



# Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

July 2006, NCJ 214646

Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003

# Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2005

By Allen J. Beck, Ph.D. and Paige M. Harrison

**BJS Statisticians** 

On September 4, 2003, President George W. Bush signed into law the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-79). The legislation requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to develop new national data collections on the incidence and prevalence of sexual violence within correctional facilities. This report fulfills the requirement under Sec. 4 (c)(1) of the act for submission of an annual report on the activities of BJS with respect to prison rape.

In 2004, as one step in a multiphase implementation strategy, BJS completed the first-ever national survey of administrative records on sexual violence in adult and juvenile correctional facilities. In 2005 the survey was expanded to collect detailed information on substantiated incidents. New survey items included the circumstances surrounding each incident, characteristics of victims and perpetrators, the type of pressure or physical force, victim injuries, sanctions imposed, and victim assistance.

The 2005 survey results should not be used to rank systems or facilities. Future data collections, based on surveys of current and former inmates, are being developed to permit reliable comparisons of facilities.

## Highlights

### 6,241 allegations of sexual violence in prison and jail reported in 2005, up from 5,386 in 2004

Total*	2005 6,241	2004 5,386
Federal prisons	268	284
State prisons	4,341	3,172
Local jails	1,384	1,700
Private prisons/jails	204	210
Other facilities	44	20
*Dood on adult correct	ional facilities	only

\*Based on adult correctional facilities only.

- 38% of allegations involved staff sexual misconduct; 35%, inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts; 17%, staff sexual harassment; and 10%, inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contact.
- There were 2.83 allegations of sexual violence per 1,000 inmates in 2005, up from 2.46 in 2004.

## Correctional authorities substantiated 885 incidents of sexual violence in 2005, 15% of completed investigations

	Number of substantiated incidents	Rate per 1,000 inmates
Total*	885	0.40
Federal prisons	41	0.26
State prisons	458	0.39
Local jails	336	0.45
Private prisons/jails	37	0.31
Other facilities	13	1.21
*Estimates hased on	the reported n	umhar of

\*Estimates based on the reported number of substantiated incidents times the inverse probability of selection, and then summed.

- There were an estimated 0.40 substantiated incidents of sexual violence per 1,000 inmates in 2005, down from the 0.55 recorded in 2004.
- Based on completed investigations only, 37% of allegations of staff sexual misconduct in local jails and 15% in State prisons were substantiated.

# Half of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence involved physical force or threat of force; two-thirds of staff misconduct was romantic

Percent of substantiated inmate-on-inmate incidents Abusive sex-Nonconsensual ual contacts 33% Force/threat used 59% Victim injured 22 3 Victim given medical exam 63 33 Victim placed in 30 protective custody 49 Perpetrator arrested/ 58 39 prosecuted Perpetrator placed in solitary confinement 72 70

- In prisons 67% of victims involved in staff sexual misconduct were male, while 62% of perpetrators were female. In jails 78% of victims of staff sexual misconduct were female; 87% of the perpetrators, male.
- Staff were arrested or prosecuted in 45% of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct; discharged, fired or resigned in 82%.

### Second administrative records collection conducted for 2005

Between January 1 and June 22, 2006, BJS completed the second national survey of the incidence and prevalence of sexual violence in correctional facilities. The Governments Division of the U.S. Census Bureau was the data collection agent for the survey. Initiated in 2004, the survey was conducted to provide information on occurrences of sexual violence based on allegations brought to the attention of correctional authorities. Although the results are limited to incidents reported to officials, the survey provides an understanding of what officials know, how many allegations were reported, and the outcomes of followup investigations.

In 2005 the survey was expanded to obtain data on each substantiated incident in which the event was investigated and determined to have occurred. Using a separate incident form, the survey obtained incidentbased data on all substantiated allegations, providing a basis for an in-depth analysis of sexual violence. New information included details on the circumstances surrounding each incident, characteristics of victims and perpetrators, type of pressure or physical force used, victim injuries, sanctions imposed, and victim assistance.

Administrative records alone cannot provide reliable estimates of sexual violence. Due to fear of reprisal from perpetrators, a code of silence among inmates, personal embarrassment,

and lack of trust in staff, victims are often reluctant to report incidents to correctional authorities.

BJS is developing and testing methods for more fully measuring the incidence of sexual violence in correctional facilities. These methods will rely on selfadministered surveys to provide anonymity to victims when reporting their experiences. At the same time, computer-assisted technologies will ensure uniform conditions under which inmates complete the survey, and sampling techniques and supplemental data collections will reduce potential biases. (See box below for an update of these activities.)

### Collection of victim self reports to begin in 2006

BJS is working toward full implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act. BJS has entered into cooperative agreements with -

- Research Triangle International (RTI) (Raleigh, NC) to develop and test the adult prison and jail collection methodologies;
- Westat, Inc. (Rockville, MD) to develop and test methodologies for measuring sexual violence in State and local juvenile facilities;
- National Opinion Research Center (NORC) (Chicago, IL) to develop and test methods of collecting data from former inmates.

Though underlying survey methodology and logistical procedures differ with each of the data collection efforts. the measurement strategies will be consistent. The surveys will consist of an Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interview (ACASI) in which respondents interact with a computer-administered questionnaire using a touchscreen and follow audio instructions delivered via headphones. The use of ACASI is expected to overcome many limitations of previous research. (See Data Collections for the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, December 30, 2005.)

As of June 30, 2006, the following work had been completed or was underway:

### Prison and jail inmates

- The ACASI questionnaire and survey protocols for adult inmates have been developed and tested. Between January and May 2006, BJS and RTI completed a pretest with more than 1,400 inmates in 4 State prisons, 4 local jail facilities, and 1 Federal prison. Results of the pretest will be published in October 2006 and assessed at a national meeting of stakeholders in November.
- In July 2006 BJS will submit an overview of all survey procedures, sampling methods, and questionnaires to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval to begin national implementation in late 2006.
- · Procedures for selecting prison and iail facilities and for sampling inmates within selected facilities have been developed. In the first year of implementation, BJS expects to select 450 public and private prisons and jails and to interview more than 60,000 inmates.
- · Upon OMB approval, RTI field staff will begin obtaining approval from State-level Institutional Review Boards (IRB) and begin interviews in January 2007.

Youth in residential placement facilities

- Survey procedures and questionnaires have been developed and reviewed by State and local administrators and other stakeholders. Cognitive testing of questionnaires with eligible youth began in June 2006.
- · A formal pretest of collection methods in 10 juvenile facilities with up to 600 youth is planned for September 2006.
- National implementation is expected in 2007. Initial survey efforts will focus on more than 14,000 adjudicated youth in a sample of 150 State-operated facilities and 30 large, local or private facilities.

### Former State prisoners

- An ACASI questionnaire, an administrative records form, and survey protocols have been developed to survey former inmates under active parole or post-custody supervision.
- A formal pretest of collection methods in 10-20 parole offices with up to 1,000 former inmates is planned for September 2006.
- National implementation is scheduled in 2007 with more than 11,500 completed interviews expected in 285 parole field offices.

The 2005 administrative survey provides the basis for the annual statistical review, as required under the act. These data will be used by the Review Panel on Prison Rape within the Department of Justice for purposes of conducting hearings concerning the operation of correctional facilities. The number of allegations and substantiated incidents for each system and sampled facility in the survey is provided. (See Appendix tables.)

### 2005 survey covered 1,867 adult correctional facilities

The 2005 survey included all Federal and State prison systems and facilities operated by the U.S. military and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (table 1). In addition, a representative sample was drawn of local jail jurisdictions, privately operated adult prisons and jails, and jails in Indian country. Altogether, the administrative survey covered 1,867 of the 5.220 adult facilities. These facilities

housed more than 1.7 million inmates. or 78% of all inmates held in adult facilities in 2005.\*

The survey was based on seven separate samples corresponding to the different types of facilities covered under the act. (See *Methodology*, page 11.) Each sample was designed in accordance with the requirement that BJS draw a random sample, or other scientifically appropriate sample, of not less than 10% of facilities. Entire systems were selected, when possible, to maximize reporting coverage. Local and private facilities were sampled to ensure at least one in each State and with selection probabilities proportionate to the number of inmates held.

In 2004 BJS developed uniform definitions of sexual violence. (See box to the left.) Incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence were classified as nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts. Incidents of staff-oninmate sexual violence were separated into staff sexual misconduct and staff sexual harassment. For purposes of this report, all such incidents are considered sexual violence.

\*A survey of State-operated juvenile systems and privately or locally operated juvenile facilities was also conducted. Survey results for juvenile systems and facilities will be published in a separate report.

### How sexual violence was measured

The definition of "rape" as required under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 was operationalized by disaggregating sexual violence into two categories of inmate-on-inmate sexual acts and two categories of staff sexual misconduct. The categories were —

### Nonconsensual sexual acts

Contact of any person without his or her consent, or of a person who is unable to consent or refuse; and

- Contact between the penis and the vagina or the penis and the anus including penetration, however slight; or
- · Contact between the mouth and the penis, vagina, or anus; or
- Penetration of the anal or genital opening of another person by a hand, finger, or other object.

### Abusive sexual contacts

Contact of any person without his or her consent, or of a person who is unable to consent or refuse; and

- Intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person.
- Excluding incidents in which the intent of the sexual contact is to harm or debilitate rather than sexually exploit.

### Staff sexual misconduct

Any behavior or act of a sexual nature directed toward an inmate by an employee, volunteer, official visitor, or agency representative. Romantic relationships between staff and inmates are included. Consensual or nonconsensual sexual acts include:

- Intentional touching of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks with the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire; or
- · Completed, attempted, threatened, or requested sexual acts; or
- Occurrences of indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or staff voyeurism for sexual gratification.

### Staff sexual harassment

Repeated verbal statements or comments of a sexual nature to an inmate by an employee, volunteer, official visitor, or agency representative, including:

- Demeaning references to gender or derogatory comments about body or clothing; or
- Profane or obscene language or gestures.

### Table 1. Facilities selected for the Survey of Sexual Violence, 2005

our voy or coxuar	• 10101100,	_000
Facility type	Number of facilities	Selected in the 2005 survey
Total Prisons	5,220	1,867
Public - Federal	84	All*
Public - State	1,320	All*
Private	319	31
Local jails		
Public	3,318	347
Private	38	5
Other adult facilities		
Indian country jails	68	7
Military-operated	59	All*
ICE-operated	14	All*

\*The 2005 survey included all State prison systems, all Federal facilities, and all facilities operated by the U.S. military or the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

### State prison reporting capabilities improve during 2005

The most serious forms of sexual violence (inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts and staff sexual misconduct) were the most widely reported using survey definitions and reporting rules (table 2). During 2005 State and Federal prison authorities enhanced their abilities to report data on sexual violence.

Correctional authorities in more than 36 State and Federal prison systems were able to report incidents of inmateon-inmate nonconsensual acts as defined in the 2005 survey (up from 34 in 2004). Authorities in 38 States were able to report incidents of abusive sexual contacts separately, while 10 combined these incidents with the more serious nonconsensual acts. Only 2 systems did not record abusive sexual contacts, down from 9 in 2004.

The greatest improvements in reporting were for staff sexual misconduct and harassment. In 2005 most prison administrators (44) were able to report data on staff sexual misconduct using survey definitions, up from 35 in 2004. Six systems were unable to separate sexual harassment from misconduct in 2005, down from nine in 2004. Only 1 system was unable to report any data on sexual harassment in 2005, down from 13 in 2004.

The ability to report incidents of sexual violence by authorities in sampled jail jurisdictions dropped during 2005. Also, jail authorities were less likely than prison authorities to meet survey definitions. A third of jail jurisdictions were unable to separate abusive sexual contacts from the more serious nonconsensual sexual acts; a fifth were unable to report staff sexual harassment separately from staff sexual misconduct.

The lower percents meeting survey requirements may be the result of the sampling procedures. More than twothirds of the jail jurisdictions (242) received the definitions and reporting criteria for the first time in 2005, while all of the prison systems received the survey in 2004. BJS expects to work with administrators to improve reporting, especially in large jail jurisdictions with systems too large for manual searches of paper files.

