. However, a complete analysis of youth ombuds offices is beyond the scope of this report. In short, current state grievance policies—which I describe in depth below—are complex and inadequate. As a result, the system deprives youth of meaningful processes to express themselves and shuts youth out of federal court under the PLRA when they “fail” to exhaust their available remedies.

At the federal level, the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) is the closest thing to a grievance protection for youth in institutional placements. PREA was enacted to “provide for the analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape in federal, state, and local institutions and to provide information, resources, recommendations, and funding to protect individuals from prison rape.” In 2012, as required under the Act, the Department of Justice set out national standards to help prevent sexual abuse, protect individuals in institutions, and create procedures to report sexual abuse. PREA has improved youth awareness of their right to sexual safety and has increased reporting of sexual mistreatment. However, it has not meaningfully reduced sexual abuse of youth in institutions. There is no definitive reason why PREA has been unable to effectively reduce sexual violence in youth facilities, although there are many explanations. For example, it does not meet the core components described in further detail below. Specifically, there was no record of youth inclusion in the design of orientation, reporting, or investigative responses. PREA limits its scope to only one type of abuse, sexual violence. It also delegates the investigative processes, a vitally important component of youth-centered grievance protections, to agencies and facilities themselves.

Without a broad overarching framework for either rights or grievance protections, some of our most vulnerable youth are left with a complicated patchwork of intersecting Federal, State, and local laws. These laws exist ostensibly to protect youths’ rights, but in effect, create an echo chamber that leaves children screaming into the void: unseen, unheard, and unprotected.
2.3 Core Components of Grievance Protections

Our current systems and structures of oversight disempower youth, hide abuse, and protect facilities from liability. “Children have very specific differing needs from adults when it comes to complaints mechanisms,” so youth grievance protections must be “youth-centered.” Youth in these systems are particularly vulnerable and face unique challenges voicing their concerns because of the inherent vulnerability of childhood and a multitude of intersecting identities around race, gender, sexual orientation, and trauma histories that heighten and complicate vulnerability.

What does it mean for a grievance protection to be youth-centered? A significant focus of my project was trying to define exactly that. When I began, I consulted with Anthony and Anahi, two expert youth advocates with Juvenile Law Center’s Youth Advocacy Program. Anthony and Anahi both provided invaluable insight into the creation of this report. One insight from Anahi stood out: what youth need the most is to be seen, heard, and protected. This insight helped shape the organizational framework of my research and led me to discover New Zealand’s comprehensive review of youth voice in child complaint protections. New Zealand’s review details the key elements of a “child centered” complaint mechanism developed from an international literature review and in-depth discussions with youth. New Zealand’s key elements are: (1) awareness; (2) “accessibility, including the provision of advocacy services”; (3) timeliness; (4) “problem solving approach and perspective”; (5) “fair and transparent administration”; and (6) “quality assurance and accountability.”

16 Anthony Simpson has been an advocate with Advocates Transforming Youth Systems (ATYS), a project of Juvenile Law Center, for five years where he advocated for policy reform for youth who have had experience in the child welfare system. He most recently served as the Youth Advocacy Alumni Fellow where he worked to increase youth participation in dependency court hearings and improve permanency and educational outcomes for older youth in foster care. He has spoken nationally on these issues, publishing numerous op-eds and has spoken across the country. He was the recipient of the Pennsylvania’s Statewide Adoption Network’s 2018 Youth Advocacy Award; this award recognizes an individual in the state of Pennsylvania who is a current or former youth in foster care who has raised awareness about the challenges of foster care. Anthony is also a performing artist and uses his music as an outlet for expression and advocacy. He serves as a member of the Philly Homes 4 Youth Coalition to End Youth Homelessness in the city of Philadelphia and the Pride Task Force at Valley Youth House.

What truly sparks his inspiration to continue to do this work is the resilience that he not only had to exemplify but also saw in a growing number of other young leaders formally involved in the juvenile justice or child welfare systems. They continually echoed the sentiment of change he sought on a foundational level to truly make youth-centered systems work, to bring young people home and in communities, and to keep them safe and make sure they have a support system they can depend on.

17 Anahi Figueroa been an advocate with Advocates Transforming Youth Systems (ATYS) for five years where she advocated for policy reform with other youth who have had experience. Anahi was an author of the Broken Bridges report, and has spoken nationally on issues facing youth in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems, and currently advocates for policy change with the Care Not Control committee, John Hopkins committee, and Juvenile Law Center’s Alumni Speakers Bureau. Anahi hopes that her advocacy will make life a little bit easier for children touched by these systems.
Based on my review of New Zealand’s research and experience, my conversations with youth, first-hand accounts from news articles and reports, my analysis of grievance protections across the country (including a brief overview of ombuds programs and standards), and my own experiences in foster care, I developed three core components of “youth-centered” grievance protections. The components are:

1. **See Youth**: youth must be provided with an inclusive comprehension and skill-based orientation.

2. **Hear Youth**: youth must be provided with several methods of raising concerns to a trusted evaluation process that is responsive to youth in emergencies and provides help as needed and requested.

3. **Protect Youth**: youth must have a broad right to grievance protections; youth rights must be enforced through an independent, external entity empowered to ensure accountability and transparency.

In this section, I describe what each of these components means and analyze the extent to which they are reflected in current state law and policy. My aim in cataloging existing state regulations is to expose the harmful deficiencies in current grievance protections and supply examples and a framework from which advocates can begin developing state-specific youth-centered grievance protections. For this reason, I have included a youth-design curriculum in the appendix. I hope policy makers and advocates will use the curriculum to answer the many unanswered questions throughout the core components. For example: How often is repetitious? What does “understandable” mean? What is a good grievance protection? The answer is it depends. Youth-centered grievance protections must center youth and their experience.

The best way to proactively overcome the marginalization of various intersecting identities and experiences is to meaningfully center a diverse group of youth, with a variety of lived experiences, in the design of the orientation and processes to assert their rights. I hope this report can be a tool for advocates to discover and design effective solutions in community with local youth advocates so that grievance protections center the myriad of unique strengths and vulnerabilities of your communities' children.
Youth must be provided with an inclusive comprehension- and skill-based orientation.

Youth-centered grievance protections must: (1) ensure youth are educated about their rights and grievance protections and (2) confirm youth understand those rights and grievance protections. To effectively educate youth on their rights and grievance protections, states must consider both the ubiquitous and unique characteristics of youth in care when developing notification requirements. Adolescent brain science, learning theory, and the growing research on trauma imply that youth are best able to process and retain information when it is shared repeatedly, in various ways, by someone they trust, in a place they feel safe. For example, a repeated skills-based orientation, providing written and oral instructions, by a trusted and supportive adult, with examples of issues that could arise, can help youth engage with and process information that might otherwise be intimidating.

The who, when, what, where, and how children are notified must be thoughtfully considered and regulated. However, most states delegate key considerations of educating youth about their rights and grievance protections. Most often, notification on youths’ rights and grievance protections occur “at” or “upon” admission. Providing this information only at admission is insufficient. It does not consider either the unique characteristics of youth or the traumatic experience of being separated from your family and community nor the magnitude of information youth are expected to process at admission. Therefore, youth-centered grievance protections must consider the timing, both when and how often, to educate youth on their rights. Ideally, notification of rights would occur before placement by a supportive adult in a safe environment, in addition to regular notifications after being placed. The information about the protections themselves must be easily understood by children with varying cultural backgrounds, gender identities, native languages, reading levels, and a spectrum of neurological and physical abilities, all of which affect how a youth receives, experiences, and processes information.

Some states supply vague grievance comprehension requirements, such as that youth grievance protections must be “age, and developmentally appropriate” or written in a “clear and simple manner.” Vague comprehension considerations are insufficient. The vulnerabilities our youth face necessitates specific and express considerations. For example, to ameliorate literacy or oral comprehension limitations, orientation must be provided in both verbal and written formats. It also must be provided in the youth-identified language of greatest fluency or comprehension. Finally, to monitor implementation and youth comprehension, youth grievance protections must require documentation of both a youth’s receipt of their rights and grievance protections and documenting youth’s understanding utilizing a skills-based evaluation tool.
(1.1) Notification Requirements

Two states grant youth in facilities the right to be notified about their rights and grievance protections.

- One state grants this right to youth in both systems: Nevada.\[239\]
  - Youth have the right to “receive information concerning [their] rights.”\[240\]
- One state grants youth this right in dependency: California.\[241\]
  - “To be informed, and to have his/her authorized representative, if any, informed, by the licensee of the provisions of law regarding complaints including, but not limited to, the address and telephone number of the complaint receiving unit of the licensing agency, and of information regarding confidentiality.”\[242\]

Thirty-eight jurisdictions require facilities to notify youth about their rights and grievance protections.

