

FACT SHEET 1

THE GLEN MILLS' SCHOOLS (GMS) IS AN OPEN CAMPUS

- In the last year, GMS students participated in 3,399 sessions of group and individual co-occurring substance abuse counseling with independent provider, Onward Behavioral Health (OBH) employees.
- External accreditation officials interview GMS students privately for GMS' Middle States Accreditation evaluation.
- Students are interviewed privately by external parties for every program evaluation from every jurisdiction that sends students to GMS.
- The Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities interviews students for GMS to become CARF accredited.
- Students receive private counseling sessions with two contracted psychologists.
- Students receive counseling sessions and consultations with a contracted psychiatrist.
- Students are examined by physicians who are contracted to provide services in the GMS Health Center. (The physicians are not GMS employees).
- Students meet privately with their independent living workers, none of whom are GMS employees.
- Students meet privately with their attorneys and case managers, regularly.
- Students meet privately with members of the clergy who regularly visit GMS.
- Currently there are 64 tutors that visit the GMS campus who provide tutoring to students. These tutors come from West Chester University, St. Joseph's University, Villanova University, Drexel University, etc.
- The Glen Mills Schools receives services from the Chester County Intermediate Unit (CCIU) for ELL, developmental reading, and speech and language. Students meet privately with employees from CCIU for these services.

FACT SHEET 2

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATION

Assertion: The Department of Justice (DOJ) has an ongoing investigation into Glen Mills School (GMS). The investigation is looking at “violence” at GMS.

- Our information demonstrates that both of these statements are incorrect. The Department of Justice did begin an “inquiry” in July 2012. At that time, GMS received a letter stating that DOJ had received “complaints” regarding discrimination. The DOJ never revealed the source of the complaint nor the nature of the complaint.
- GMS cooperated completely with the DOJ in its inquiry and responded immediately to every request for information.
- Those requests related to special education and alternative education students. At the time, DOJ was active in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the country reviewing possible violations of student rights in connection with alternative education (disciplinary) placements. At the time, GMS believed the inquiry was connected with this work in the education system and communicated with local school districts about it.
- During the “inquiry,” which extended over four years, GMS hosted representatives from DOJ on four separate occasions. The representatives included lawyers from the DOJ Civil Rights Division, as well as child welfare and education experts. Each visit by DOJ was a multi-day visit. During each visit, the DOJ representatives toured and freely inspected the campus with unlimited access to any area they wanted to visit or observe.
- They also had unlimited private interviews with students and employees. After each interview session, GMS representatives pointedly asked the interviewers if they had identified any information that GMS needed to be concerned about regarding student safety. Each time, the interviewers stated that they had not.
- At the end of the DOJ’s last visit, in July 2016, GMS requested an exit interview. During that interview, GMS asked if the DOJ had identified any violations of student rights. In response, the DOJ representatives stated only that they intended to return to Washington and compare notes. They told us that if they had found any violations, they would issue a Notice of Violations Letter in the near future. We have never heard a word from them since.
- Our understanding of the DOJ process is that if the DOJ finds violations, they act to end them. We believe it defies logic to believe that DOJ found violations at GMS and has simply sat back and allowed them to continue for almost three years (almost seven years if you add the period when the inquiry was ongoing). It is also our understanding that if the DOJ finds NO violations, they often just go away and rarely, if ever, report back a clean bill of health. We believe this is what happened here and that if DOJ found anything wrong, they would have announced their findings and moved to end whatever was wrong. While GMS cannot say with ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY that DOJ ended its inquiry almost three years ago, the fact that DOJ announced no violations and took no remedial or enforcement action suggests conclusively that they found no violations and simply ended their inquiry.