As first noted in the 2004 report, the absence of uniform reporting necessitates caution when interpreting the survey results. The data should not be used to rank systems or facilities. Higher or lower counts, especially among jail jurisdictions, may reflect variations in definitions, reporting capacities, and procedures for recording allegations and not differences in the underlying incidence of sexual violence.

All selected correctional systems and facilities responded to the survey.

### Sexual violence allegations increased

Reports of sexual violence varied across systems and sampled facilities, with every State prison system except New Mexico reporting at least one allegation of sexual violence. Among the 347 sampled local jails, 131 (38%) reported an allegation. About 42% of the 36 sampled privately operated prisons and jails reported at least one allegation.

Combined, the 2005 survey recorded 5,247 allegations of sexual violence. Taking into account weights for sampled facilities, the estimated total number of allegations for the Nation was 6,241. Expressed in terms of rates, there were 2.83 allegations of sexual violence per 1,000 inmates held in 2005, up from 2.43 per 1,000 inmates held in prisons, jails, and other adult correctional facilities in 2004. Prison systems reported 74% of all allegations; local jails, 22%; private prisons and jails, 3%; and other adult facilities, 1%.

Table 2. Reporting capabilities of correctional authorities to provide data on sexual violence, 2004 and 2005

	Federal and systems	Federal and State prison systems		Local jails	
Type of sexual violence	2005	2004	2005	2004	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Nonconsensual sexual acts Full reporting Partial* Includes abusive sexual contacts Unable to report	70.6%	66.7%	62.8%	78.0%	
	9.8	7.8	2.3	7.4	
	19.6	25.5	34.9	13.6	
	0	0	0	1.0	
Abusive sexual contacts Full reporting Partial* Combined with other sexual acts Unable to report	74.5%	51.0%	61.9%	84.9%	
	0	5.9	0	0	
	19.6	25.5	34.6	13.6	
	3.9	17.6	3.5	1.5	
Staff sexual misconduct Full reporting Partial* Includes sexual harassment Unable to report	86.3%	68.6%	76.1%	88.4%	
	2.0	5.9	1.4	2.5	
	13.7	17.6	21.3	7.9	
	0	7.8	1.2	1.2	
Staff sexual harassment Full reporting Partial* Combined with sexual misconduct Unable to report	86.3%	52.9%	76.1%	90.3%	
	0	3.9	0.3	0	
	11.7	17.6	21.9	7.9	
	2.0	25.5	1.7	1.7	

<sup>\*</sup>See Appendix tables for systems and facilities that reported only incidents that were completed or substantiated.

Nationwide, the number of allegations rose by nearly 16%. Consistent with improvements in reporting capabilities, State and Federal prison systems reported a 33% increase in the number of allegations; local jails reported a 19% decrease.

Allegations of sexual violence per 1,000 inmates, by type of facility, 2005

	National	Rate per 1,000
Facility type	estimate	inmates
Total	6,241	2.83
Prisons		
Public - Federal	268	1.71
Public - State	4,341	3.68
Private	182	1.80
Local jails		
Public	1,384	1.86
Private	22	1.33
Other adult facilities		
Indian country jails*	32	٨
Military-operated	8	3.08
ICE-operated	4	0.60
AF 1 1 6 1110 1		

<sup>\*</sup>Excludes facilities housing juveniles only. ^Too few cases to provide a reliable rate.

About 38% of the reported allegations of sexual violence involved staff sexual misconduct, 35% involved inmate-oninmate nonconsensual sexual acts: 17% staff sexual harassment; and 10% inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts.

Allegations of sexual violence, by type of incident. 2005

	National	
Incident type	estimate F	Percent
Total	6,241	100.0 %
Inmate-on-inmate noncon- sensual sexual acts	2,160	34.6
Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts	611	9.8
Staff sexual misconduct	2,386	38.2
Staff sexual harassment	1,084	17.4

### Approximately 15% of allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts in 2005 were substantiated

Allegations reported in 2005 were classified as:

- · substantiated, if they were determined to have occurred
- · unsubstantiated, if the evidence was insufficient to make a final determination that they occurred
- unfounded, if they were determined not to have occurred
- investigation ongoing, if a final determination had not been made at time of data collection.

Overall, inmate-on-inmate allegations of nonconsensual sexual violence were less likely to be substantiated than allegations of staff sexual misconduct. Based on allegations in State and Federal prisons for which investigations had been completed, 14% of nonconsensual sexual acts were substantiated, compared to 15% of allegations of staff sexual misconduct (table 3). In jails 16% of completed investigations of nonconsensual sexual acts were substantiated, compared to 37% of the allegations of staff sexual misconduct.

The most common outcome of investigations of sexual violence was a determination of lack of evidence. More than 66% of allegations of staff sexual misconduct in prison and 49% of allegations of inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts were unsubstantiated. More than a third of completed investigations of nonconsensual sexual acts in State and Federal prisons (37%) and local jails (38%) were determined to be unfounded.

### **During 2005 correctional authorities** substantiated 885 incidents of sexual violence

The survey of administrative records recorded 620 substantiated incidents of sexual violence. Taking into account sampling of local jails, private prisons or jails, and jails in Indian country, the estimated total for the Nation was 885. Relative to the number of inmates. there were 0.40 substantiated incidents of sexual violence per 1,000 inmates reported in 2005, down from the 0.55 per 1,000 inmates in adult facilities in 2004.

> Number of substantiated incidents of sexual violence

		Rate per
	National	1,000
Facility type	estimate	inmates
Total	885	0.40
Prisons		
Public - Federal	41	0.26
Public - State	458	0.39
Private	24	0.24
Local jails		
Public	336	0.45
Private	13	0.78
Other adult facilities		
Indian country jails*	10	٨
Military-operated	2	0.77
ICE-operated	1	0.15

<sup>\*</sup>Excludes facilities housing juveniles only.

Table 3. Allegations of sexual violence in Federal and State prisons, local jails, and private prisons and jails, 2005

	State and prisons	Federal	Local jails				risons
	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent*	
Inmate-on-inmate non-							
consensual sexual acts	1,443	100.0%	263	100.0%	34	100.0%	
Substantiated	163	13.7	32	15.8	7	31.8	
Unsubstantiated	582	49.0	94	46.3	13	59.1	
Unfounded	442	37.2	78	37.9	2	9.1	
Investigation ongoing	236		32		12		
Inmate-on-inmate abu-							
sive sexual contacts	423	100.0%	57	100.0%	3	100.0%	
Substantiated	103	25.8	12	22.6	0	0	
Unsubstantiated	235	58.8	17	32.1	3	100.0	
Unfounded	62	15.5	24	45.3	0	0	
Investigation ongoing	13		4		0		
Staff sexual misconduct	1,829	100.0%	184	100.0%	29	100.0%	
Substantiated	195	14.9	53	36.5	6	20.7	
Unsubstantiated	867	66.4	50	34.5	18	62.1	
Unfounded	243	18.6	42	29.0	5	17.2	
Investigation ongoing	519		39		0		
Staff sexual harassment	914	100.0%	39	100.0%	7	100.0%	
Substantiated	39	5.7	3	10.0	0	0	
Unsubstantiated	478	69.4	12	40.0	7	100.0	
Unfounded	172	25.0	15	50.0	0	0	
Investigation ongoing	226		8		0		

Note: Excludes facilities operated by the U.S. military, the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, tribal authorities and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. \*Percents based on allegations for which investigations had been completed.

<sup>^</sup>Too few cases to provide a reliable rate.

# Correctional authorities provided detail on 82% of substantiated incidents

For the first time in the 2005 survey prison systems and sampled facilities were asked to provide detailed information on each substantiated incident of sexual violence. Using a separate incident form, the survey obtained incident-based data, providing a basis for an in-depth analysis of sexual violence. Data included details on the circumstances surrounding each incident, characteristics of victims and perpetrators, type of pressure or physical force, sanctions imposed and victim assistance.

Incident-level data were reported on 510 of the 620 substantiated incidents (82%). More than two-thirds of the unreported incidents were in the Federal system (missing data on 35 incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual

violence), New Hampshire (missing 23 incident reports), and Vermont (missing 16 reports on staff sexual harassment). An additional 25 substantiated incidents were missing from local jail reports. Because most systems and facilities reported fully, there was little evidence of any selection bias among the 510 incident reports.

Data provided on substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence revealed that —

- In 4% of the incidents more than one inmate was victimized (table 4).
- In 7% of the incidents there was more than one perpetrator (table 5).
- Males comprised 88% of the victims and 91% of the perpetrators in prison and jails.
- 74% of victims in jail and 42% in prison were age 24 or younger; while 42% of perpetrators in jail and 66% in prison were age 30 or older.

- Whites comprised 73% of the victims, 43% of the perpetrators; while blacks comprised 12% of victims, 39% of perpetrators.
- 15% of perpetrators were Hispanic, compared to 9% of victims.
- More than half of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence was interracial: 10% involved a white perpetrator and a nonwhite victim; 31% black perpetrators and a non-black victim; 11% a Hispanic perpetrator on a non-Hispanic victim (not shown).

Number of victims and perpetrators by race/ Hispanic origin

	Perpetrator					
Victim	White*	Black*	Hispanic	Other*		
Total	171	152	65	13		
White*	130	113	39	10		
Black*	15	28	4	0		
Hispanic	6	11	21	1		
Other*	20	0	1	2		

\*Excludes persons of Hispanic origin.

Table 4. Characteristics of victims in substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence, by type, 2005

	All facilities <sup>a</sup>	Prison	Jail
Number of incidents	358	208	127
Number of victims			
1	95.8%	94.7%	96.9%
2 3	3.1	3.4	3.1
3	0.3	0.5	0
4 or more	0.8	1.4	0
Gender <sup>b</sup>			
Male	88.4%	84.8%	92.4%
Female	11.6	15.2	7.6
Age <sup>b</sup>			
Under 18	7.7%	0.9%	20.6%
18-24	45.1	41.4	53.4
25-29	12.5	15.8	3.8
30-34	17.0	18.1	10.7
35-39	9.3	11.2	7.6
40-44	4.8	6.5	3.1
45 or older	3.7	6.0	8.0
Race/Hispanic originb			
White <sup>c</sup>	72.7%	78.1%	71.0%
Black <sup>c</sup>	11.9	10.2	11.5
Hispaniç	9.3	9.8	3.8
Other <sup>c,d</sup>	6.1	1.9	13.7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

Table 5. Characteristics of perpetrators in substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence, by type, 2005

	All facilities <sup>a</sup> Prison		Jail	
Number of perpetrators				
1	92.7%	92.8%	91.4%	
2 3	3.6	3.9	3.9	
3	1.4	1.9	0.8	
4 or more	2.3	1.5	3.9	
Gender <sup>b</sup>				
Male	91.3%	85.7%	98.6%	
Female	8.7	14.3	1.4	
Age <sup>b</sup>				
Under 18	5.4%	0.5%	14.7%	
18-24	20.1	16.8	30.1	
25-29	14.9	16.8	13.2	
30-34	14.9	15.0	9.6	
35-39	14.7	17.3	6.6	
40-44	18.0	16.4	19.9	
45 or older	11.9	17.3	5.9	
Race/Hispanic origin <sup>b</sup>				
White <sup>c</sup>	43.0%	42.1%	48.2%	
Black <sup>c</sup>	38.8	42.1	33.6	
Hispanic	14.7	10.0	18.2	
Other <sup>c,d</sup>	3.4	5.9	0	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICF

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Based on characteristics of victims for whom gender (380), age (377), or race/Hispanic origin (377) were reported.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Excludes victims of Hispanic origin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Based on characteristics of perpetrators for whom gender (401), age (388), or race/Hispanic origin (381) were reported.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Excludes perpetrators of Hispanic origin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders.

### Physical force or threat of force was used in 51% of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence

Correctional authorities reported that force or threat of force was involved in about half of all incidents of inmate-oninmate sexual violence (table 6). In less than a third of the incidents no force was used or threatened. In other incidents of inmate sexual violence. victims were talked into it (18%), bribed/blackmailed (11%), or offered protection from other inmates (6%).