- Twenty-one states require notification in both systems: Colorado,\[243\] Delaware,\[244\] Florida,\[245\] Idaho,\[246\] Illinois,\[247\] Kansas,\[248\] Kentucky,\[249\] Louisiana,\[250\] Maine,\[251\] Michigan,\[252\] Montana,\[253\] New Hampshire,\[254\] New Jersey,\[255\] Ohio,\[256\] Oklahoma,\[257\] Oregon,\[258\] Pennsylvania,\[259\] Rhode Island,\[260\] Vermont,\[261\] Virginia,\[262\] West Virginia.\[263\]
- Ten jurisdictions require notification only in dependency: Arizona,\[264\] Maryland,\[265\] Minnesota,\[266\] North Carolina,\[267\] North Dakota,\[268\] South Carolina,\[269\] South Dakota,\[270\] Washington D.C.,\[271\] Wisconsin,\[272\] Wyoming.\[273\]
- Seven states require notification only in delinquency: Arkansas,\[274\] Indiana,\[275\] Iowa,\[276\] New Mexico,\[277\] New York,\[278\] Tennessee,\[279\] Texas.\[280\]

Whether youth have the right to be notified or facilities must notify youth, there are three methods of notification: oral, written, or both.

- Seventeen states require both oral and written notification in both systems: Florida,\[281\] Kansas,\[282\] Louisiana,\[283\] Michigan,\[284\] Nevada,\[285\] Pennsylvania,\[286\] Rhode Island.\[287\]
  - Florida requires staff to “explain the grievance process” and “post the written procedures throughout the facility for easy access by youth.”\[288\]
  - Michigan requires that the policy “be provided” and “be explained.”\[289\]
- Six jurisdictions require both oral and written notification only for dependency: California,\[290\] Kansas,\[291\] North Dakota,\[292\] Ohio,\[293\] Washington D.C.,\[294\] Wyoming.\[295\]
  - California requires each facility to provide an “orientation that includes an explanation of the rights of the child and addresses the child’s questions and concerns.”\[296\] Children, staff, and “authorized representatives . . . receive a copy of the procedures.”\[297\]
- Six states require both oral and written notification only for delinquency: Arkansas,\[298\] Idaho,\[299\] Oklahoma,\[300\] Texas,\[301\] Vermont,\[302\] Wisconsin.\[303\]
  - In Arkansas, youth and family members must “be informed” both “orally and in writing.”\[304\]
  - Idaho requires that the grievance protections be “explained” and included within youth handbooks.\[305\]

\[16\] Although I am not aware of any grievance rights comprehension assessment tool currently available, excellent scholarship has been developed around youth’s understanding of Miranda Rights, and supplies a foundation from which to build. See Dr. Naomi Goldstein’s work at Miranda Rights Research, JUV. JUST. RSCH. & REFORM LAB, http://www.jjrrlab.com/miranda-rights.html (last visited June 2, 2021).
Thirteen states require only written notification about their grievance protections.

- Four states require only written notification in both systems: Delaware, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Virginia.
  
  » New Hampshire requires that the grievance protections be “provided in the parent and youth handbooks.”
  
  » New Jersey dependency facilities must “prepare, post or give” all children the written grievance procedure. New Jersey delinquency requires that a “written copy of the facility’s rules and regulations shall be provided to each juvenile upon admission, including the grievance procedure.”
  
- Six states require only written notification for dependency: Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont.
  
  » Oklahoma dependency requires facilities to annually notify the child (and guardians when applicable) “in writing of the right to file a grievance and how to access the grievance resolution procedures.”
  
  » South Carolina facilities must post the grievance notification “in a conspicuous place.”
  
- Three states only require written notification for delinquency: Iowa, New York, West Virginia.
  
  » New York requires that “every youth shall be advised in writing as to the availability of grievance forms.”

There are three main ways in which youth receive written notification (whether alone or in addition to oral notification or explanation): (a) the information is posted; (b) the information is provided (either generally or specifically within the handbook), or (c) the information is made available for review.

**Posted**

- Three states require the information be posted in both systems: Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia.
  
- Five dependency systems require the information to be posted: California, Florida, Oregon, South Carolina, Washington D.C.
  
- Three delinquency systems require the information to be posted: Arkansas, New Hampshire, Texas.

**b. Provided**

- Four dependency systems require the information to be provided: Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, South Dakota.
  
- Two delinquency systems require the information to be provided: Idaho, Maine.

**c. Made Available**

- Five dependency systems require the information to be available: Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico.
  
- One delinquency system requires the information to be available: Montana.

**d. Combination**

- Two states require written notification to be given in multiple ways: Oklahoma, Nevada.
  
- One delinquency system requires written notification to be given in multiple ways: Kansas.

Six states regulate who must notify youth of their grievance protections.

- Three states have this for dependency: California, North Dakota, West Virginia.
  
  » California grants youth the right to be informed of these rights “by the social worker or probation officer.”
  
  » West Virginia dependency law requires the primary case manager to explain the processes to the youth and family.
  
- Three have this for delinquency: Florida, Idaho, Rhode Island.
  
  » Florida requires that an “admission officer . . . orient each youth by clearly communicating to the youth the rules of the center and expectation of behavior. Orientation shall include, at a minimum, the following: . . . 2. Grievance procedures.”
  
  » Rhode Island delinquency law requires that unit managers and social workers do the notification about the emergency grievance procedure process.
Twenty-six states regulate when to notify youth about their rights and grievance protections.

- Six states regulate this in both systems: Colorado, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, West Virginia.

- Eleven states have this for dependency: Arizona, California, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wyoming.


There are three general “times” when youth are notified: (a) only at or around orientation or admission, (b) before admission, or (c) repeatedly. I recommend all three, provide a complete orientation before placement, once in placement, and regularly throughout placement.

(a) Before Orientation

- Four states require this information to be provided at or before admission/orientation in dependency only: Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, North Dakota.

(b) Repeated

- Five dependency regulations require some measure of repetition: Arizona, California, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota.
  - California requires that youth be notified of their rights and grievance protections “at the time of placement, any placement change, and at least once every six months or at the time of a regularly scheduled contact with the social worker or probation officer.”
  - Oregon requires an annual review of youth rights and grievance protections.
- One delinquency regulation requires some measure of repetition: Indiana.
  - Indiana requires that the “department… periodically communicate” to the youth “the rules and policies affecting” them.

(c) Only at or around Orientation

- Four states require notification only around admission/orientation for both systems: Colorado, Pennsylvania, Vermont, West Virginia.

- Five dependency regulations require notification only around admission/orientation: Kentucky, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Wyoming.

- Ten delinquency regulations require notification only around admission/orientation: Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, Maine, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont.

Fifteen states have only vague notification requirements.

- Three states have only vague notification requirements in both systems: Kentucky, Maine, Montana.
  - Maine requires that youth “shall be informed” of the grievance protections.
- Five states have only vague notification requirements for dependency: Minnesota, Mississippi, South Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin.
  - Wisconsin dependency requires: “[a] method for informing clients and their guardians, parents, and advocates about the way grievances are presented and the process by which reviews of grievances are conducted.”

19 There are no states that require orientation before placement. Given the trauma and impact of being separated from your family, I highly recommend that states consider how to provide this information before placement. Ideally, this could occur over the course of a few days, in the child’s home, where they are given the chance to adjust to their upcoming separation from family, friends and community. However, even a few hours in a family-friendly conference room, where youth have a chance to process their upcoming incarceration could be a start.

20 By vague I mean the use of broad and unspecific language. Most often States used language such as: inform, develop instruction, “provide reasonable notification” (see also above examples). I also included states that require an “explanation” and “be available.” However, if a jurisdiction required an “explanation” in addition to any specific distribution method (e.g. posted, provided, handbooks, etc.), I included it under requiring both oral and written notification.
Washington requires the department to “develop procedures to assure that clients and foster parents are informed of the availability of the complaint resolution process and how to access it.”

- Seven have only vague notification requirements for delinquency: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee.

Ohio’s delinquency administrative code simply requires “notification of the grievance process.”

Fourteen states require proof of orientation or receipt of information.

- Three states require proof of orientation in both systems: Colorado, Idaho, Pennsylvania.
  
  Colorado requires facilities to document that orientation has been completed by “a statement signed and dated by the youth.”

- Ten jurisdictions require proof of orientation in dependency: Arizona, California, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, Washington D.C., West Virginia.
  
  California requires that “signed copies of such procedures shall be maintained in each child’s record.”

- One state requires proof of orientation in delinquency: Kansas.
  
  Kansas requires that “each offender shall sign a statement indicating that the required explanation has been given.”

(1.2) Comprehension Considerations

I analyzed two types of comprehension considerations. First, general considerations apply to the ubiquitous qualities of youth, for example, requiring an “age and developmentally appropriate” orientation. Second, there are specific considerations. My research uncovered two main types of specific considerations: (a) expanded language considerations other than English and (b) accommodations based on ability.