FACT SHEET 3

GLEN MILLS NEVER OBSTRUCTED INVESTIGATIONS OF SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE

- In 1999 and 2000, several allegations of suspected abuse were under investigation. All were unfounded.
- During the investigations by the Department of Human Services (DHS) (formerly known as the Department of Public Welfare or DPW) its employees interviewed numerous students and Glen Mills cooperated completely. Had Glen Mills failed to cooperate fully, DPW would have instantly revoked its license.
- As part of its investigation process, DPW engaged the state police to assist them in interviewing students.
- Glen Mills cooperated multiple times when state police came to the campus to interview students.
- Glen Mills objected to one trooper's investigation when he interviewed a student and did not get the answers he wanted from the student. He then told the student he was removing the student from the Glen Mills campus and taking him to the state police barracks where the student would be "safe."
- The student objected to being removed. As the trooper had no court order or any lawful basis for taking the student into custody, Glen Mills told him he needed to cease his effort to remove the student and, if a basis for doing so existed despite the student's objections, the trooper abide by the law and obtain a court order authorizing the removal.

The trooper left and went to the local District Attorney, who told him that the advice from Glen Mills was correct and that he needed to obtain a court order to take a student off grounds under these circumstances. The trooper never obtained such an order.

FACT SHEET 4

SOME STUDENTS HAVE THEIR COMMUNICATIONS MONITORED

- The assertion that GMS monitors ALL communications of ALL students is false.
- Every student has an absolute right to communicate privately with their counsel and with their probation officers. All students also have the right to write letters that GMS cannot read before mailing unless we have a court order of positive information that the student is planning delinquent behavior.
- In addition, students have multiple opportunities to communicate privately with people not employed by Glen Mills including:
 - During regular in person court hearings off our campus to review the student's status and progress
 - Through use of public phones on the campus of Glen Mills Schools none of which are monitored
 - During monthly visits with social workers and probation officers
 - When students are interviewed privately by jurisdictional program reviewers and evaluated from the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF)
 - For Philadelphia students, private interviews with their Public Defenders, prior to their video conference (Hundreds of visits in the last 2 years)
 - When students participate in tutoring programs using tutors from area colleges and universities
 - When Philadelphia students speak privately with CUA workers.

FACT SHEET 5

GLEN MILLS' CURRENT PROMISES ABOUT PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT AND REFORM CANNOT BE BELIEVED

- 2010
 - Glen Mills adopts evidence based programming which includes Botvin Life Skills, Cognitive Behavior Therapy, Coping with Anger, and Parenting & Family Values.
 - Glen Mills adopts enhanced competency based programming which includes Gun Violence Reduction, Wellness and Nutrition, Independent Living Skills, and Victim Awareness Impact of Crime curriculum.
- 2011
 - Glen Mills begins out of state Parental Visitation Program.
 - Glen Mills expands its Career and Technical program offering by 5 new programs, Indoor/ Outdoor Maintenance, Building Trades, Masonry, Paint, and Turf Engine Repair.
 - Glen Mills becomes a PACTT; Pennsylvania Academic and Career Technical Training affiliate.
- 2012
 - Glen Mills contracts the services of a Board Certified Child Psychiatrist.
 - Glen Mills begins individual Grief and Loss sessions.
 - Glen Mills provides case managers to better supervise and manage high risk students
- 2013
 - Glen Mills provides additional Individual and Family counseling through 2 contracted psychologists.
 - Glen Mills enhanced their Regulatory Compliance Department by hiring 2 Regulatory Compliance Specialists to help facilitate program evaluations, assist with reporting requirement questions, and oversight, and PREA compliance.
- 2014
 - Glen Mills opens a GED Testing Center on campus.
 - Glen Mills contracts with a Licensed Clinical Social worker to assist in providing individual and family counseling.
 - Glen Mills opens an Emergency Shelter for dependent youth.
 - PREA Compliance initiated with the hiring of a PREA Compliance Officer.
 - Glen Mills enters into an agreement with Delaware County Women against Rape to provide crisis intervention, advocacy, individual counseling, and court/police/hospital accompaniment, educational and civil legal services for victims of sexual abuse.
 - Glen Mills creates a strategic plan.