Force was more common among incidents of nonconsensual sexual activity than among incidents of abusive sexual contacts. In nearly a third of nonconsensual sexual acts, the victim was physically held down or restrained. In a sixth, the victim was physically harmed or injured.

In more than two-thirds of the inmateon-inmate incidents, the sexual violence occurred in the victim's cell (59%) or in a dormitory (12%). In only 21% of the substantiated incidents did the sexual violence occur in a common area, such as a shower or a day room. In less than 9% of the incidents, the inmate-on-inmate sexual violence occurred in a program service area, such as in a storage room, hallway, laundry, cafeteria, kitchen or workshop.

Incidents of inmate sexual violence were the most common (44%) in the evening between 6 p.m. and midnight and the least common (18%) overnight between midnight and 6 a.m. The most serious forms of inmate sexual violence (nonconsensual sexual acts) were most likely to have occurred in the evening (50%); while the least serious acts (abusive sexual contacts) were most likely to have occurred in the morning between 6 a.m. and noon (41%).

In nearly 90% of the substantiated incidents of inmate sexual violence, the victim or another inmate reported the incident. In less than 11% of the incidents had a correctional officer made

the initial report. In only 4% of the most serious incidents (nonconsensual sexual acts) had medical or health care staff reported the incident.

Table 6. Circumstances surrounding substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence, by type, 2005

	All facilities*	Prison	Jail	Noncon- sensual sexual acts	Abusive sexual contacts
Number of incidents	357	207	127	241	116
Type of pressure or force	00.50/	05.40/	40.00/	47.00/	F0 00/
None	30.5%	25.1%	40.2%	17.8%	56.9%
Force/threat of force Threatened with physical	50.7	61.4	39.4	58.9	32.8
harm	22.4	32.4	10.2	26.1	15.5
Physically held down or	22.4	JZ. <del>4</del>	10.2	20.1	13.3
restrained	28.3	32.9	23.6	32.4	19.0
Physically harmed or	20.0	02.0	20.0	02.1	10.0
injured	12.6	13.0	13.4	16.5	5.2
Threatened with a					
weapon	4.2	6.8	0.8	5.8	0.9
Persuasion or talked into it	18.5	15.9	15.7	22.4	10.3
Bribery/blackmail	10.9	7.7	11.8	12.9	6.9
Gave victim drugs/alcohol	0.3	0.5	0	0.4	0
Offered protection from					
other inmates	5.9	6.8	5.5	8.3	0.9
Where occurred					
In victim's cell/room	59.1%	58.7%	60.2%	59.2%	58.6%
In perpetrator's cell/room	3.9	5.3	0	5.0	1.7
In a dormitory	12.1	7.8	17.3	10.8	15.4
In a common area	20.7	18.0	25.8	23.3	15.5
In temporary holding area	0.3	0	0.8	0	0.9
In a program service area	8.7 1.1	12.6 1.9	3.1	2.9 1.3	20.7
Outside the facility While in transit	0.3	0.5	0 0	1.3 0.4	0.9 0
	0.3	0.5	U	0.4	U
Time of day	07.00/	00.00/	00.00/	04.50/	44.00/
6 a.m. to noon	27.8%	22.0%	36.0%	21.5%	41.3%
Noon to 6 p.m.	20.5 44.0	30.9 44.5	4.8 42.4	18.4 50.2	24.8 31.2
6 p.m. to midnight Midnight to 6 a.m.	44.0 18.4	44.5 18.8	20.0	50.2 18.5	31.2 18.2
ŭ	10.4	10.0	20.0	10.5	10.2
Who reported the incident	00.00/	00.00/	00.00/	04.00/	70.00/
Victim	82.6%	80.2%	90.6%	84.2%	78.6%
Another inmate	8.4 0.6	9.7 0.5	7.1 0.8	7.9 0.4	10.3 0.9
Family of victim Correctional officer	10.6	0.5 12.1	6.3	0. <del>4</del> 10.8	10.3
Administrative staff	0.6	0	1.6	0.8	0
Medical/healthcare staff	2.8	2.4	1.6	4.1	0
Counselor/teacher	1.4	2.4	0	0.4	3.4
Chaplain/other religious			-		<del>-</del>
official	0.3	0.5	0	0.4	0

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed for each

\*Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

### Victims received physical injuries in 15% of substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence

In most substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence victims were not physically injured (85%) (table 7). Anal or rectal tearing was reported in 6% of the incidents; less serious injuries, including bruises, black eyes, sprains, cuts, and scratches were reported in 11% of the incidents. In fewer than 1% of the incidents, victims received broken bones or were knocked unconscious.

Knife or stab wounds and other internal injuries were not reported for any of the incidents.

Victims received medical attention, counseling or mental health treatment in more than two-thirds of the incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts. Among the most serious incidents, 63% of the victims were given a medical examination: 27% were administered a rape kit; 17% were tested for HIV/AIDS; 17% were tested for other sexually transmitted diseases; and 33% were provided counseling or mental health treatment.

### Half of victims of nonconsensual sexual acts were placed in protective custody or administrative segregation

The most common response following a reported incident of sexual violence was to place the victim in administrative segregation or protective custody (44%) or to transfer the victim to another facility (11%). Given differing housing options, prison authorities were more likely than jail authorities to move the victims rather than confine them to their cell/room.

Victims of abusive sexual contacts were the least likely to be moved, with over half (53%) having no change in housing. About a third of the victims of nonconsensual sexual acts were confined to their cell (11%) or had no change in their housing (23%).

### Table 7. Impact on victims and perpetrators in substantiated incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence, by type, 2005

	, ., ., ,,				
	All facilities <sup>a</sup>	Prison	Jail	Noncon- sensual sexual acts	Abusive sexual contacts
Victim injured					
No	84.6%	80.0%	95.7%	78.4%	96.6%
Yes <sup>b</sup>	15.4	20.0	4.3	21.6	3.4
Broken bones	0.3	0.5	0	0.4	0
Anal/vaginal tearing	6.1	5.4	2.6	9.3	Ö
Teeth chipped/knocked out	0.3	0	0.9	0	0.9
Knocked unconscious	0.3	0.5	0	0.4	0
Bruises, black eye, sprains, cuts,					
scratches, swelling	11.0	15.6	2.6	15.0	3.4
Medical follow up for victim					
Given medical examination	53.4%	58.9%	42.5%	63.3%	33.3%
Administered rape kit	19.0	21.3	8.7	26.7	3.4
Tested for HIV/AIDS	12.0	14.0	6.3	17.0	1.7
Tested for other STD	11.8	14.0	5.5	16.6	1.7
Provided counseling or mental health			0.0		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
treatment	34.9	43.5	20.3	32.9	39.3
None of the above	35.7	29.0	46.9	31.7	43.6
Change in housing/custody for victim <sup>c</sup>					
Placed in administrative segregation					
or protective custody	44.0%	46.6%	40.2%	49.3%	30.3%
Placed in medical unit	8.7	13.2	2.0	9.1	7.8
Confined to own cell/room	9.0	3.2	18.6	10.5	5.6
Transferred to another facility	10.7	17.5	0.0	12.3	6.7
Other (reported after release/transfer)		2.6	1.0	6.0	2.2
None of the above	31.7	30.7	38.2	23.2	52.8
Sanction imposed on perpetrator	•		00		02.0
Solitary/disciplinary	70.8%	84.5%	55.9%	71.6%	69.6%
Confined to own cell/room	27.9	21.8	40.2	25.1	33.0
Placed in higher custody	20.1	16.6	26.8	27.3	5.4
Transferred to another facility	18.9	25.4	9.4	17.7	21.2
Loss of good time	13.4	22.8	0	13.9	12.5
Given extra work	0.6	0.5	0	0.4	0.9
Loss of privileges	20.7	21.2	22.0	21.6	18.8
Legal action	51.3	31.1	83.5	57.6	39.3
Arrested	12.2	4.1	20.5	15.9	4.5
Referred for prosecution	45.6	28.5	77.3	50.6	34.8
Given new sentence	4.1	1.0	9.4	6.1	0
Disciplinary report issued	4.7	8.3	0	6.1	1.8

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed for each item

### Most inmate perpetrators received legal sanctions or solitary confinement

- A legal sanction, including arrest, referral for prosecution, or new sentence, was imposed on perpetrators in 31% of the substantiated incidents in prisons; 83% of the incidents in jails.
- · Perpetrators were referred for prosecution in more than half of the substantiated incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts: in a third of the incidents of abusive sexual contacts.
- Perpetrators were moved to solitary confinement in 72% of the incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts and in 70% of the incidents of abusive sexual contacts.
- Perpetrators also received other sanctions, including confinement to own cell/room (28%), loss of privileges (21%), placement in a higher custody level (20%), or transfer to another facility (19%).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>The categories "knife or stab wounds" and "internal injuries" were not marked in any incident.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>The category "given a higher custody level within the facility" was not marked in any incident.

### Two-thirds of incidents of staff sexual misconduct with inmates were reported to be romantic

The survey collected data on 344 substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment during 2005. In two-thirds of these incidents, correctional authorities determined that staff had a romantic relationship with the inmate (table 8). Although legally all sexual relationships between staff and inmates are considered nonconsensual, fewer than 15% of the substantiated incidents involved physical force, abuse of power or pressure by staff.

Coercion, including force, pressure, unwanted touching, indecent exposure, and harassment, was more common among incidents in jails (43%) than in prisons (26%).

Other data reported on substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment revealed that —

- · In more than half the incidents, either the victim (32%) or another inmate (26%) reported the misconduct (table 9).
- In a third of the incidents, correctional officers (18%) or administrative staff (16%) reported the incident. In 10% of the incidents, the misconduct was reported anonymously.
- · Most incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment occurred outside of the inmate's living area, in a program area (53%), outside of the facility (12%), or in a common area (10%).
- In prisons, incidents of staff sexual misconduct occurred most often between noon and 6 p.m. (50%); in jails, incidents occurred more evenly throughout the day.
- In 5% of the incidents more than one staff member was involved in the sexual misconduct.
- In 10% of the incidents more than one inmate was involved.

### Female staff implicated in staff sexual misconduct in prisons; males in local jails

Characteristics of victims and perpetrators of staff sexual misconduct and harassment differed among prisons and jail facilities:

- In State and Federal prisons 67% of the victims of staff misconduct were male, while 62% of the perpetrators were female (tables 10 and 11).
- In local jails 78% of the victims were females; 87% of the perpetrators, male.
- 47% of the prison staff involved in sexual misconduct and harassment were age 40 or older; compared to 27% of the jail staff.
- In prisons 69% of the perpetrators were white, 25% black, and 3% Hispanic.
- In jails 74% of the perpetrators were white, 21% black, and 4% Hispanic.

Table 8. Characteristics of substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility, 2005

Characteristic	All facilities*	Prison	Jail	
Number of incidents	344	208	111	
Nature of the incident				
Romantic	68.3%	73.6%	56.8%	
Sexual harassment	10.9	12.0	10.9	
Unwanted touching	10.3	9.6	10.8	
Indecent exposure	5.3	4.8	7.2	
Pressure/abuse of power	14.1	10.6	21.6	
Physical force	0.6	1.0	0	
Number of staff involved				
1	95.0%	95.7%	92.8%	
2	5.0	4.3	7.2	
Number of victims				
1	90.1%	92.8%	84.7%	
2	8.1	4.8	14.4	
3	0.6	1.0	0	
4 or more	1.2	1.5	0.9	
N - 4 - 1 D - 4 - 11 4	41 4000/ I		I -	

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed for each item.