Twelve states have general comprehension considerations.

- Three states have general comprehension consideration in both systems: Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia.
  
  Delaware and Virginia require an “age or developmentally appropriate” orientation.

- Eight states have general comprehension consideration for dependency: Arizona, California, Idaho, Maryland, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Oregon, Vermont.
  
  Mississippi and Vermont require “clear and simple” language.

- Maryland requires orientation to occur in an “understandable” manner.

- Oklahoma dependency encourages providers to provide “a simplified version of their grievance policies using language appropriate to the clients’ age level and cognitive functioning.”

- One state has general comprehension considerations for delinquency only: New Jersey.
  
  New Jersey’s delinquency requires the grievance process to “be written in simple, clear, and considered language that most juveniles can understand.”

Twelve states have specific comprehension considerations.

- Four states have specific comprehension considerations in both systems: Colorado, Kansas, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.
  
  Colorado requires that if “the youth does not understand English, the orientation is to be in the youth’s own language.”

- New Jersey’s dependency regulations require a written procedure for youth but only require
• Louisiana,\textsuperscript{486} Oregon,\textsuperscript{487} Tennessee,\textsuperscript{488} Texas.\textsuperscript{489}

  » Arkansas requires the procedures to be posted in “English and Spanish.”\textsuperscript{490}
  
  » Tennessee delinquency regulations require that “[t]he facility’s grievance system shall be accessible to all youth, including youth with limited literacy, youth who have limited English proficiency and youth with intellectual developmental disabilities. Staff shall ensure that: 1. Youth with intellectual disabilities, developmental disabilities, or limited literacy, or limited English proficiency receive oral explanations of the grievance process that they can understand; 2. Grievance forms shall use easy-to-understand language and shall be simple in their design; 3. Youth shall be able to report grievances orally and in writing.”\textsuperscript{491}

Two states provide a “check” on youth’s comprehension of their rights and grievance protections: Colorado,\textsuperscript{492} Rhode Island.\textsuperscript{493}

• Colorado requires a “discussion about the procedures to assure youth’s understanding.”\textsuperscript{494}

• Rhode Island delinquency requires staff to “ask the residents whether they understand the grievance process.”\textsuperscript{495}
(2) HEAR YOUTH

Youth must be provided with several methods of raising concerns to a trusted evaluation process that is responsive to youth in emergencies and provides help as needed and requested.

When youth feel emboldened to assert their rights, it transforms rights from words on a page into an experience; legal empowerment. It’s important to remember the audacity it takes for each youth, with their unique interlocking and often marginalized identities, to raise complaints and concerns. This is why we need protected pathways in legislation that make it as easy as possible for all youth to assert their rights. Specifically, youth-centered grievance accessibility must: (1) explicitly establish several methods of raising concerns (including a method that does not require staff cooperation); (2) provide a trusted evaluation process for youth grievances; (3) provide assistance to youth as needed or requested; and (4) be responsive to youth emergencies.

(2.2) Explicitly Establish Several Methods of Raising Concerns

Six states provide both verbal and written methods to raise grievances.

- Four states establish that youth may raise concerns either verbally or written in dependency: California, Louisiana, South Dakota, Wisconsin. In the Louisiana dependency system, there must be, at minimum, procedures “for filing verbal, written, or anonymous grievances.”
- In South Dakota, “a grievance may be in writing or oral.”
- Wisconsin dependency broadly establishes that a “grievance may be presented to the program manager or any staff person in writing, orally or by any alternative method through which the client or other person ordinarily communicates.”

- Two states establish that youth may raise concerns either verbally or written in delinquency: Tennessee, Texas.
  - Tennessee delinquency law requires facilities to “provide more than one method to report abuse, neglect, harassment and retaliation by other youth or staff” and specifically requires “ways to report orally, in writing, anonymously and by third parties.”

Thirteen states require youth to raise grievances through a written method.

- Five states require youth to raise concerns through a written method in both systems: Alaska, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Missouri, Oklahoma. In Alaska, youth can “petition superior court” for relief.
- Eight states require youth to raise concerns through a written method in delinquency: Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island. In Missouri, “any youth who has a grievance may submit their grievance in written form.” Oregon requires that grievance forms be available but allows youth to “initiate the request in letter form, if grievance forms are not immediately available.”

Four states provide only verbal methods to raise concerns.

  - Illinois requires youth have access to “a statewide toll-free telephone number that may be used to file complaints, or to obtain information about the delivery of child welfare services by the Department or its agents.”
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explaining the process to “children who are developmentally disabled, unable to read or unable to hear.” Delinquency requires that such rules and regulations “be written in a simple, clear, and concise language that most juveniles can understand.”

- Three states have specific comprehension considerations for dependency only: Michigan, Rhode Island, Wisconsin.
  - Rhode Island requires that the procedure “be explained in language that the child understands.”

- Five states have specific comprehension considerations for delinquency only: Arkansas.

- One state provides verbal methods for youth to raise concerns in delinquency: Maryland.
  - In Maryland, a “child may initiate a grievance by contacting the child advocate or requesting that a staff member contact the child advocate.”

Thirty states simply require there be a method for youth to raise grievances.

- Thirteen states require a way for youth to raise grievances in both systems: Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.
  - Alabama dependency law requires that the process be “activated upon the request of the child.”
  - Michigan dependency law simply requires that there must be a way for the child to activate the grievance process. Michigan delinquency simply requires that the facility “have and follow a written grievance procedure.”

- Twelve jurisdictions require a way for youth to raise grievances in dependency: Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Dakota, Vermont.
  - Arkansas requires “procedures for the receipt, recordation, and disposition of complaints.”

- Five states require a way for youth to raise grievances in delinquency: Idaho, Indiana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio.
  - New York requires specialized secure juvenile detention to have “procedures to ensure grievance program accessibility to youth.”

(2.2) Provide a Trusted Evaluation Process of Grievances

Youth must trust the evaluation process for it to be effective. There are five essential qualities to a youth-trusted process that must be considered. Specifically: (a) confidentiality; (b) independence; (c) transparent process with clearly defined expectations and timelines; (d) opt-out appeal progression; (e) clearly defined end or “exhaustion”; and (f) youth engagement.

Youth repeatedly discuss confidentiality as an empowerment tool to help them find the courage to report rights violations. Similarly, independence is essential for building trust in grievance protections. Ensuring agencies are not acting as their own judges is a matter of “natural justice.” Unfortunately, however, in most states, facilities themselves evaluate youth grievances. Therefore, I have also analyzed whether jurisdictions supply any protections to ensure impartiality short of true independence, such as prohibiting staff complained of from evaluating the complaint.

Many states that provide grievance protections require that there be some type of appeal or review progression. If there are additional phases of review, passage through the stages must be “opt-out” rather than “opt-in” progression. By “opt-out,” I mean requiring that the youth take affirmative action to stop the progression of the complaint rather than requiring effort to push their grievance forward. “Opt-out” progression helps interrupt the inherent power differential between youth and facility staff. States must also protect youth from coerced withdrawals, for example, by prohibiting youth from...
withdrawing a grievance before they have spoken with counsel or an independent interested adult outside of the facility.

The process, and any progressive reviews, must have clearly delineated steps and specific timeframes and expectations. Because of the importance of exhausting all administrative remedies to access federal relief, grievance processes must have a clearly defined “end.” The timeframes set for the agency or system to respond must consider a “child’s perspective on time.”

Finally, engagement and trust in the process require youth inclusion. Youth inclusion is critical given how quickly youth can lose faith and feel powerless against agencies and service providers.

(a) Confidentiality

Seven states provide some confidentiality protections to youth grievances.

- Two states provide confidentiality protections in both systems: Alaska, California.
  - In California, delinquency law states, “the youth shall have the option to confidentially file the grievance or to deliver the form to any youth supervision staff working in the facility.”
- Two states provide confidentiality protections in dependency: Louisiana, Wisconsin.
  - Louisiana expressly permits youth to file “anonymous grievances.”
- Three states provide confidentiality protections in delinquency: New Mexico, Tennessee, Texas.
  - New Mexico requires grievances be “transmitted confidentially.”
  - Texas requires that “the extent possible, grievances remain confidential. The identity of a person filing a grievance is not shared with staff members other than those necessary to resolve the grievance. Youth files do not contain any reference to the filing of grievances.”

(b) Independence

Twenty states provide some measure of independence when evaluating youth grievances.

- Five states provide some measure of independence in both systems: Delaware, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Virginia.
  - In Delaware, youth in both systems are regulated under the same codes, which require “that any grievance shall be investigated by an objective employee who is not the subject of the grievance.”
- Five jurisdictions provide some measure of independence in dependency: Idaho, Michigan, Nevada, South Dakota, Washington D.C.
  - Idaho requires a “prompt investigation of the grievance by a person who can be objective.”
  - Nevada requires that the “process for resolving those grievances . . . must provide for persons who are not directly responsible for the care of the child who filed or is the subject of the grievance to evaluate the grievance.”
- Ten states provide some independence measures in delinquency: Arkansas, California, Illinois, Louisiana, Missouri, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont.
  - New York requires that investigations be done with the use of “personnel separate from that of the facility.”
  - Tennessee delinquency law requires the facility to provide avenues to report abuse to external advocacy entities, such as the defenders, attorneys, courts, child abuse hotline, law enforcement, etc. It further requires that any filed grievances be overseen “independently,” specifically excluding any staff subject to the grievance.

(c) Transparent process with clearly defined expectations, and timelines.

This element is more of a range than the others.

Twenty-three states regulate or delegate timelines for the grievance protection process for both systems.

- Eight states regulate or delegate timelines in both systems: Alaska, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, Vermont.
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• Five jurisdictions regulate or delegate timelines in dependency only: Florida,613 Michigan,614 North Dakota,615 Washington D.C.,616 Wisconsin.617

• Ten states regulate or delegate timelines in delinquency only: Arkansas,618 California,619 Kansas,620 Louisiana,621 Maine,622 Missouri,623 New Jersey,624 New York,625 Rhode Island,626 Texas.627

2.2.1 Regulate

• Two states regulate timelines in both systems: Alaska,628 Oklahoma.629
  » In Alaska, once a formal grievance is received, the facility has ten days to have a meeting to discuss the grievance and suggest methods of resolution. The supervisor then has “five calendar days” to issue a decision letter.630 Alaska dependency facilities must accept or reject the youth grievances within five business days after receipt.631
  » Oklahoma delinquency requires that the youth grievance “be numbered and logged in a grievance log on the day the grievance is received,” then assigned to a staff member for review and resolution. Further, if “the grievance is not resolved within (5) five working days (excluding weekends and holidays), the juvenile may seek review by the supervisor.”632

• Three jurisdictions regulate timelines in dependency: Ohio,633 Nebraska,634 Washington D.C.635
  » Ohio requires that the procedures “make every effort to ensure that any complaint is resolved within thirty days” after filing.636

• Nine states regulate timelines in delinquency: Idaho,637 Louisiana,638 Maine,639 Massachusetts,640 Missouri,641 New York,642 Oregon,643 Rhode Island,644 Vermont.645
  » Idaho requires that the review be completed “within three (3) business days of receipt of the grievance form.”646

2.2.1 Delegate

• One state delegates timelines in both systems: Maryland.647
  » Maryland delinquency requires that the child advocate “respond to the grievance by meeting with the child as soon as possible to obtain the facts and attempt a prompt solution.”648 Dependency requires the facility to have a written grievance procedure that includes “specific timelines.”649

• Seven states delegate timelines in dependency: Florida,650 Idaho,651 Massachusetts,652 Michigan,653 North Dakota,654 Vermont,655 Wisconsin.656
  » Florida requires facilities to establish “procedures shall address each of the following phases of the youth grievance process, specifying timeframes that promote timely feedback to youth and rectification of situations.”657
  » Idaho requires a “prompt investigation.”658
  » Michigan requires the agency to specify “time frames for decision.”659

• Seven states delegate timelines in delinquency: Arkansas,660 California,661 Kansas,662 Nebraska,663 New Jersey,664 Ohio,665 Texas.666
  » Kansas requires that “the grievance shall be answered promptly” at “every stage of the process.”667
  » Nebraska delinquency requires that the facility “promptly investigate” and provide responses “within a prescribed, reasonable time period.”668
  » New Jersey delinquency requires a “response by a staff member . . . within a prescribed, reasonable time limit.”669

(d) Opt-out appeal progression.

One state provides opt-out progression through the review process.

• One state provides opt-out progression in delinquency: Oklahoma.670
  » In Oklahoma, “[i]f the juvenile does not accept the resolution, a copy of the grievance, appeals, and proposed resolutions” is forwarded to the oversight office.671
One state ensures that once filed, a grievance cannot be withdrawn.

- One state does not permit grievances to be withdrawn once filed in delinquency: Texas.672
  - Texas establishes that “[o]nce a youth submits a grievance, it may not be withdrawn.”673

(e) Clearly defined end or “exhaustion of administrative remedies.”

Ten states define the final step, or “administrative exhaustion” for youth grievances.

- Four states regulate the final steps or “administrative exhaustion” in both systems: Alaska,674 Massachusetts,675 Missouri,676 Oklahoma.677
  - Oklahoma delinquency requires the person completing the final review, notify the youth that their “administrative remedies have been exhausted.”678 Dependency requires that the local grievance coordinator provide a copy of a written decision by “the chair of the board of directors or the appeals committee” which “concludes the grievance process” and exhausts administrative remedies.679
  - In Massachusetts, the “decision of the commissioner shall be final.”680
  - Missouri delinquency clearly states that the “findings of the grievance committee will be final.”681 Dependency similarly states that the decision of the regional administrator or designee will be the final decision of the division.682
  - Six states regulate the final steps or “administrative exhaustion” in delinquency: Arkansas,683 Louisiana,684 Maine,685 Maryland,686 Oregon,687 Rhode Island.688
  - In Arkansas, “any decision by the DYS Director” is considered final.689

(f) Youth Engagement

Twenty-three states provide some measure of youth engagement—ranging from inclusion to simply communicative—when evaluating youth grievances.

- Three states provide some measure of youth engagement in both systems: Alaska,690 Oklahoma,691 Virginia.692

- Oklahoma delinquency requires that the grievance resolution be reviewed with the youth.693

- Six jurisdictions provide some measure of youth engagement in dependency only: Arizona,694 Illinois,695 Louisiana,696 Massachusetts,697 Washington D.C.,698 Wisconsin.699
  - In Arizona, dependency requires “a means to tell the grievant about the action taken in response to the grievance.”700
  - Illinois requires youth who grieved to be provided a final report of their findings or an update every 30 days while still being investigated.701
  - Louisiana requires the facility to have “a formal process … to communicate about the grievance within 24 hours and respond to the grievance in writing within five days.”702

- Fourteen states provide some measure of youth engagement in delinquency only: California,703 Idaho,704 Indiana,705 Maine,706 Maryland,707 Missouri,708 New Jersey,709 New Mexico,710 New York,711 Ohio,712 Oregon,713 Rhode Island,714 Tennessee,715 Texas.716
  - California states that the grievance system “provide, to the extent reasonably possible, for the selection by their peers of persons committed to the Youth Authority as participants in the design, implementation, and operation of the grievance system.”717
  - Indiana delinquency law requires ongoing communication with youth.718
  - Tennessee requires youth in delinquency facilities to “receive responses to their grievances that are respectful, legible and responsive.”719
  - Texas youth in the delinquency system are provided a copy of the grievance they filed. Additionally, youth are involved in distributing the forms across living areas in facilities.720
(2.3) Provide Assistance to Youth as Needed or Requested

Youth often need help to access their grievance protections fully. However, the nature of what assistance is required varies based on the individual child’s characteristics and experiences. Generally, assistance should provide “all relevant information and support [the youth] in interpreting and understanding that information so that they can make [a] well-informed decision[.]”

Children often become weary of adults’ agendas and can clearly see conflicts of interest and empty rhetoric. Accordingly, research shows that for any assistance to help youth effectively, it must be independent, trusted, confidential, and focused on the child’s wishes (compared to “best interests”). However, not all youth will need or want assistance. A youth-centered process must remain “easy for children to access on their own or it risks undermining [youth] independence.” It’s essential to allow youth to identify the supportive adult of their choice to help them. Permitting children to choose their own advocate is supported by New Zealand’s evaluation, citing England’s national standards. Youth-identified supportive adults should be provided access and support to help youth advocate for their rights effectively.

Eighteen states provide assistance to youth attempting to utilize their grievance protection.

- Four states provide some measure assistance in both systems: California, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Virginia.
  - In Oklahoma delinquency grievances “may be filed by either a juvenile or by another person on behalf of the juvenile.” In dependency, a grievance may be filed by the youth or “by any person who knows the client and is interested in the client’s welfare including, but not limited to, a parent, guardian, relative, foster parent, court appointed special advocate, guardian ad litem, case manager, personal support team member, job coach, or others including DHS employees and employees of residential, in-home supports, and vocational providers.” In dependency assistance is also provided from the local grievance coordinator.

- Three states provide some measure assistance in dependency only: Florida, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont.
  - In Arkansas, delinquency regulations permit “[a] uthorized family members, attorneys, advocates, and other representatives” to submit grievances “on behalf of youth who lack capacity to submit on their own behalf.”