### Table 9. Circumstances surrounding substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility, 2005

Characteristic	All facilities <sup>a</sup>	Prison	Jail
Who reported the incident			
Victim	31.9%	24.9%	43.9%
Another inmate	25.8	28.9	26.2
Family of victim	0.9	0.5	1.9
Correctional officer	17.6	18.8	11.2
Administrative staff	15.8	16.2	18.7
Medical/healthcare staff	2.4	2.5	0
Instructor/teacher/counselor	0.9	1.5	0
Chaplain/other religious official	0.3	0.5	0
Other (anonymous/letter)	9.7	11.7	4.7
Where occurred <sup>b</sup>			
In victim's cell/room	14.0%	8.9%	26.1%
In a dormitory	6.7	8.9	3.6
In a common area	10.1	7.3	17.3
In temporary holding area	0.6	0.5	0.9
In a program service area	52.6	57.3	40.5
Outside the facility	12.5	13.0	12.7
Other/unknown	9.7	12.5	2.7
Time of day			
6 a.m. to noon	32.4%	37.0%	30.5%
Noon to 6 p.m.	41.4	50.0	29.5
6 p.m. to midnight	36.8	36.4	32.4
Midnight to 6 a.m.	18.5	16.9	23.6

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed for each item.

<sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and

<sup>b</sup>The category "In transit" was not marked in any incident.

<sup>\*</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

Table 10. Characteristics of staff involved in staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility, 2005

	All facilities <sup>a</sup>	Prison	Jail
Gender <sup>b</sup>			
Male	54.3%	37.7%	86.6%
Female	45.7	62.3	13.4
Age <sup>b</sup>			
24 or younger	12.7%	10.4%	10.5%
25-29	14.7	13.3	14.9
30-34	15.9	13.7	21.9
35-39	19.0	15.2	25.4
40-44	14.1	13.7	17.5
45-54	18.2	25.1	8.8
55 or older	5.5	8.5	0.9
Race/Hispanic originb			
White <sup>c</sup>	68.5%	69.4%	74.4%
Black <sup>c</sup>	23.5	25.4	21.4
Hispanic	4.3	2.9	4.3
Other <sup>c,d</sup>	3.7	2.4	0

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed for each item.

Table 11. Characteristics of inmates involved in staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility, 2005

	All facilities <sup>a</sup>	Prison	Jail
Gender <sup>b</sup>			
Male	52.0%	67.5%	21.9%
Female	48.0	32.5	78.1
Age <sup>b</sup>			
Under 18	0.6%	0%	1.7%
18-24	17.6	12.8	24.4
25-29	28.5	25.1	26.9
30-34	22.9	27.5	18.5
35-39	17.3	18.0	18.5
40-44	6.7	8.5	5.0
45 or older	6.4	8.1	5.0
Race/Hispanic origin	ı <sup>b</sup>		
White <sup>c</sup>	56.8%	54.2%	66.7%
Black <sup>c</sup>	26.9	32.1	24.0
Hispanic	9.8	9.4	6.2
Other <sup>c,d</sup>	6.5	4.2	3.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

Among victims of staff sexual misconduct, white inmates were overrepresented, compared with the general inmate population. Non-Hispanic whites comprised 57% of the inmates involved in staff misconduct, compared to 36% of all prison and jail inmates at midyear 2005. (See Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2005, NCJ 213133.) Non-Hispanic blacks comprised 27% of inmates involved in staff misconduct; 40% of all inmates nationwide. Hispanic inmates were 10% of the victims of staff misconduct compared to 20% of the inmate population.

### Over two-thirds of perpetrators of staff sexual misconduct or harassment were correctional officers

Most substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment involved correctional officers — 57% of the incidents in prisons; 89% of those in jails (table 12). In prisons, nearly 16% of perpetrators of staff misconduct were maintenance and other facility support staff, including groundskeepers, janitors, cooks, and drivers. An additional 10% of perpetrators in prisons were medical or health care staff, including counselors, doctors, dentists, nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, and medical assistants.

In both prisons and jails, about 13% of the staff perpetrators of sexual misconduct or harassment were contract employees or vendors.

### Inmates involved in staff sexual misconduct often transferred or placed in segregation

In 27% of the substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct the inmates involved were transferred to another facility; in 20% of the incidents they were placed in administrative segregation or protective custody (table 13). In incidents involving a romantic relationship between inmate and staff, more than half of the inmates were either transferred (30%) or placed in administrative segregation (22%) (not shown).

In incidents involving staff coercion, about a third of the victims were either transferred (20%) or placed in segregation (15%).

In most substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct (74%), victims received no medical followup, counseling, or mental health treatment. Excluding incidents involving romantic relationships, victims in 15% of the nonconsensual acts were given a medical examination and 19% were provided counseling or mental health treatment.

Table 12. Type of staff involved in staff sexual misconduct and harassment, by type of facility, 2005

	All facilities*	Prison	Jail
Type of staff involved			
Full/part-time employee	86.7%	86.2%	87.9%
Contract employee/vendor	13.3	13.8	12.1
Volunteer/intern	0.6	1.0	0
Position of staff involved			
Administrator	1.8%	2.9%	0%
Correctional officer	68.7	57.0	89.1
Clerical	3.5	3.9	3.6
Maintenance	10.9	15.9	0.9
Medical/health care	6.2	9.7	0.9
Educational	2.6	3.9	0.9
Other program staff	1.5	2.4	0
Other	6.8	5.3	9.1

<sup>\*</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>The number of staff involved totaled 358. Gender was reported for 350 staff; age for 347; and race/Hispanic origin for 349.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Excludes staff of Hispanic origin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>The number of victims of staff misconduct totaled 390: gender was reported for 367; age for 358; and race/Hispanic origin for 368.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Excludes inmates of Hispanic origin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders.

### Nearly 90% of perpetrators of staff misconduct arrested, referred for prosecution, or discharged

Correctional authorities indicated that in 82% of the substantiated incidents staff had been discharged or resigned; 45% arrested or referred for prosecution, and 17% were disciplined, transferred, or demoted.

Among the multiple types of sanctions imposed on staff, discharge or resignation was the most common — 30% of the incidents in prison and 55% of those in jails. Many staff chose to resign (43%) rather than be terminated. In incidents involving a romantic relationship between an inmate and staff, 90% of staff were discharged or resigned (not shown). In incidents involving coercion, 64% of staff lost their jobs and 53% were arrested or referred for prosecution.

### Methodology

The 2005 Survey of Sexual Violence was based on seven separate samples, corresponding to the different

facilities covered under the act. The following samples were drawn:

- 1. The survey included all 50 State adult prison systems and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Prison administrators were directed to report only on incidents of sexual violence that occurred within publicly operated adult facilities.
- 2. A sample of 32 privately operated prison facilities was drawn to represent a 10% sample of the 319 private prisons identified in the 2000 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities and updated for new construction and closures since 2000. Facilities were sorted by region and average daily population and then sampled with probabilities proportionate to size. One sampled facility had closed.
- 3. Publicly operated jail facilities were selected based on data reported in the 2004 Deaths in Custody collection.

Jurisdictions were sorted into 6 strata, based on their average daily populations, and then sampled systematically, to provide a representative national sample. A total of 72 jurisdictions were sampled with certainty (corresponding to the largest jurisdiction in each State plus 26 jurisdictions selected due to their large size). An additional 278 jurisdictions were selected from 4 strata, with probabilities of selection proportionate to size. Jail administrators were directed to report on all publicly operated facilities

within their jurisdiction. Of the 350

selected facilities. 3 had closed.

- 4. A sample of 5 privately operated jails was also selected based on the data reported in the 2004 Deaths in Custody collection. The 38 private facilities were sorted by region and their average daily population during 2004. Facilities were selected systematically using a random start and a fixed sampling interval.
- 5. Three additional samples of other correctional facilities were drawn to represent:
- a) jails in Indian country (7 facilities holding adults were selected from a total of 68 based on probabilities proportionate to size);
- b) military-operated facilities (all of the 59 facilities operated by the Armed Services in the continental U.S.);
- c) 14 facilities operated by the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Data for each correctional system and sampled facility are displayed in the Appendix tables. In each table a measure of population size has been provided as a basis of comparison; however, the survey results should not be used to rank systems or facilities. Variations in the number of allegations and substantiated incidents may reflect differences in definitions and reporting criteria, as well as variations in procedures for recording allegations and in the thoroughness of subsequent investigations.

Table 13. Impact on inmate and staff in substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and harassment, 2005

	All facilities <sup>a</sup>	Deinos	la:I
	All facilities	Prison	Jail
Medical followup for inmate			
Given medical examination	14.7%	11.6%	17.1%
Administered rape kit	7.4	2.6	11.8
Tested for HIV/AIDS	1.5	0.5	1.8
Tested for other STD	2.5	1.6	2.7
Provided counseling or mental health treatment	14.2	17.4	10.9
None of the above	74.2	78.4	67.6
Any change in housing/custody for inmate			
Placed in administrative segregation or protective custody	/ 19.7%	26.3%	3.0%
Placed in medical unit	2.2	0	4.0
Confined to own cell/room	5.1	1.1	11.1
Given a higher custody level within facility	4.5	4.7	1.0
Transferred to another facility	26.8	25.3	35.4
Other <sup>b</sup>	11.1	7.4	17.2
None of the above	36.3	42.6	28.3
Sanctions on staff			
Legal sanction	44.7%	37.0%	62.7%
Arrested	27.9	16.8	48.6
Referred for prosecution	34.3	34.6	35.1
Loss of job	81.8	81.7	79.3
Discharged	41.3	30.3	55.5
Staff resigned (prior to investigation)	30.1	32.7	27.0
Staff resigned (after investigation)	13.2	19.7	3.6
Other sanction	17.0	16.8	19.8
Reprimanded/disciplined	11.8	12.5	11.8
Demoted/diminished responsibilities	3.5	1.0	8.1
Transferred to another facility	2.3	3.4	0

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed for each item. <sup>a</sup>Includes substantiated incidents reported by private prisons and jails, Indian country jails, and facilities operated by the U.S. military and ICE.

bIncludes "stayed in same unit," "transferred elsewhere in facility," and "incident reported after release."

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

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business Penalty for Private Use \$300



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

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jeffrey L. Sedgwick is director.

Allen J. Beck and Paige M. Harrison wrote this report. Laura Maruschak, Seri Palla, and Maura Spiegelman verified the report. Tina Dorsey, Carolyn Williams, and Marianne W. Zawitz produced and edited the report. Jayne Robinson prepared the report for publication.

Timothy A. Hughes and Paige M. Harrison, under the supervision of Allen J. Beck, designed the survey, developed the questionnaires, and monitored data collection and data processing.

Pamela H. Butler, Greta B. Clark, and Nicole D. Simpson carried out data collection and processing, under the supervision of Charlene M. Sebold, Governments Division, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. Patricia D. Torreyson, Pearl E. Chase, and D. Alicia Gumbs assisted in data collection. Suzanne M. Dorinski drew the facility samples and provided sampling weights.