- Eleven states provide some measure assistance in delinquency only: Arkansas, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont.
  - California delinquency law provides the grievant the “right” to be “represented by another person committed to the Youth Authority who is confined within the institutions or camps of the Youth Authority, by an employee, or by any other person, including a volunteer, who is a regular participant in departmental operations.”
(3) PROTECT YOUTH

Youth must have a broad right to grievance protections; youth rights must be enforced through an independent, external entity that is empowered to supply accountability and transparency.

It is our moral and legal imperative to protect our youth in institutions from harm. Youth in institutional placement, who experience the most significant restrictions on their freedom, must have an effective right to grievance protections, including both an affirmative right to grieve and an agency or facility obligation to provide a grievance process. An affirmative right is a grant of a privilege to an individual or class of individuals. An implied right, comparatively, is created from a third-party obligation. The most substantial rights provide both. Unfortunately, as discussed below, most states legislate only a facility obligation to provide a grievance process, which is neither sufficient nor youth-centered. Providing only an implied right through facility obligation decenters the child, disempowers youth voice, and places “accountability” primarily in external reports and corrective action plans, rather than youth's daily experience, safety, or well-being.

One of the most critical determinants of a right's functionality is its scope, or how “big” the right is. The scope of a right to grievance protections can be defined by any number of time, place, manner, or subject matter restrictions or protections. It is shocking how few jurisdictions provide the flimsiest layer of insulation between those in a position to violate youth rights and those in charge of what, how, when, and why youth can complain. Unfortunately, states often defer to facilities to decide the scope of a youth’s grievance protections. Delegating the task of developing, protecting, and implementing youth rights to facilities leaves the child “protected” by those from who they need protection. Therefore, the scope of a youth’s right to grievance protections must be expressly and explicitly broad.

More commonly, however, states expressly limit the scope of youth’s grievance protections. One of the most common categories of restriction is time, explicitly limiting how long after an abuse or rights violation occurred, the youth must initiate the grievance process. Time restrictions, particularly severe limitations, do not consider adolescence. Youth unique processing needs and considerations, particularly in “hot” or stressful environments. Strict time limitations also do not consider the impact of trauma on cognitive processing and how long it can reasonably take a child with a trauma history to recognize violence as violent and undeserved.

Furthermore, these limitations can block youth’s access to federal relief because of the exhaustion requirements under the PLRA. Additionally, youth-centered grievance protections must broadly provide access to assert rights violations. Conversely, subject matter limitation—or limiting what youth may complain about through the grievance process—creates confusion and administrative barriers to asserting their rights.

Given the role of the grievance protection for youth to actualize their rights, states must create effective deterrents for anyone affiliated with a facility who refuses to assist, interferes with, or retaliates against a child attempting to file a grievance. Provisions that allow the facility to discipline youth for filing grievances for any reason create an opening for retaliation. These provisions do not consider the experience of youth, ignore the numerosity of dismissed or unfounded claims (despite legitimate instances of abuse and rights violations), and ignore the harm they can perpetrate when misused to silence youth.

---

21 For example, see California media example discussed above on page 27. The California DJJ ombudsperson uncovered staff training informing staff on how to use such provisions to silence youth grievances.
(3.1) Provide Youth with the Affirmative Right to Grievance Protections

3.1.1 Provide Youth with the Affirmative Right to Grievance Protections

Forty-nine (of fifty-one) jurisdictions require youth to have some type of grievance protection.

In this I am being intentionally broad and have included states that merely require that youth have some grievance process, without any more regulatory guidance. Out of the forty-nine jurisdictions, only five states affirmatively grant youth the right to grievance protections. As compared to an agency or facility requirement.

Forty-nine (of fifty-one) jurisdictions provide youth with some type of grievance protection. Hawaii\textsuperscript{751} and Utah\textsuperscript{752} do not have grievance protections for their youth in either system.\textsuperscript{753}

- Thirty-six states provide some measure of grievance protections in both systems: Alabama,\textsuperscript{754} Alaska,\textsuperscript{755} Arizona,\textsuperscript{756} Arkansas,\textsuperscript{757} California,\textsuperscript{758} Colorado,\textsuperscript{759} Connecticut,\textsuperscript{760} Delaware,\textsuperscript{761} Florida,\textsuperscript{762} Idaho,\textsuperscript{763} Illinois,\textsuperscript{764} Iowa,\textsuperscript{765} Kansas,\textsuperscript{766} Kentucky,\textsuperscript{767} Louisiana,\textsuperscript{768} Maine,\textsuperscript{769} Maryland,\textsuperscript{770} Massachusetts,\textsuperscript{771} Michigan,\textsuperscript{772} Minnesota,\textsuperscript{773} Missouri,\textsuperscript{774} Montana,\textsuperscript{775} Nebraska,\textsuperscript{776} Nevada,\textsuperscript{777} New Hampshire,\textsuperscript{778} New Jersey,\textsuperscript{779} Ohio,\textsuperscript{780} Oklahoma,\textsuperscript{781} Oregon,\textsuperscript{782} Pennsylvania,\textsuperscript{783} Rhode Island,\textsuperscript{784} South Dakota,\textsuperscript{785} Vermont,\textsuperscript{786} Virginia,\textsuperscript{787} West Virginia,\textsuperscript{788} Wyoming.\textsuperscript{789}

- Eight jurisdictions provide some measure of grievance protections only in dependency: Georgia,\textsuperscript{790} Mississippi,\textsuperscript{791} North Carolina,\textsuperscript{792} North Dakota,\textsuperscript{793} South Carolina,\textsuperscript{794} Washington,\textsuperscript{795} Washington D.C.,\textsuperscript{796} Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{797}

- Five states provide grievance protections only in delinquency: Indiana,\textsuperscript{798} New Mexico,\textsuperscript{799} New York,\textsuperscript{800} Tennessee,\textsuperscript{801} Texas.\textsuperscript{802}

Five states grant youth the right to grievance protections in facilities.

- One state grants this right to youth in both systems: Nevada.\textsuperscript{803}

- Three states grant youth this right in dependency\textsuperscript{22}: California,\textsuperscript{804} Oregon,\textsuperscript{805} South Carolina.\textsuperscript{806}
  
  » South Carolina grants each resident the “right to voice grievances without discrimination or reprisal.”\textsuperscript{807}

- One state grants youth this right in delinquency\textsuperscript{23}: West Virginia.\textsuperscript{808}
  
  » West Virginia states that a child in custody or detention has the right to be “afforded a grievance procedure, including an appeal mechanism.”\textsuperscript{809}

\textsuperscript{22} Wisconsin provides the full right and protection only to youth placed through the dependency system receiving mental health services. WIS. ADMIN. CODE DCF § 52.31.

\textsuperscript{23} New Mexico only provides the right for “health care decisions and services” in delinquency. N.M. CODE R. § 8.14.4
Thirty-nine jurisdictions delegate the power to define the scope of youth grievance protections to state agencies.

- Twenty-one states delegate defining the scope of grievance protections in both systems: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wyoming.

  - Colorado requires the residential treatment center to “establish a written grievance procedure which adequate safeguards due process.”
  - In Pennsylvania, the facility must “develop and implement written grievance procedures for the child.”

- Thirteen jurisdictions delegate defining the scope of grievance protections in dependency only: Florida, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

  - Kansas requires each facility to “develop a current, written grievance procedure for residents.”
  - Rhode Island requires agencies to have and conform to “written procedures for redressing concerns, disagreements, complaints and grievance of clientele to safeguard the legal rights of children served.”

- Five states delegate defining the scope of grievance protections in delinquency only: Arkansas, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, and Tennessee.

  - Arkansas permits grievances “to include without limitation: (A) Placement; (B) Treatment plan issues; (C) Medical care; (D) Education; (E) Disciplinary actions; (F) Quality of life; and (G) Any action or injury caused by a DYS staff, contractor, volunteer, or other youth.”

In Kentucky, facility licensing regulations require that “there shall be a written grievance procedure.”

Tennessee requires facilities to “provide more than one method to report abuse, neglect, harassment and retaliation by other youth or staff within the facility.”

There are a variety of scope limitations that states place on youth grievance protections. For example, both Texas delinquency and Nevada dependency allow the placement to reasonably limit the time, place, and manner of a youth’s exercise of their grievance protection “in order to preserve order.” Oregon limits the number of grievances a youth may file to two per week or six per month. Wyoming’s grievance protection is limited to children in solitary or “room confinement.” However, the most pervasive scope limitation is time, precisely how long a youth has, to file a grievance. Although there are some states, such as Tennessee, which explicitly prohibit facilities from placing time restrictions on a youth filing a grievance.

Eleven jurisdictions explicitly place time restrictions on youth grievance protections.

- Two states explicitly place time restrictions on youth grievance protections in both systems: Alaska and Oklahoma.

  - Oklahoma youth in the delinquency system have three working days to file an informal grievance and seven working days to file a written grievance. Youth in the dependency system are given fifteen-business days, but that time limit may be extended by the local grievance coordinator. No time limits are allowed for youth filing a grievance alleging “abuse, neglect, verbal abuse, exploitation, or caretaker misconduct.” Furthermore, no time limits can be placed on youth a involved with both dependency and disability.

  - Two states explicitly place time restrictions on youth grievance protections in dependency only:
Massachusetts, Wisconsin.

> Youth in Wisconsin have “45 days . . . [from] the occurrence of the event,” when it “should reasonably have been discovered,” or when the child “gains or regains the ability to report the matter, whichever comes last.”

- Seven states explicitly place time restrictions on youth grievance protections in delinquency only: Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, New York, Oregon, Vermont.

  > Maryland youth placed through the delinquency system have five working days to file a grievance.

  > Youth in Maine and Oregon’s delinquency systems have 15 days to file an appeal.

  > Youth placed through the New York and Vermont delinquency systems have ten days to file a grievance, although Vermont creates an explicit exception for complaints about staff abuse.

3.3.3 Provide Emergency Responsiveness

Given the overwhelming evidence of systemic rights deprivations in these systems, youth must have access to an expedited process that can quickly protect them from extreme rights violations, such as physical or sexual abuse.

Seventeen states require youth grievance protections to be able to respond to youth emergencies.

- Three states require emergency responsiveness in both systems: California, Oklahoma, Virginia.

  > California delinquency law requires procedures that “provide for priority processing of grievances which are of an emergency nature which would, by passage of time required for normal processing, subject the grievant to substantial risk of personal injury or other damage.” California dependency law requires any emergency injury intervention or observation to be reported “immediately.”

- Two states require emergency responsiveness in dependency only: Minnesota, Wisconsin.

  > Wisconsin requires that “the program manages send emergency grievances to the county director or designated department “within three business days” and “a written decision shall be issued within 10 days after the request for review.”

- Twelve States require emergency responsiveness in delinquency only: Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, Nebraska, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wyoming.

  > Nebraska requires “special provisions for responding to emergencies.”

  > New Jersey simply requires that the grievance protections “allow for responding to emergencies.”

  > Florida requires that allegations of abuse be brought to the superintendent or designee for “immediate resolution.”

3.3.4 Provide Enforceable Anti-retaliation / Anti-Interference Provisions

Twenty-nine states explicitly prohibit retaliation and interference.

- Thirteen states prohibit retaliation and interference in both systems: California, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia.

  > In Colorado, youth in both systems are protected under the same regulations, requiring youth “shall not be subject to any adverse actions as a result of filing the grievance” and that grievances “be processed without alteration, interference, or unreasonable delay.”

  > Delaware requires “continuous monitoring by the licensee of any grievance to assure there is no retaliation against the child” and prohibits “a
licensee” from threatening or taking “any punitive or other retaliatory action against a child who utilizes the grievance procedure.”

- Pennsylvania facility regulations (covering both dependency and delinquency) provide: “A child and the child’s family have the right to lodge a grievance with the facility for an alleged violation of specific or civil rights without fear of retaliation.”

- Seven jurisdictions prohibit retaliation and interference in dependency only: Arizona, Georgia, Ohio, South Carolina, Washington D.C., West Virginia, Wisconsin.

- Georgia requires youth to be able to submit grievances “without fear of retaliation.”

- Ohio requires facilities to ensure “against retaliation by staff or by other children against the person making the complaint.”

- Nine states prohibit retaliation and interference in delinquency only: Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Maine, New York, Tennessee, Texas.

- New York’s specialized secure detention requires a “statement regarding safeguards for youth against reprisals” to be provided to youth but seems to fall short of prohibiting reprisals for filing a grievance.

- Two states prohibit interference only in delinquency: Montana, New Mexico.

Three states establish enforcement mechanisms against retaliation or interference.

- One state provides enforcement mechanisms in response to retaliation or interference in dependency only: Wisconsin.

- In Wisconsin, no one may “intentionally retaliate or discriminate against any patient or employee for contacting or providing information to any official or to an employee of any state protection and advocacy agency, or for initiating, participating in, or testifying in a grievance procedure or in an action for any remedy authorized under this section. Whoever violates this paragraph may be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months or both.”

- Two states provide enforcement mechanisms in response to retaliation or interference in delinquency only: Texas, South Dakota.

- South Dakota provides for criminal consequences for individuals who retaliate or interfere with a youth’s report of violations. The dependency regulations, similar to the majority of states, simply prohibit reprisal.

- Texas provides consequences against retaliation. Texas delinquency law provides disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment, and dependency regulations provide a conference to determine consequences for retaliatory actions. Texas also takes the unique step of requiring youth to have access to pre-numbered grievance forms (to help prohibit destruction or interference).

Five states expressly prohibit discipline or punishment for youth utilizing their grievance protections.

- Two states prohibit discipline in dependency only: California, New Jersey.

- New Jersey prohibits the facility from taking or threatening to take “retaliatory or disciplinary action of any kind against a child who uses the grievance procedure.”

- Three states prohibit discipline in delinquency only: Illinois, Indiana, Tennessee.

- Illinois and Indiana’s delinquency regulations prohibit disciplining youth for utilizing the grievance procedure.

- Tennessee delinquency law states that “[s]taff shall not discipline youth for filing a grievance, even if an investigation does not establish sufficient evidence to substantiate the complaint.”

Three states expressly permit discipline or punishment for youth utilizing their grievance protections.

- Three states permit discipline in delinquency only: Louisiana, Maine, Oklahoma.
» Maine delinquency regulations similarly prohibit retaliation yet restrict such protections to youth’s “good faith filings,” permitting disciplinary acts against “abuse of the grievance process.”960

» In Oklahoma, facilities may discipline youth for filing a grievance if misused but “may discipline a resident for filing a grievance related to alleged sexual abuse only where the agency demonstrates that the resident filed the grievance in bad faith.”961

3.3.5 Provide External Oversight with Enforcement Powers and Reporting Requirements

A vital requirement for having even the best grievance protections is transparent, external, independent monitoring of both the grievance protection (evaluation) and the underlying substance of grievance evaluations. The most common example of external, youth- and family-focused oversight is a youth ombudsperson office. Since the existence of an ombudsperson office falls outside of grievance protections, delving deeply into this issue is beyond the scope of this report; however, I highlight here a few recommendations that would supplement the grievance rights presented in this report. An external monitor, such as an ombudsperson, should be autonomous, impartial, and free of administrative control. They must also have broad authority to speak with youth, visit facilities unannounced, gather data and information about facilities, and remediate harms. They should be supported in discussing facility conditions with youth who have been released and may feel safer sharing about their experiences. Juveniles for Justice Youth Advocates set forth recommendations on standard questions to ask youth to meet these goals.962 State policies should also support transparency by ensuring that external monitors provide information to youth, families, system stakeholders, and the general public on the impact of the carceral system on youth. For a deeper review of ombudsperson offices, The National Conference of State Legislatures provides an extensive overview of such offices across the country.963
CONCLUSION

As discussed previously, the disparate treatment of youth of color can be traced back to America’s earliest days. Laws—a source of economic, social, and political power—created the infrastructure for slavery and oppression of individuals of color. Neither states nor the federal government has dismantled this infrastructure, and racial and ethnic disparities remain deeply embedded in the administration and discourse of institutional placements for youth.

These disparities have incredibly far-reaching impacts on the lives of youth. Youth in institutional placements are subject to widespread systemic abuse, physical and sexual violence, in addition to legally sanctioned abusive practices such as strip searches, physical restraints, and solitary confinement. This abuse compounds the trauma imposed by isolation and separation from their families, friends, and communities.

Despite endemic levels of abuse in institutional placements, most states allow facilities to establish, implement and monitor grievances themselves. Some systems do not even require that much. There is little to no federal oversight of the abuse of incarcerated youth beyond the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA)—which has been ineffective in meaningfully reducing sexual abuse of children in institutions. The most impactful federal law, the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), has impeded youth and family’s access to justice.

States must empower youth by providing information about youths’ legal rights and creating concrete, accessible avenues to seek justice for rights violations. Legally empowering youth through robust grievance protections is a step forward towards strengthening youths’ agency and ‘squeezing justice out of a system of injustice’. Adequate protections can set precedents for accountability and standards for future practice reflected in law, policies, and practices. Those laws, policies, and practices can then be replicated and scaled.

On April 20, 2021, Columbus police fatally shot 16-year-old Ma’Khia Bryant. The police were responding to a call reporting Ma’Khia was unsafe in her group home.964 The heartbreak of her death is excruciating; I can’t find the words to describe it.24 An attorney representing her family blamed Ma’Khia’s death on “a bureaucracy ill-equipped to protect’ children ‘in their time of greatest uncertainty and need.”965 I can’t think of a better description for youth grievance protections.

We must do better. We must see youth, hear youth and protect youth.