July 2006, NCJ 214646

This report in portable document format and in ASCII and its related statistical data and tables—including five appendix tables—are available at the BJS World Wide Web Internet site: <a href="http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/">http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>

### Office of Justice Programs

Partnerships for Safer Communities http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov

			•	nmate-on-in Isual sexual					d inmate-or sexual con		
lurisdiction	Prisoners in custody, 6/30/2005 <sup>a</sup>		Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Investi- gation ongoing	Allega-	Sub- stantiated	Unsub-	Unfounded	Investi- gation ongoing
Total	1,337,473	1,443	163	582	442	236	423	103	235	62	13
ederal <sup>b</sup>	156,643	25	5	1	1	1	40	30	1	/	1
State	1,180,830		158	582	442	236	383	73	235	62	13
Alabama	25,161	9	1	4	4	0	1	0	0	1	0
Alaska	3,248	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	/	1
Arizona	27,204	17	6	4	6	1	6	2	1	3	0
Arkansas	12,568	7	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
California	161,709		4	28	16	11	16	2	8	0	6
Colorado	16,997	27	15	8	4	0	11,	8	3	0	C
Connecticut <sup>c</sup>	19,087		0	20	1 2	0	1	0	/	1	Ċ
Delaware Florida	6,916 79,478	2 124	0 0	0 101	2 14	0 9	19	0	0 14	1 5	0
Georgia <sup>c</sup>	43,057	37	0	0	4	33	/	1	/	,	
Hawaii <sup>c</sup>	3,931	8	4	3	1	0	,	,	,	,	
Idaho	6,136		3	5 5	7	0	11	5	6	0	ć
Illinois	44,669	17	1	14	0	2	0	0	0	Ö	Č
Indiana	22,304	27	3	12	11	1	3	0	1	2	Ċ
lowa	8,578	11	0	5	3	3	8	0	0	8	C
Kansas	9,068	25	1	7	16	1	17	1	14	1	1
Kentucky	11,366	3	0	2	1	0	10	4	4	2	C
_ouisiana	16,667	10	1	6	1	2	1	0	0	1	C
Maine	2,063		3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	C
Maryland	23,086	15	2	10	0	3	1	1	0	0	C
Massachusetts	10,159	10	2	2	5	1	21	9	2	10	C
Michigan <sup>c</sup>	48,535		19	29	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Minnesota	7,996		1	2	9	0	1	1	0	0	C
Mississippi Missouri	11,643	1	0 1	1 25	0 5	0 5	0 21	0 4	0 11	0 2	0
Missouri	31,000		· ·					· ·			
Montana	1,911	2	2	0	0	0	3	2	1,	0	C
Nebraska <sup>c</sup> Nevada <sup>c</sup>	4,308 11,155		0 0	0 7	10 2	0 5	1	,	1	,	,
New Hampshire <sup>c,d,e</sup>	2,456		18	,	1	1	1	,	1	,	
New Jersey <sup>c</sup>	26,353	3	0	Ó	2	1	,	,	,	,	
New Mexico	3,757	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
New York	63,234		1	14	Ö	13	1	1	0	ő	Č
North Carolina <sup>c</sup>	36,477	20	7	12	1	0	1	1	1	1	
North Dakota	1,287	1	0	0	1	0	8	4	1	3	C
Ohio	42,346	71	11	10	50	0	27	12	6	9	C
Oklahoma <sup>a</sup>	17,196	23	3	10	10	0	2	1	1	0	C
Oregon	12,769		4	15	2	4	3	0	3	0	C
Pennsylvania <sup>c</sup>	40,649		6	10	0	0	/	/	/	/	,
Rhode Island South Carolina <sup>d</sup>	3,364	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0
	23,057		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	3,385		1	3	2	0	7	2	3	2	C
Tennessee	14,303		3	12	7	3	7	2	2	1	2
Texas Utah	141,247 4,775		10 3	145 8	225 3	131 0	143 7	5 3	131 2	7 2	C
utan Vermont <sup>e</sup>	4,775 1,601	19	3 1	8 17	3 1	0	20	3 1	2 18	1	0
	•		-					-		•	
Virginia <sup>e</sup>	29,445		1 7	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	C
Washington West Virginia	16,126 3,966		/ 2	12 0	5 0	1 1	0 1	0 1	0 0	0 0	C
west virginia Wisconsin <sup>f</sup>	21,850		6	13	4	1	1	I /	/	0	(
Wyoming	1,187		2	3	1	0	3	1	2	0	ć

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Excludes inmates in private facilities. Counts were based on National Prisoners Statistics (NPS-1A), 2005.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Allegations were reported for occurrences in 2005; findings may include cases from previous years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Allegations of abusive sexual contacts could not be counted separately from allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Allegations limited to substantiated occurrences only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>e</sup>Allegations limited to completed acts only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>f</sup>Reports of abusive sexual contacts were based on a broader category of inmate sexual misconduct.

Appendix table 1b. Allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates reported by State or Federal prison authorities, by type, 2005 Reported allegations of staff Reported allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates sexual harassment of inmates Investi-Investigation Allega-Sub-Unsub-Allega-Sub-Unsubgation stantiated stantiated Unfounded stantiated stantiated Unfounded ongoing Jurisdiction tions ongoing tions Total 1,829 Federal<sup>a,b</sup> State 1,626 Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticuta Delaware Florida q Georgia Hawaii R Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska<sup>a</sup> / Nevada<sup>a</sup> New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina<sup>a,c</sup> North Dakota Oklahoma<sup>a</sup> Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina<sup>c</sup> South Dakota Tennessee Texas<sup>a</sup> Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin 

<sup>/</sup>Not reported.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct may include reports of staff sexual harassment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Excludes 5 cases disposed of administratively.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct are based on substantiated allegations only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Reports of staff sexual harassment are not recorded in a central database.

	Average		Reported inn	nate-on-inmate			Reported in	mate-on-inmate	<b>!</b>
	daily	nonconsensual sexual acts							
Jurisdiction and facility	population, 2005	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
Total	328,655	263	32	94	78	57	12	17	24
Alabama									
Attalla City	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Autauga County	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bibb County	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chilton County	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crenshaw County <sup>a</sup>	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Franklin County	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lipscomb City	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madison County	835	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mobile County <sup>b</sup>	1,433	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Pickens County	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pleasant Grove City	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russell County	297	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		_	-	-	-	_	-	-	•
Alaska	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unalaska City <sup>a,b</sup>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona									
Maricopa County	9,515	9	0	6	3	2	0	2	0
Mohave County	441	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pinal County <sup>a</sup> <sup>*</sup>	698	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Arkansas									
Brinkley City <sup>a</sup>	7	0	0	0	0	,	1	1	1
Craighead County <sup>a</sup>	227	0	0	0	0	,	1	,	1
						,	,	,	,
Dallas County <sup>c</sup>	66	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/
Drew County <sup>a</sup>	40	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Pulaski County Regional <sup>b</sup>	857	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren City	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California									
Calaveras County	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contra Costa County <sup>a</sup>	1,627	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/
Fresno County	3,029	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
Kern County	2,198	- 1	Ö	1	0	2	1	1	0
Kings County	307	0	Ö	Ó	Ö	0	Ö	0	Ö
Los Angeles County	19,488	4	Õ	4	Ö	4	Ö	4	Ö
Nevada County	215	0	Õ	0	Ö	0	Ö	0	Ö
Orange County	6,164	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	Ö
Riverside County	3,268	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	0
Sacramento County	4,123	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0		0	0	0
San Bernardino County	5,592	12			1	0	U	U,	U
San Diego County <sup>a</sup>	5,172		0	10	-	/	7	7	7
San Luis Obispo County	503	0	0	0	0	0	0,	0	0
Santa Clara County <sup>a</sup>	4,525	2	0	2	0	1	/	/	/
Santa Cruz County <sup>a,d</sup>	599	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Sierra County	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Solano County <sup>a</sup>	1,061	1	0	0	1	/	/	/	/
Stanislaus County	1,284	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado									
Adams County <sup>a</sup>	1,197	1	1	0	0	1	/	/	1
Denver City <sup>a,d,e</sup>	2,336	0	0	Õ	Ö	,	,	,	,
Gilpin County <sup>a</sup>	53	0	Õ	Ö	Ö	,	,	. /	,
La Plata County <sup>a</sup>	175	0	Õ	Ö	Ö	1	,	. /	,
Larimer County <sup>a</sup>	528	0	0	0	0	,	,	,	,
Mesa County <sup>a</sup>	365	0	0	0	0	,	,	,	,
Sedgwick County <sup>b</sup>	3	0	0	0	0	Ó	ó	ó	ó
							,		,
District of Columbia <sup>c</sup>	3,588	3	0	2	0	1	/	1	/
Florida									
Bradford County	226	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Broward County <sup>c,e</sup>	5,482	3	Ö	Ö	3	1	1	1	1
Charlotte County	471	0	Õ	Õ	Ö	Ó	ó	Ó	ó
Dade County <sup>a</sup>	6,772	3	0	0	2	1	,	,	,
Hillsborough County <sup>a</sup>	4,637	0	0	0	0	,	,	,	,
Indian River County	4,037 627	0	0	0	0	0	0	ó	0
Indian River County			-			Ü	U ,	U,	U ,
Jacksonville City <sup>a</sup>	3,420	13	0	13	0	Ι,	,	/	/
Orange County <sup>a</sup>	3,706	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Palm Beach County	2,789	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Average		•	mate-on-inmate				mate-on-inmate	
Jurisdiction	daily population,	Allega-	nonconsens Sub-	ual sexual acts Unsub-		Allega-	abusive sex	ual contacts Unsub-	
and facility	2005	tions	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	tions	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded
Florida (continued)	·								
Pinellas County <sup>a</sup>	3,317	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Polk County	2,724	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
St. Lucie County Sarasota County <sup>b</sup>	1,073 873	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Seminole County	933	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Taylor County	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0
Volusia County	1,575	Ö	Ö	ő	Ö	4	2	1	ĭ
Wakulla County	218	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia									
Augusta-Richmond County	1,087	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben Hill County	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Butts County	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll County Cor. Inst.	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll County <sup>a</sup>	478	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/
Cobb County <sup>a</sup> Decatur County	2,265 296	1 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0
DeKalb County <sup>a</sup>	3,032	3	1	1	1	1	/	/	1
East Point City	62	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	ó	ó	ó	ó
Forsyth County	136	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö
Fulton County <sup>a</sup>	3,200	17	1	1	1	1	/	1	1
Gwinnett County Cor. Inst.a	723	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/
Gwinnett County	1,766	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lowndes County	645	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milledgeville City	4 128	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Monroe County Muscogee County <sup>a,e</sup>	598	0	0	0 0	0	/	0	0	,
Peach County	70	0	0	0	0	ó	Ó	ó	ó
Polk County <sup>a</sup>	150	Ö	Ö	ő	Ö	1	/	1	1
Taylor County <sup>a</sup>	27	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/
Troup County <sup>d</sup>	428	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upson County	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho									
Adams County	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bingham County	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Canyon County	579	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	400	•	•	•	•	•		•	•
Adams County Cook County	106	0 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson County <sup>a</sup>	9,854 108	0	0 0	8 0	2 0	/	0	0	0
Jo Daviess County	25	0	0	0	0	ó	Ó	ó	ó
Kankakee County	385	Ö	Ö	ő	Ö	Ö	ő	Ö	ő
Stark County	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Will County <sup>a</sup>	568	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/
Woodford County	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana									
Clinton County <sup>a</sup>	118	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	1
Floyd County	273	15	10	2	3	/	/	/	/
Greene County <sup>a</sup> Hendricks County	83 276	0 1	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0
Lake County <sup>a</sup>	970	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1
Marion County <sup>a</sup>	2,584	4	0	2	2	,	,	,	,
Perry County	38	0	ő	0	0	ó	ó	ó	ó
Porter County <sup>a</sup>	493	4	Ō	4	0	1	1	1	1
Shelby County <sup>a</sup>	187	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	/
Tippecanoe County <sup>a</sup>	504	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	/
Vermillion County	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iowa									
Buchanan County	915	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Davis County <sup>a</sup>	8	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Fremont County	7 390	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0
Linn County <sup>c</sup> Marshall County	380 151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mills County <sup>a</sup>	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Polk County <sup>a</sup>	971	0	ő	Ő	Ö	,	,	•	•