After high school, my parents encouraged me to go to Luther College, a small liberal arts school a few hours away. I majored in accounting, with dual minors in French and economics and a certificate of concentration in international business. After all I had gone through, a degree in accounting represented security. I moved to Chicago, where I began to find that security I had been seeking.

But I had always wanted to be a lawyer. When I was in care, my words never mattered until a lawyer said them. And I wanted—needed—my words to have enough power to make a difference. So, I decided to go to law school. Early in my law school career, I sought out internships and clinical opportunities. I interned with the Legal Aid Justice Center’s Just Children program, where I helped with a variety of special education legal work. I interned at Cooks County Public Guardian’s Office. I also took part in the Children’s Defense clinic at law school and an advanced clinic. After law school, I clerked for two years in the Unified Family Court in Delaware with honorables Arlene Minus Coppage and Robert Coonin. There, I had the opportunity to substantially contribute to drafting orders in countless dependency, delinquency, and custody and divorce proceedings. After clerking, I was awarded the Zubrow Fellowship at Juvenile Law Center and later continued my work at Juvenile Law Center through a Soros Justice Fellowship.

The day before my Soros interview, I got a call from Melissa. She had just been apprehended by Interpol, the international criminal police organization, in Brazil. It was a shock. We had not spoken in the years since she fled from a federal drug charge. I still remember when someone asked in my interview how my sister was. I broke down crying because, for the first time in years, I knew and could respond that—at least on some level—she’s okay.
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25 Nathan Orians received his Master’s in Clinical Social Work from Smith School for Social Work, recently graduated from Drexel University’s Thomas R. Kline School of Law. Prior to law school, worked as a social worker at Delaware County Juvenile Detention Center, otherwise known as Lima, for almost two years. In March 2021, he was a whistle blower that helped close Lima. He was quoted as saying, “The systemic abuses I witnessed and repeatedly attempted to stop forced me to reconsider my entire career path and go to law school. The people in charge purposely place children into a dangerous facility and they turned a blind eye or even covered up abuse that was ongoing for years.”

26 Julia Sheppard is originally from Chicago, IL and is interested in a career in juvenile advocacy and criminal justice reform, aimed at prison abolition. After graduating from Oberlin College with a double major in law and dance. Julia worked as an ombudsman for residents of long-term care facilities, and then as a legal assistant at Northwestern Law School’s Bluhm Legal Clinic. She was, at the time of her research in November 2019, a 2L and Rubin-Presser Social Justice Fellow at Temple University’s Beasley School of Law.
**OVERVIEW**

The most effective and sustainable solutions are imagined by the very people who experience a problem itself. Abuse in facilities is a systemic problem. Youth need to be included in designing grievance protections to effectively overcome the hurdles of youth reporting concerns, abuse, and rights violations.

**OBJECTIVES**

*After this curriculum, youth will:*

- understand what a grievance protection is.
- understand the core components to an effective grievance protection.
- evaluate local (or national) grievance protections.
- make recommendations for an effective grievance protection.

---

**Participants**

Youth should have personal experiences in a facility from either dependency and/or delinquency. Youth reflect the diversity of subpopulations of youth within the community. The curriculum is best for groups of 8-12. If you have two facilitators, 15 participants should be the maximum. These numbers allow everyone to participate and begin sharing their thoughts and experiences. If the group exceeds 15, it is suggested that the group splits into two groups.

**Staffing Requirements**

2-3 facilitators. A separate note-taker is strongly encouraged. One facilitator should be comfortable with the language and practices of policymakers and or able to read and translate policy into terms easily understood by those without policy experience. The second facilitator should be someone that has experience working with youth. A youth worker that is familiar with a youth-centered approach is preferred. This person can also be a point of contact for youth with specific questions and concerns. All staff should review the "Helpful Hints".

**Meeting Length**

There are two sessions. Sessions should be 2 hours each. That includes break times, snacks, and lunch, if provided.

---

*Antonio Thomas: thoman02@gmail.com*

Empathy. Love. Honesty. Respect. In no order, these are the values that drives Antonio Thomas’ work with youth. Antonio is a Sr. Curriculum Specialist with Youth Guidance’s Becoming A Man program. He has over 10 years working in youth programs of all types, most of which specializing with underserved communities. A native of Milwaukee, WI, education took him to Luther College in Decorah, IA, followed by his current home in Chicago after graduating from DePaul University with a Master of Education in Community Counseling.

Since 2007, Antonio has found himself in spaces where he is working with youth of all backgrounds. Bible Camp, Sports Camps, Reading Programs, Juvenile probation, Recess monitor, the list goes on. Antonio has prided himself on being able to work with any and all youth. Most notably his work with the young men of the Becoming a Man program in Chicago. A time in which Antonio was able to form relationships with the youth, community, families, and other organizations, ultimately being awarded by the 48th ward Alderman “Pillar of Safety” honors in 2017.

He is a co-founder, and active alumni member of the Zeta Tau Psi Fraternity at Luther and Cornell Colleges in Iowa. A football coach. A supporter of anything positive for youth in our communities.

Outside of working with youth, Antonio has passion in helping create/support better systems that effect youth. Whether helping maintain current BAM programs, consulting with community programs on police reform, writing or improving curriculum, or providing neighborhood safety programming for schools and immigrant families. Antonio enjoys using his skills and experiences to better the lives of youth everywhere.
**Pay**
Youth should receive compensation for their participation and expertise. Prepare to supply cash payment or a gift card for participation. If incentivizing with gift cards, consult with youth. For example, if using cash gift cards, it’s important to choose the ones that can be used without requiring identification documents or bank accounts. $25 per session or more is recommended.

Create a participation plan with youth members. This plan is to ensure youth members always have a plan to attend or actively participate in meetings. This recommendation is essential to identify any needs, barriers, or other obligations they may have that could impact participation. This should include recommending meeting times and flexibility to schedule meetings that prioritize youth schedules.

Ensure youth can attend the meetings and reduce barriers to attendance.

**Scheduling**
Accommodate youth schedules when attendance and participation is not built into their current work. For example, many programs have meetings in the later afternoon after 3 pm.

**Transportation**
Provide transportation and other logistical support as needed for youth to participate (i.e., provide bus or train passes, Amtrak tickets, ride pools, or pickups). This should include allowing for remote access for all members and other mechanisms to provide feedback or comments for each meeting.

**Childcare**
Provide childcare options if this is a need or barrier for the youth to participate actively.

---

**Food**
Best practice is to provide light snacks and beverages throughout the sessions. This can also be a way to honor and respect participants time, since meeting often can be over lunch or dinner. If in the budget, providing lunch is a great incentive for getting full participation throughout the entire project.

---

**SUGGESTED SCHEDULE**

**SESSION 1**
INTRODUCTION
CHECK-INS
WHAT DO WE KNOW
BREAK
DIVE IN
CORE COMPONENTS

**SESSION 2**
INTRODUCTION
CHECK-INS
CORE COMPONENTS
DISCUSSION
RE-IMAGINED
GRIEVANCE POLICY
BREAK
REVIEW
NEXT STEPS
CLOSING
Youth engagement is involving young people in the creation of their own destinies. Facilitating meaningful youth participation with passion and opportunities for youth to take responsibility and leadership while working in partnership with caring adults who value, respect, and share power with them. (Pittman)

Youth engagement is the result when young people are involved in responsible, challenging actions to create positive social change.

(http://actforyouth.net/youth_development/engagement/)

**WHAT WORKS**

- CLEAR COMMUNICATION
- LIMITING HIERARCHY
- ENERGY
- EFFORT
- RESPECTING IDEAS
- SENSITIVITY
- EMPATHY
- OPENNESS
- HONESTY
- AUTHENTICITY

**WHAT DOESN'T WORK**

- HYPOCRISY
- CORRECTION (WITHOUT A RELATIONSHIP)
- LIES
- LACK OF FOLLOW-THROUGH
- LACK OF SYMPATHY
- LACK OF EMPATHY
- TAKING WHAT IS SAID PERSONALLY
BEFORE EACH SESSION

Think of the earliest time you were told...

"Because I said so."
"You would know if you paid attention the first time."
"Not now."
"You’re too young."
"You don’t know nothing about..."

Reflect on how this made you feel as a youth.

How does it affect the relationship as a young person to be told these things?

Be Prepared
• Do you have all materials?
• Do you have a backup plan?
• How does subject matter relate to you?
• Did you read the curriculum?

Give off Good Energy
• Stay comfortable and confident.
• Maintain a positive regard.
• Be accepting.

This draws young people in.

Make Connections
• To their real lives
• To their experiences
• To one another

Show that you get it and if you don’t, ask. This leads to openness.

Assess Engagement
• Bring activities
• Find ways to bring the curriculum to life.
• Offer incentives

Be Versatile
• Know your audience
• Scan the room
• Adjust as needed

When working with youth, remember what it was like for you to be dismissed, treated unfairly, or unheard. It is encouraged to do your own reflection to avoid transference as well as coaching. In this project, the goal is to learn from the youth. Hear their perspective and ask for more information. Ask for clarification. You want your youth to feel safe.
SESSION ONE

1. WHY ARE WE HERE?
2. CHECK-INS
3. WHAT DO WE KNOW?
4. DIVE INTO THE WORK
5. CORE COMPONENTS INTRODUCTION

MATERIALS NEEDED:
Easel Pad, Markers, Paper and Pen

GOALS OF THE SESSION:
Understand what a grievance is.
Understand what current rights exist.
Begin to explore core components of a grievance policy.
Start reimagining an effective grievance policy.
1. INTRODUCTIONS

Leaders: Be sure to take a couple of minutes to introduce yourself and how you got involved in this project. Be honest and open. This will set the tone for the remaining time spent together—end by explaining this project and the importance of this group meeting.

- Introduce goals of the two sessions
- Let group members know what to expect
  (If incentives are involved, share those here)

Prepare youth to strategically and safely share their stories. This curriculum does not explicitly call for youth to share their experiences. Know why you’re asking youth to consider telling their stories. This should happen ONLY if youth want to use their stories to help elevate their advocacy efforts. If they do, there should be a clear tie to the policy goal, or in this case – core components.

ICE BREAKER

Two Truths and a Lie

The main instructions of the game are that each member of the group introduces themselves by stating two truths and one lie about themselves. Leaders should be prepared to go first. The statements don’t have to be intimate, life-revealing things—just simple hobbies, interests, or past experiences that make each person unique. The lie can be outrageous and wacky, or it can sound like truth to make it harder for the other participants.

One at a time, each person shares their statements. The group has to guess which statements are true and which statement is the lie. You can keep score to see who correctly guesses the most lies, or just play for fun to get to know one another—it’s up to your group.

AGREEMENTS FOR WORK

- Explain that these are less rules but rather group agreements to guide the work.
- Come up with a list of 5-10 expectations
  (ex: Respecting others' opinions, confidentiality, etc.)
- Once completed, have everyone verbally agree and sign the agreement.
2. Check-Ins

On a scale of 1-10, how comfortable are you with grievance protections in facilities or institutions and why?

Leave space for youth to take the check-in when they want. The leader should be prepared to go first to model the process.

- Make sure you are using "I" statements
- Respect the speaker
- Passing is OK

3. What Do We Know?

Use this time to learn what the group really knows. There are no wrong answers. Use this time to gauge where you are.

Here are some sample questions to ask to get the conversation going:
- What’s a grievance?
- Where does it go?
- Why do we need them?

4. Dive-In

Read or present grievance policy of the state you’re in. (Alternate- choose a state to use as an example)

Ask for initial thoughts/feelings on what they just learned (It is ok if their response is one of non-understanding)

Activity: Good/Bad/Change/Missing

Use four poster boards or Easel paper and write one question on each board:

1. What was good?
2. What was bad?
3. What would you change?
4. What is missing?

Give the group 15 minutes to write directly on the boards their thoughts on each question. Then, process as a group what is learned from the activity.

Sample process questions:
1. Was there anything surprising?
2. Anything stands out as more important to you?
5. CORE COMPONENTS OF A GRIEVANCE POLICY

Introduce to the group the core components of a grievance policy. Explain each component individually. Allow group members time to explore each. Ask questions, tell stories/experiences, and process each. Be mindful of time as this is the last part of session 1.

SEE YOUTH
Notification Requirements
Comprehension Considerations

HEAR YOUTH
Method of Raising Concerns
Trusted Evaluation Process
Confidentiality
Independence
Transparent process with clearly defined expectations, and timelines.
Opt-out appeal progression
Clearly Defined end
Youth Engagement
Help: as Needed or Requested

PROTECT YOUTH
Scope of Grievance Protections
Emergency Responsiveness
Anti-retaliation/
Anti-Interference Provisions

6. CHECK-OUT

Reserve time, in the end, to acknowledge the work youth have done. Ask for a feeling word or another type of “temperature” check to see how the youth felt about the session. Make sure to follow up with any youth that expresses a need or confusion.
SESSION TWO

1. CHECK-INS
2. CORE COMPONENTS DISCUSSION
3. RE-IMAGINED GRIEVANCE POLICY
4. REVIEW
5. NEXT STEPS
6. CLOSING

MATERIALS NEEDED:
Easel Pad; Markers; Paper; Pens; Sticky Notes

GOALS OF SESSION:
Re-Imagine and write our own grievance policy
1. CHECK-INS

As you did in session 1, ask group members how they felt about the first session and to rate session 1 on a scale of 1-10. Then, ask group members to describe what they are expecting for session 2.

2. WHAT DO WE KNOW?

- What elements or processes are needed to fulfill each core component?
- How do we help youth in facilities understand each?
- What areas need to be explained more?

Please don’t limit yourself to these questions. This is to get the conversation going so when you start re-imagining a grievance policy, and thoughts are already being formed.

3. RE-IMAGINED GRIEVANCE POLICY

ACTIVITY:

- Give each group member a pack of colored sticky notes, preferably a different color for each member. Use markers and have them write directly on board if you don’t have sticky notes.
- Write one core component on each poster board.
- Instruct the group to write on their sticky notes ideas and thoughts they have on how to make sure that that component is met and understood by a youth.

Remind group members that it is important that it is in their voice and that there is no pressure to have legal language here.

- Give enough time to have each group member write on each board.
- Bring the group back together to process what they’ve come up with and to add more thoughts and ideas as needed.
4. REVIEW
Leaders take what the group came up with from the activity to create a new grievance policy.

Leaders present this information to the group.

5. NEXT STEPS
Explain to the group where their work goes from here. If there are any future incentives, make sure that those are discussed.

Most importantly, make sure that the youth know that their work was not a waste of their time. Where will this work be presented, how will it be used?

6. CLOSING
Be sure to thank the participants. Allow for any final processing and thoughts to be added. Do a final check-out. Ask youth how they feel about the work they have done and to rate the work on a scale of 1-10. Thank your participants and close the group.
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CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 22, § 84072.2; CAL. WELF. & INST. CODE § 16001.9; CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 22, § 84072.

OR. REV. STAT. § 418.201(1); OR. ADMIN. R. 413.215.0046.

114-591) (requiring facilities to develop a policy and procedure manual that includes the grievance procedure).

S.C. CODE ANN. REGS. 61-103-1002.

W. VA. CODE § 49-4-721.

Id.

See GA. CODE ANN. § 49-4A-6 (Department of Juvenile Justice shall adopt policies); GA. COMP. R. & REGS. §
290-2-5-.15 (delegating the responsibility to develop grievance procedures to institutions).

IDAHO ADMIN. CODE r. 05.01.02.142, 16.06.02.574.

730 ILL. COMP. STAT. 5/3-8-8; 20 ILL. COMP. STAT. 505/5e.

LA. ADMIN. CODE tit. 22, § 713; LA. ADMIN. CODE tit. 67, §§ 7111, 7511.

See MD. CODE REGS. 16.18.01.01–.05 (The code does not define the scope of grievance procedures but Md.
Code REGS. 16.18.01.05 provides some limitations), 14.31.06.09.

MICH. ADMIN. CODE r. 400.10137, 4132.

MINN. STAT. § 245A.04; MINN. R. 2960.3080.


MONT. ADMIN. R. 20.9.620, 37.97.159.

83 NEB. ADMIN. CODE § 12-002; NEB. REV. STAT. § 81-603.

N.H. CODE ADMIN. R. ANN. He-C 6350.33.
now be found in MN ST § 260E.13; MN ST § 260E.17; MN ST § 260E.18).

Wis. Admin. Code DHS § 94.41.

Id.

016.01.10 Ark. Code R. §§ 7260.1–.2.


Ohio Admin. Code 5139-5-02(G).

Or. Admin. R. 416-020-0020.

214-60 R.I. Code R. § 00-1.16.

Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0250-04-08-.05.


Idaho Admin. Code r. 05.01.02.142; Idaho Admin. Code r. 16.06.02.574.


D.C. Mun. Regs. tit. 29, § 6205.
bryant-announce-own-investigation-into-death/4870545001/.


Ma’Khia Bryant’s Journey through Foster Care Ended with an Officer’s Bullet.

730 ILL. COMP. STAT. 5/3-8-8.

Id.

730 ILL. COMP. STAT. 5/3-8-8.

IND. CODE § 11-11-1-2.

TENN. COMP. R. & REGS. 0250-04-08-.05.

TENN. COMP. STAT. 5/3-8-8.

IND. CODE § 11-11-1-2.

TENN. COMP. R. & REGS. 0250-04-08-.05.

LA. ADMIN. CODE tit. 22, § 713.