	Average daily	Reported inn	Reported inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts						
Jurisdiction and facility	population, 2005	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
Kansas									
Galena City	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geary County	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kingman County <sup>a</sup>	8	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/
Ottawa County	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sedgwick County	1,501	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	0
Stevens County <sup>a</sup>	14	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/
Kentucky									
Campbell County	294	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Daviess County <sup>á</sup>	650	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Hardin County	523	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laurel County	365	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Louisville-Jefferson									
County <sup>a</sup>	1,830	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Mason County	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meade County	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio County <sup>a</sup>	47	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	1	/	1	1
Oldham County <sup>c,d</sup>	90	0	Ö	Õ	Ö	,	,		. /
Whitley County <sup>f</sup>	90	0	ő	ő	Ö	Ó	Ó	ó	Ó
		ŭ	ŭ	J	·	•	~	•	•
Louisiana Amito City	40	^	^	0	^	^	0	0	0
Amite City	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Avoyelles Parish	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calcasieu Parish	1,190	5	3	2	0	1	0	1,	0
Iberia Parish <sup>a</sup>	450	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Jennings City	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orleans Parisha	3,969	7	/	/	/	1	1	1	1
Ouachita Parish <sup>a,e</sup>	850	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	/
St. Charles Parish <sup>a</sup>	508	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
St. James Parish	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Landry Parish	211	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	3
Terrebonne Parish <sup>c</sup>	616	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Washington Parish	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maine									
Cumberland County	413	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oxford County <sup>a</sup>	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Maryland									
Baltimore City	3,710	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery County	978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince Georges County	1,256	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	306	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's County	300	2	1	U	U	U	U	U	U
Massachusetts									
Hampden County	1,607	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Hampshire County	270	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Middlesex County <sup>a</sup>	1,182	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Plymouth County <sup>a</sup>	1,514	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan									
Delta County <sup>a,d,e</sup>	89	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/
Dickson County	77	Ő	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ó	Ó	Ó	Ó
Genesee County	575	0	ő	ő	Ö	0	Ö	Ö	Ő
Jackson County	410	0	Ő	ő	Ö	0	Ő	Ö	ő
Kalkaska County <sup>a</sup>	47	0	ő	ő	Ö	1	1	1	1
Livingston County <sup>a</sup>	217	0	Ő	ő	Ö	,	,	,	,
Mackinac County <sup>a</sup>	29	0	0	0	0	,	,	,	,
Macomb County	1,409	1	0	0	0	3	Ó	1	2
Monroe County	369	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0
Van Buren County <sup>a,d</sup>	178	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	/
Wayne County	2,712	4	0	3	0	2	ó	ó	2
	2,112	7	U	3	J	_	J	3	_
Minnesota		_	_	_	^	_	^	^	_
Hennepin County	552	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston County	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nicollet County	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winona County	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright County	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi									
Attalla County	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claiborne County	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harrison County <sup>a,d</sup>	925	0	0	0	0	,	/	,	,

Appendix table 2a (continu	Appendix table 2a (continued). Allegations of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence reported by local jail authorities, by type, 2005									
	Average daily			ate-on-inmate			Reported inr	mate-on-inmate		
Jurisdiction and facility	population, 2005	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	
Mississippi (continued) Kemper-Neshoba County										
Regional	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Leflore County	130	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Stone County	344	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington County Wayne County <sup>a</sup>	74 49	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 /	0 /	0 /	0 /	
Missouri										
Callaway County	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Clinton County	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Greene County	501	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	
Howard County	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howell County	41	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	
Kansas City Phelps County	132 123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reynolds County	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Francois County <sup>a</sup>	136	1	0	1	Ö	1	,	1	1	
St. Louis City <sup>a</sup>	1,572	Ö	Ö	Ô	Ō	,	,	,	,	
Montana	_	•	•	•	•				,	
Glacier County <sup>a,e</sup>	5	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Lake County Yellowstone County <sup>a,e</sup>	40 430	0 1	0 1	0 0	0 0	1 /	1 /	0 /	0 /	
Nebraska										
Cedar County	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Douglas County <sup>a</sup>	1,034	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Fillmore County a,d,e	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Seward County <sup>a</sup>	23	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/	
Nevada			_	_	_			_	_	
Clark County	3,296	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
Lander County	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washoe County	1,077	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
New Hampshire	504		•	•		•	•	•	•	
Hillsborough County	524	1 0	0 0	0 0	1 0	0	0	0	0	
Merrimack County <sup>a</sup>	180	U	U	U	U	1	/	1	1	
New Jersey	000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bergen County Essex County	989 2.138	0 2	0 0	0 0	0 2	0 2	0 0	0 0	0 2	
Hudson County	2,136	3	1	1	7	3	0	0	3	
Middlesex County	1,152	2	Ó	ó	Ó	0	Ö	Ő	Ö	
Ocean County <sup>a</sup>	471	1	Ö	Ö	Õ	1	/	1	1	
Salem County	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
New Mexico										
Bernalillo County	2,239	8	1	2	4	2	0	0	1	
Lea County	289	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Rio Arriba County <sup>a</sup>	120	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/	
San Juan County	598	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	
Sierra County	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
New York			_	_			•		•	
Erie County Holding Center		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Livingston County	100 1,581	0	0 0	0 0	0 1	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	
Nassau County <sup>e</sup> New York City <sup>a</sup>	13,420	2 6	0	4	2	/	0	0	/	
Onondaga County	672	0	0	0	0	ó	ó	ó	ó	
Oswego County	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Rensselaer County <sup>a</sup>	320	0	ő	Ö	ő	1	1	1	1	
Steuben County	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
North Carolina										
Alamance County <sup>a</sup>	276	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	/	
Beaufort County	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cumberland County	511	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Dare County	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Greene County <sup>a</sup>	73 145	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	/,	/	/	1	
Harnett County Mecklenburg County <sup>a</sup>	145 2,178	1	0	0	0 1	1	1	1	<i>I</i> <i>I</i>	
New Hanover County <sup>a</sup>	2,176 517	1	0	0	1	1	,	,	/	
Randolph County <sup>a</sup>	200	Ö	0	0	Ö	,	,	,	,	
Wake County	1,682	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ó	Ó	Ó	Ó	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,	-				-		-		

	Average			mate-on-inmate		Reported inmate-on-inmate				
lurisdiction	daily population,	Allega-	nonconsens Sub-	ual sexual acts Unsub-		Allega-		exual contacts Unsub-	<u> </u>	
and facility	2005	tions	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	tions	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	
North Dakota										
Cass County	223	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Forks County	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mercer County	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dhio										
Ashland County <sup>a</sup>	95	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Brown County	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,	0	
Butler County <sup>a</sup> Carroll Countv	766	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0	
Clark County <sup>a</sup>	41 227	0	0	0	0	,	,	0	,	
Franklin County	2,370	0	0	0	0	ó	0	0	ó	
Greene County <sup>a</sup>	370	0	0	0	0	1	,	,	1	
Hamilton County	2,101	1	1	Ö	Ö	1	1	Ó	Ó	
Highland Heights City	1	0	0	Ō	0	0	0	0	Ō	
Mahoning County	428	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Muskingum County	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Richland County	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
klahoma										
Coal County	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Comanche County <sup>a</sup>	230	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Custer County <sup>a</sup>	75	0	0	0	0	/	1	1	1	
Eufaula City <sup>a</sup>	3	0	0	0	0	/	1	1	1	
Johnston County	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Le Flore County <sup>b,e</sup>	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Oklahoma County <sup>a</sup>	2,800	5	0	0	5	/	/	/	/	
Okmulgee County <sup>a</sup>	140	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	1	
regon										
Deschutes County	231	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Josephine County	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Lane County	572	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,	0	
Multnomah County <sup>a</sup>	1,495	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	1	
ennsylvania										
Allegheny County	2,394	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cumberland County <sup>d</sup>	350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dauphin County	1,265	4	0	0	4	0	0	0,	0	
Greene County <sup>a</sup>	112	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Lebanon County Luzerne County	449 753	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0 0	
Montgomery County	1,543	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Philadelphia City	7,792	5	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	
Pike County	279	0	0	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	0	
Union County <sup>d</sup>	60	0	Ö	ő	Ö	0	0	Ö	Ö	
outh Carolina		•	_	-	-		_	-	-	
Beaufort County	243	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charleston County	1,466	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Edgefield County <sup>á</sup>	34	0	0	0	0	,	1	1	1	
Lexington County <sup>a,d,e</sup>	609	2	Ö	2	Ö	,		,	,	
Pickens County <sup>c</sup>	98	0	Ö	0	Ö	1	1	1	,	
Sumter-Lee County										
Regional <sup>a</sup>	393	0	0	0	0	/	1	1	1	
outh Dakota										
Charles Mix County <sup>a</sup>	34	0	0	0	0	/	1	1	1	
Minnehaha County <sup>a</sup>	560	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
ennessee										
De Kalb County	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dickson County	203	0	Ö	Ő	Ö	0	0	Ö	Ö	
Fentress County	47	Ő	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ő	Ö	Ö	Ö	
Greene County	294	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	
Knox County	1,052	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
_incoln County <sup>c</sup>	112	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Nashville-Davidson County	2,250	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	
Rhea County	114	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Scott County	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Shelby County <sup>a</sup>	2,519	2	0	0	2	/	1	1	1	
Sulliván County <sup>a</sup>	575	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	/	

	Average daily		nonconsensu	nate-on-inmate ıal sexual acts			abusive sex	mate-on-inmat ual contacts	te
Jurisdiction and facility	population, 2005	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
exas									
Bell County	645	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bexar County	3,871	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brown County <sup>a</sup>	155	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	/
Burleson County	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cameron County	968	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comal County <sup>a</sup>	263	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	/
Crane County <sup>a</sup>	12	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	/
Dallas County <sup>a</sup>	7,629	5	2	0	3	/	1	/	/
El Paso County	2,110	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Falls County <sup>a</sup>	93	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	/
Fort Bend County	835	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Galveston County	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grayson County <sup>á</sup>	463	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	/
Gregg County	512	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hale County <sup>a</sup>	118	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	/
Harris County	8,730	13	1	3	5	1	0	0	1
Hutchison County <sup>a</sup>	57	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1
Johnson County <sup>á</sup>	480	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	/
Kemah City	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lamar County	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Live Oak County	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock County	731	4	0	0	4	2	0	0	2
Medina County	85	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson County	28	0	0	Ō	0	Ö	0	0	Ō
Tarrant County <sup>a</sup>	3,299	Ö	0	Ō	0	1	1	/	1
Travis County <sup>a</sup>	2,629	10	2	3	2	/	1	/	/
Zavala County	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ltah									
Carbon County	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rich County	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salt Lake County	1,913	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	450	1	0	1	0	'	,	0	1
Washington County <sup>a</sup>	450	Į.	U	,	U	1	,	,	/
'irginia									
Albemarle-Charlottesville									
Regional	446	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Augusta County <sup>a</sup>	223	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
Henrico County	1,143	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Loudon County	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newport News City <sup>a</sup>	656	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	/
Norfolk City	1,664	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pamunkey Regional	411	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rappahannock Regional <sup>a</sup>	964	1	0	0	1	1	1	/	/
Richmond City	1,378	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shenandoah County	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia Peninsula Regional	381	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren County <sup>a</sup>	119	1	1	0	0	1	/	/	/
/ashington									
King County <sup>a</sup>	2,303	0	0	0	0	1	,	1	1
Pacific County	34	0	0	0	Ö	ó	ó	ó	ó
Pierce County <sup>a</sup>	1,298	0	0	0	0	1	,	1	,
Spokane County <sup>a</sup>	621	1	0	1	0	1	,	,	,
Thurston County <sup>a</sup>	432	4	0	1	3	1	,	,	,
Whatcom County <sup>a</sup>	263	0	0	0	0	1	1	,	,
•	203	U	U	U	U	1	/	1	/
lest Virginia									
Kanawha County Regional	486	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Raleigh County Regional <sup>a</sup>	459	2	0	1	1	/	1	1	1

### Appendix table 2a (continued). Allegations of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence reported by local jail authorities, by type, 2005

	Average daily			nmate-on-inmat sual sexual act			Reported inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts			
Jurisdiction	population,	Allega-	Sub-	Unsub-		Allega-		Unsub-		
and facility	2005	tions	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	tions	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	
Wisconsin										
Marathon County	293	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
Milwaukee County	863	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Milwaukee County House										
of Cor. <sup>a</sup>	2,327	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	1	
Polk County	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Richland County	27	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	
Sawyer County	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington County	202	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Waukesha County	563	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	
Wyoming										
Albany County <sup>c,f</sup>	73	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Converse County <sup>a</sup>	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Natrona County <sup>a</sup>	305	1	0	0	1	1	/	/	/	

Note: The total number of allegations includes ongoing investigations (not shown).

<sup>/</sup>Not reported.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Allegations of abusive sexual contacts could not be counted separately from allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Number of inmates confined on December 31, 2005.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Reports of abusive sexual contacts are not recorded in a central database.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Allegations limited to substantiated occurrences only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>e</sup>Allegations limited to completed acts only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>f</sup>Number of inmates confined on June 30, 2005.

		eported allegat	ions of staff act with inmates		Reported allegations of staff sexual harassment of inmates				
	Allegations	Sub-	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	
Total	184	53	50	42	39	3	12	15	
Mabama									
Attalla City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Autauga County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bibb County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Chilton County	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	0	0	0	Ó	
Crenshaw County <sup>a</sup>	ő	ő	Õ	Ö	,	,	,	,	
	1	1	0	0	0	ó	ó	ó	
Franklin County		•							
Lipscomb City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Madison County	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mobile County	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	
Pickens County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Pleasant Grove City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Russell County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
laska	•	•	•	•	,	,	,	,	
Jnalaska City <sup>b</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1	
rizona									
Maricopa County	9	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	
Mohave County	0	Ö	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	
Pinal County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	,	,	,	
•	U	U	U	U	1	/	/	1	
rkansas									
Brinkley City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Craighead County <sup>a,c</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	/	
Dallas County <sup>b,d</sup>	1	1	1	1	,	,	,	,	
Drew County	Ó	Ó	Ó	Ó	1	Ó	Ó	1	
	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	0	Ó	
Pulaski County Regional									
Warren City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
alifornia									
Calaveras County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Contra Costa County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Fresno County	Ő	Õ	Õ	Ö	4	Ó	2	Ó	
Kern County	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	
,	0	0	0		0	0		0	
Kings County				0			0		
Los Angeles County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Nevada County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Orange County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Riverside County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sacramento County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
San Bernardino County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
San Diego County	2	Õ	2	Ö	1	Õ	Õ	1	
San Luis Obispo County	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	Ó	
	_	_		_		_	_		
Santa Clara County	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Santa Cruz County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Sierra County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Solano County	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
Stanislaus County <sup>a,c</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1	
colorado									
Adams County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Denver City <sup>a</sup>	Ó	0	0	Ó	,	,	,	,	
Gilpin County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	,	,	,	1	
Giipiii Coulliy"					/	,	,	/	
La Plata County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Larimer County	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	
Mesa County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sedgwick County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
strict of Columbia	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	
	J	U	ı	ı	ı	U	U	U	
orida									
Bradford County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Broward County <sup>b</sup>	10	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	
Charlotte County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Dade County	0	ő	Õ	Ö	5	Õ	1	2	
Hillsborough County <sup>a</sup>	2	2	0	0	1	,	',		
					•	,	,	,	
Indian River County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Jacksonville City	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Orange County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Palm Beach County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Pinellas County	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	Ō	
Polk County	1	ő	Õ	1	Ö	Õ	Ö	ő	

		eported allegati	ct with inmates		Reported allegations of staff sexual harassment of inmates Sub- Unsub-				
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations		onsub- stantiated	Unfounded	
Florida (continued)					-				
Sarasota County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Seminole County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Lucie County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Taylor County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Volusia County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wakulla County Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Augusta-Richmond County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ben Hill County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Butts County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll County Cor. Inst.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	1	
Cobb County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Decatur County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DeKalb County <sup>a</sup>	3	1	1	1	/	/	1	1	
East Point City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Forsyth County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Fulton County	/	1	1	1	/	/	1	1	
Gwinnett County Cor. Inst.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Gwinnett County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Lowndes County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Milledgeville City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Monroe County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Muscogee County <sup>a,c</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	1	
Peach County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Polk County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	1	
Taylor County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	1	
Troup County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Upson County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	1	
daho									
Adams County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bingham County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Canyon County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ilinois									
Adams County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cook County	1	0	0	0	Ö	Ö	0	Ö	
Jackson County	Ö	0	0	0	Ö	Ö	0	Ö	
Jo Daviess County	Ő	Ő	Ö	ő	ő	ő	Ö	Ö	
Kankakee County	Ő	Ő	Ö	ő	ő	ő	Ö	Ö	
Stark County	Ő	ő	ő	ő	ő	ő	Ö	Ö	
Will County <sup>a</sup>	Ö	0	0	Ö	1	,	,	,	
Woodford County	Ő	Ő	Ö	Ö	Ó	Ó	Ó	Ó	
ndiana	ŭ	ŭ	•	- J	-	· ·	ū	•	
Clinton County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	,	1	
Floyd County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	,	,	,	
Greene County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	,	,	1	,	
Hendricks County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Lake County	0	0	Ó	0	0	0	0	0	
Marion County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Perry County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Porter County <sup>d</sup>	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	
Shelby County <sup>a</sup>	1	1	ó	ó	,	,	1	,	
Tippecanoe County <sup>a</sup>	1	1	0	0	,	,	,	,	
Vermillion County	0	Ó	0	0	ó	ó	ó	ó	
owa	ū	· ·	•	J	-	•	J	•	
Buchanan County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Davis County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Fremont County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	U /	U /	U ,	0	
Linn County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	/	,	
Marshall County	0	0	0	0	/	U ,	0	0	
Mills County <sup>a</sup> Polk County		0		0	-	/	,	•	
FUIK COUTILY	0	U	0	U	0	0	0	0	

Appendix table 2b (continued)	. Allegations of staff sexua	I misconduct with inmates rep	oorted by local	iail authorities, by type, 2005

			ations of staff duct with inmate	es	Reported allegations of staff sexual harassment of inmates				
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	
Kansas									
Galena City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Geary County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kingman County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ottawa County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sedgwick County	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Stevens County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Kentucky									
Campbell County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Daviess County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Hardin County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1	
Laurel County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Louisville-Jefferson County <sup>a</sup>	2	0	0	2	/	/	/	/	
Mason County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Meade County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ohio County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Oldham County <sup>c</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Whitley County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Louisiana									
Amite City <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	/	
Avoyelles Parish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Calcasieu Parish	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Iberia Parish <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Jennings City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Orleans Parish <sup>a</sup>	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	
Ouachita Parish <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
St. Charles Parish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. James Parish	0	0	0	0	,	,	7	,	
St. Landry Parish	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	
Terrebonne Parish Washington Paris <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
=	U	U	U	U	,	,	/	1	
Maine	•	•	0	0	•	0	0	•	
Cumberland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Oxford County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maryland									
Baltimore City	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery County	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince Georges County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Massachusetts									
Hampden County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Hampshire County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Middlesex County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Plymouth County a,c	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	/	
Michigan									
Delta County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	1	
Dickson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Genesee County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Jackson County	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kalkaska County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Livingston County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/	
Mackinac County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Macomb County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Monroe County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Van Buren County <sup>a,c</sup>	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0	
Wayne County	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	
Minnesota	_	_		_	_	_	_		
Hennepin County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Houston County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nicollet County <sup>a</sup>	1	0	1	0	/	/	/	/	
Winona County Wright County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	
vvriani Coliniv	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	()	

Appendix table 2b (continue	d). Allegations	of staff sexua	al misconduct	with inmates	reported by lo	cal jail autho	rities, by type,	2005
		eported allegation	t with inmates				ent of inmates	
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
Mississippi	•	_				_		
Attalla County Claiborne County	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Harrison County <sup>a,c</sup>	1	1	0	0	/	/	/	/
Kemper-Neshoba County	'	•	O	O	,	,	,	,
Regional <sup>a</sup>	1	1	0	0	1	/	1	1
Leflore County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stone County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wayne County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri								
Callaway County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene County	1 0	1 0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard County Howell County	0	0	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Kansas City	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Phelps County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reynolds County	Ö	0	0	0	0	Ö	Ö	0
St. François County	0	0	0	0	0	Ō	0	0
St. Louis City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montana								
Glacier County <sup>c</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yellowstone County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1
Nebraska								
Cedar County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Douglas County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fillmore County <sup>c</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seward County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1
Nevada								
Clark County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Lander County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washoe County	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Hillsborough County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merrimack County <sup>a</sup>	5	0	5	0	/	1	1	1
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	•
Bergen County Essex County	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Hudson County	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middlesex County	1	0	Ő	1	0	Ö	Ö	Ö
Ocean County	2	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö
Salem County	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
New Mexico								
Bernalillo County <sup>b</sup>	4	2	0	1	/	1	1	1
Lea County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Rio Arriba County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Juan County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sierra County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York	-	_	_	_	_	-	-	•
Erie County Holding Center	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Livingston County	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0
Nassau County New York City <sup>a</sup>	25	2	9	2	1	0	0	0
Onondaga County	25 1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Oswego County	Ö	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	Ö
Rensselaer County	2	2	0	0	0	Ö	Ö	0
Steuben County	0	0	Ő	Ő	Ő	Ö	Ö	Ö
North Carolina		-	-		-		-	
Alamance County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beaufort County <sup>á</sup>	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	1	1	1	1
Cumberland County	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Dare County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1

Appendix table 2b (continue	ed). Allegatio	ns of staff sex	ual misconduc	t with inmates	reported by	local jail auth	orities, by type	e, 2005
		eported allegati xual miscondu	ons of staff ct with inmates			eported allega xual harassm	tions of staff ent of inmates	
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
North Carolina (continued) Harnett County Mecklenburg County <sup>a</sup> New Hanover County <sup>a</sup> Randolph County <sup>a</sup> Wake County	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 / / / 0	0 / / / 0	0 / / / 0	0 / / /
North Dakota Cass County Grand Forks County Mercer County	1 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Ohio Ashland County Brown County Butler County Carroll County Clark County Franklin County Greene County Hamilton County Highland Heights City Mahoning County Muskingum County	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 / 0 0 0 / 0	0 0 / 0 0 0 / 0 0	0 0 / 0 0 0 / 0	0 0 / 0 0 0 0 / 0
Richland County  Oklahoma  Coal County Comanche County <sup>c</sup> Custer County Eufaula City <sup>a</sup> Johnston County Le Flore County Oklahoma County	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 7 0 0	0 0 0 0 / 0 0	0 0 0 0 / 0 0	0 0 0 0 / 0 0
Okmulgee County  Oregon  Deschutes County <sup>a</sup> Josephine County  Lane County  Multnomah County <sup>a</sup>	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	/ 0 1 /	/ 0 0 /	/ 0 0 /	/ 0 1 /
Pennsylvania Allegheny County Cumberland County <sup>c</sup> Dauphin County Greene County Lebanon County Luzerne County Montgomery County Philadelphia City Pike County	0 0 1 0 0 0 0 12	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Union County  South Carolina  Beaufort County Charleston County Edgefield County Lexington County Pickens County Sumter-Lee County Regiona	0 1 3 0 0 0	0 2 0 0 0	0 1 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0
<b>South Dakota</b> Charles Mix County <sup>a</sup> Minnehaha County <sup>a</sup>	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	<i>I I</i>	/	<i>! !</i>	/
Tennessee De Kalb County Dickson County Fentress County Greene County	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 1

	Reported allegations of staff  Reported allegations of staff										
		xual miscondu	ct with inmates			xual harassm	ent of inmates				
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded			
Tenneessee (continued											
Knox County <sup>a</sup>	1	1	0	0	/	1	1	1			
Lincoln County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Nashville-Davidson County	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0			
Rhea County	Õ	0	Ö	Ö	1	Ö	Ö	Ö			
Scott County	Õ	Ö	Õ	Ö	Ö	Ő	Ö	ő			
	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0			
Shelby County					3	Ů,	3	0			
Sullivan County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	1			
exas											
Bell County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Bexar County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Brown County <sup>a,c</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/			
Burleson County	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	0	Ó	0	Ó			
Cameron County	Õ	Ö	Õ	Ö	0	Ő	0	Ő			
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Comal County					Ů,	U,	U ,	U,			
Crane County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1,	/,	1,	/			
Dallas County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/			
El Paso County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Falls County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Fort Bend County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Galveston County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Grayson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Gregg County	1	Ö	Ö	1	Ö	Ö	0	Ö			
Hale County <sup>a</sup>	Ö	Ö	Õ	Ö	,	,	,	,			
Harris County	0	0	0	0	ó	ó	ó	ó			
					Ů,	Ů,	Ü	Ů,			
Hutchison County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/			
Johnson County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0			
Kemah City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Lamar County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Live Oak County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Lubbock County	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0			
Medina County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Robertson County	0	Ō	Ö	Ō	0	0	0	Ö			
Tarrant County <sup>a</sup>	3	1	1	Ö	,	,	,	1			
Travis County	4	1	1	1	ó	ó	ó	ó			
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Zavala County	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U			
Jtah											
Carbon County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/			
Rich County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Salt Lake County	15	10	0	3	1	1	0	0			
Washington County	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2			
-	•	ū	•	•	=	•	•	_			
/irginia											
Albemarle-Charlottesville	_		_	-	_	_	_	_			
Regional	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0			
Augusta County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	/	1	/			
Henrico County	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0			
Loudon County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Newport News City <sup>a</sup>	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	1	1	1	1			
Norfolk City	0	Ö	Õ	Ö	Ó	ó	Ó	ó			
	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Pamunkey Regional	1	1			-						
Rappahannock Regional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Richmond City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Shenandoah County	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1			
Virginia Peninsula Regional	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	/			
Warren County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

### Appendix table 2b (continued). Allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates reported by local jail authorities, by type, 2005

	Ri se	eported allega exual miscond	tions of staff uct with inmate:	s	Re se		tions of staff ent of inmates	
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
Washington								
King County	5	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Pacific County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pierce County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	/	1	/	1
Spokane County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thurston County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whatcom County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virgina								
Kanawha County Regional	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Raleigh County Regional <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	/	1	/
Wisconsin								
Marathon County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Milwaukee County	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milwaukee County House								
of Cor. <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Polk County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Richland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sawyer County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waukesha County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming								
Albany County <sup>b,d</sup>	1	/	1	1	1	/	1	/
Converse County <sup>b</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	/
Natrona County <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	/	/	1

Note: The total number of allegations includes ongoing investigations (not shown). /Not reported.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct may include reports of staff sexual harassment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Reports of staff sexual harassment are not recorded in a central database.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct are based on substantiated allegations only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct are not recorded in a central database.

	Average daily		nonconsens	nate-on-inmate ual sexual acts		-	abusive sex	Reported inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts			
Jurisdiction and facility	population, 2005	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allega- tions	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded		
Total	42,966	34	7	13	2	3	0	3	0		
<b>Arizona</b> Arizona State Prison- Kingman (MTC) <sup>a</sup>	1,022	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1		
Central Arizona Detention Center (CCA)	3,259	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		
California Central Valley Community Cor. (GEO) <sup>a</sup>	532	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/		
Taft Correctional Institution (GEO)	2,293	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Colorado ComCor, Inc. <sup>a</sup>	456	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1		
Crowley County Correctional Facility (CSC) Phoenix Center	920 201	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	0 0		
Connecticut Cochegan House (Connections)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Florida Bay County Jail and Annex (CCA)	850	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Moore Haven Correctional Facility (GEO)	747	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
South Bay Correctional Facility (GEO)	1,462	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Georgia Wheeler Correctional Facility (CCA)	1,500	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	0		
Indiana Volunteers of America of Indiana (VOA)	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
<b>Kentucky</b> Lee Adjustment Center (CORC)	770	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Louisiana Allen Correctional Center (GEO)	1,450	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		
Mississippi Delta Correctional Facility (CCA) East Mississippi Correctional	963	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Facility (GEO)  New Jersey	858	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Hope Hall (VOA) New Mexico	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Guadalupe County Correctional Facilty (GEO) <sup>a</sup> <b>Ohio</b>	591	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1		
Lake Erie Correctional Institution (MTC) <sup>b,c</sup>	1,428	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0		
Oklahoma Cimarron Correctional Facility (CCA)	952	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Diamondback Correctional Facility (CCA)	1,892	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Pennsylvania George W. Hill Correctional Facility (GEO)	1,919	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Tennessee Hardeman County Correctional Center (CCA)	1,950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Metro Davidson County Detention Facility (CCA)	1,077	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0		
South Central Correctional Center (CORC)	1,630	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

### Appendix table 3a (continued). Allegations of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence reported in private prisons and jails, by type, 2005 Average Reported inmate-on-inmate Reported inmate-on-inmate daily onconsensual sexual acts abusive sexual contacts Jurisdiction population, Allega-Sub-Unsubstanti-Allega-Sub-Unsubstantiated Unfounded stantiated stantiated Unfounded and facility 2005 tions ated tions **Texas** Big Spring Community Cor. Center (Cornell)<sup>a</sup> 2,792 2 2 0 0 0 0 Bradshaw State Jail (CORC) 0 0 0 0 1,973 Bridgeport Pre-Parole Facility (CCA)a 196 0 0 0 0 Dawson State Jail (CCA) 2,166 2 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 Houston/Reid Community Cor. 2 0 0 0 0 Facility (Cornell) 444 1 1 0 Limestone County Detention Center (CiviGenics) 762 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Lockhart Pre-Parole 998 0 0 0 0 0 0 Facility (GEO) 0 Mineral Wells Pre-Parole Facility (CCA) 2,030 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Willacy County State Jail (CCA) 1,053 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 Lawrenceville Correctional 0 Center (CCA) 1,568 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Note: The total number of allegations includes ongoing investigations (not shown).

Abbreviations or acronyms of private corporations:

CCA - Corrections Corporation of America.

CiviGenics - CiviGenics Corporation.

Connections - The Connections Incorporated.

CORC - Corrections Corporation.

CSC - Correctional Services Corporation.

Cornell - Cornell Companies, Incorporated.

GEO - Global Expertise in Outsourcing.

MTC - Management and Training Corporation.

VOA - Volunteers of America.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Allegations of abusive sexual contacts could not be counted separately from allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Allegations limited to substantiated occurrences only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Allegations limited to completed acts only.

			ations of staff duct with inmat	es	Reported allegations of staff sexual harassment of inmates				
	Sub- Unsub-			Sub- Unsub-					
	Allegations	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations		stantiated	Unfounded	
Total	29	6	18	5	7	0	7	0	
Arizona Arizona State Prison-Kingman (MTC) Central Arizona Detention Center (CCA)	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	
California Central Valley Community Cor. (GEO) <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	,	/	,	,	
Taft Correctional Institution (GEO)	1	0	1	0	Ó	ó	0	ó	
ComCor, Inc. <sup>b</sup> Crowley County Correctional Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
(CSC) Phoenix Center	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	
Connecticut	U	U	O	U	U	U	O	O	
Cochegan House (Connections)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Florida Bay County Jail and Annex (CCA) Moore Haven Correctional Facility	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	
(GEO) South Bay Correctional Facility (GEO)	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 1	0 0	0 1	0 0	
<b>Georgia</b> Wheeler Correctional Facility (CCA) <sup>c</sup>	1	1	1	1	1	/	1	1	
Indiana Volunteers of America of Indiana (VOA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kentucky Lee Adjustment Center (CORC)	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
<b>Louisiana</b> Allen Correctional Center (GEO)	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	
Mississippi Delta Correctional Facility (CCA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
East Mississippi Correctional Facility (GEO) <sup>a</sup>	3	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	
New Jersey Hope Hall (VOA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
New Mexico Guadalupe County Correctional Facilty (GEO)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ohio Lake Erie Correctional Institution (MTC)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Oklahoma Cimarron Correctional Facility (CCA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Diamondback Correctional Facility (CCA) <sup>a</sup>	13	2	10	1	1	/	1	1	
Pennsylvania George W. Hill Correctional Facility (GEO) <sup>a</sup>	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Tennessee Hardeman County Correctional Center (CCA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Metro Davidson County Detention Facility (CCA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
South Central Correctional Center (CORC)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

### Appendix table 3b (continued). Allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates reported in private prisons and jails, by type, 2005

	Reported allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates				Reported allegations of staff sexual harassment of inmates			
	Sub-		Unsub-		Sub-		Unsub-	
	Allegations	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	stantiated	stantiated	Unfounded
Texas								
Big Spring Community Cor. Center (Cor-								
nell) <sup>a</sup>	2	0	2	0	1	1	/	1
Bradshaw State Jail (CORC)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bridgeport Pre-Parole Facility (CCA) <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Dawson State Jail (CCA) <sup>a</sup>	1	0	0	1	1	1	/	1
Houston/Reid Community Cor. Facility								
(Cornell)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone County Detention Center								
(CiviGenics) <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Lockhart Pre-Parole Facility (GEO) <sup>c</sup>	0	0	0	0	1	1	/	1
Mineral Wells Pre-Parole Facility (CCA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Willacy County State Jail (CCA)	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Virgina								
Lawrenceville Correctional Center (CCA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0

Note: The total number of allegations includes ongoing investigations (not shown).

Abbreviations or acronyms of private corporations:

CCA - Corrections Corporation of America.

CiviGenics - CiviGenics Corporation.

Connections - The Connections Incorporated.

CORC - Corrections Corporation.

CSC - Correctional Services Corporation.

Cornell - Cornell Companies, Incorporated.

GEO - Global Expertise in Outsourcing.

MTC - Management and Training Corporation.

VOA - Volunteers of America.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct may include reports of staff sexual harassment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct are based on substantiated allegations only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct are not recorded in a central database.

Appendix table 4a. Allegations of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence reported in other correctional facilities, by type, 2005 Average Reported inmate-on-inmate Reported inmate-on-inmate daily nonconsensual sexual acts abusive sexual contacts Sub-Jurisdiction population, Unsub-Sub-Unsuband facility Allegations stantiated stantiated Unfounded Allegations stantiated stantiated Unfounded Total 9,547 **U.S. Military** Air Force Army 1,113 Marines Navy U.S. Immigration and **Customs Enforcement** Aguadilla, PR\* Aurora, CO Batavia, NY El Centro, CA Elizabeth, NJ El Paso, TX Florence, AZ\* Houston, TX Laredo, TX Los Fresnos, TX Miami, FL\* San Diego, CA 1,119 San Pedro, CA7 Tacoma, WA Jails in Indian Country Gila River Dept. of Cor. and Rehab., AZ Hopi Rehabilitation Center, AZ Red Lake Law Enforcement Ser-vices, MN Rosebud Sioux Tribe Law Enforcement, SD n n n Supai Jail, AZ White Mountain Apache Police Dept., AZ n n n n Zuni Detention Facility, NM 

Note: The total number of allegations includes ongoing investigations (not shown).

/Not reported.

<sup>\*</sup>Allegations of abusive sexual contacts could not be counted separately from allegations of nonconsensual sexual acts.

Appendix table 4b. Allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates reported in other correctional facilities, by type, 2005

	Reported allegations of staff sexual misconduct with inmates				Reported allegations of staff sexual harassment of inmates			
	Allegations	Sub- stantiated	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded	Allegations	Sub-	Unsub- stantiated	Unfounded
Total	14	4	4	5	5	2	1	1
	14	7	7	3	3	_	'	•
U.S. Military Air Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Army Marines	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
	ა 2	1	1	3 0	0	0	0	0
Navy	2	ı	1	U	U	U	U	U
U.S. Immigration and								
Customs Enforcement	0	0	0	0	,	,	,	,
Aguadilla, PR*	0	0	0	0	,	/	/	/
Aurora, CO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Batavia, NY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Centro, CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elizabeth, NJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Paso, TX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florence, AZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston, TX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laredo, TX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Los Fresnos, TX	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Miami, FL*	0	0	0	0	/	/	/	/
San Diego, CA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Pedro, CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tacoma, WA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jails in Indian Country Gila River Dept. of Cor.								
and Rehab., AZ	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	0
Hopi Rehabilitation Center, AZ	0	0	0	Ô	0	0	Ô	0
Red Lake Law Enforcement Ser-	· ·	•	·	ŭ	· ·	· ·	·	· ·
vices, MN	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
Rosebud Sioux Tribe Law Enforce		•	·	·	•	· ·	·	•
ment, SD	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Supai Jail, AZ	0	0	Ö	Ö	0	Ô	0	0
White Mountain Apache Police	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	•	Ŭ	ŭ	Ü	v
Deprt., AZ	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zuni Detention Facility, NM	Ó	Ó	0	0	Ö	0	Õ	Ö

Note: The total number of allegations includes ongoing investigations (not shown).

<sup>\*</sup>Reports of staff sexual misconduct may include reports of staff sexual harassment.