- Glen Mills provides customers satisfaction surveys to monitor progress and concerns
- 2015
 - Glen Mills emphasizes family engagement and begins Facilitated Family Visits.
 - Glen Mills revises its behavioral de-escalation techniques and adopts Handle With Care.
 - Glen Mills became 100% PREA compliant.
- 2016
 - Glen Mills contracts with Onward Behavioral Health to provide Co-Occurring Substance Abuse Therapy.
 - Glen Mills creates an assessment process that coincides with the Youth Level of Service domains.
 - Glen Mills begins to work with local colleges to provide tutors for our students.
 - Glen Mills is accredited by Middle states Association of Colleges Schools Commission on Elementary and Secondary Schools.
- 2017
 - Glen Mills begins the SPEP process, Standard Program Evaluation Protocol.
 - Glen Mills contracts with Lakeside Educational Network to provide Trauma 101 Training to its staff and Brain Basics and Trauma Informed Classroom training to its teachers.
 - Glen Mills achieves accreditation in CARF, Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities.
 - Glen Mills achieved Tier 1 status for Positive Behavior Intervention Supports in two and a half years. On average schools take three to five years to be recognized with fidelity at Tier 1.
 - Glen Mills partnered with the University of Michigan to evaluate what outcome measures are important for tracking and collection.
- 2018
 - In November, Glen Mills sends 5 staff to a train the trainer Juvenile Justice Mental Health training conducted by National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice and begins to train its leadership in December.
 - Glen Mills hires 2 masters' level clinicians to increase the availability for Individual and Family therapy.
 - Glen Mills provides OVR services to students with disabilities.
 - Glen Mills full rollout of PBIS Tier 2

FACT SHEET 6
LIVERS LAWSUIT FACT SHEET

- Livers falsely alleged a long history of being discouraged from making reports of mistreatment, none of which he himself reported to anyone at any time until he filed his lawsuit.
- In fact, Livers was terminated for not reporting an injury of a student and for no other reason.
- Glen Mills first heard that Livers was making claims of having witnessed mistreatment shortly after his termination, in May 2018. At that time, his allegations seemed to be vague and unspecific. Upon hearing them, Glen Mills sent a letter reminding him of his duty to report any REAL suspicions he may have had. To our knowledge, he never reported anything to anyone and simply filed his lawsuit six months later.
- When Glen Mills received his complaint and investigated the allegations, all his assertions were shown to be false and appeared to be obviously invented to sustain a lawsuit.
- When Glen Mills revealed the true facts about the employee to his lawyer, Livers' own lawyer immediately attempted to withdraw from the case and, shortly thereafter, dropped the lawsuit entirely, WITH PREJUDICE, meaning essentially that Livers admitted his allegations were false and promised never to file it again anywhere for any reasons.

FACT SHEET 7

COUNSELORS WHO CALL CHILDLINE ARE RETALIATED AGAINST

- This assertion is false and libelous. In the spirit of sensationalism, it is made in the passive tense and does not assert that The Glen Mills Schools retaliate against their counselors who make ChildLine reports. Any implication that Jim Rostic was demoted because he called ChildLine following the M.A incident is misleading and entirely baseless.

- Jim Rostic called ChildLine on the morning of June 8, 2017. He did so after M.A. reversed his story from the night before and told Rostic's supervisor, that his original story was false and that, during the restraint the night before, he had been punched in the face. Rostic called ChildLine with the full knowledge and cooperation of his supervisor. Glen Mills fully supported this report, as the law required.

- Jim Rostic was a mid-level supervisor in Tyler 6 Hall. After reviewing what actually happened, Randy Ireson demoted the entire team of supervisors, including Jim Rostic, for failing to adequately convey to lower level staff that student safety was rule #1 at Glen Mills. Mr. Rostic was not singled out in any way. Rather, Mr. Ireson replaced the ENTIRE supervision team with other employees for one reason – to send a message that supervisors were accountable for the actions of their staff and that if their staff do not protect student safety, they would no longer be supervisors.

Mr. Rostic resigned shortly after this demotion.

FACT SHEET 8

SHAWN MAGEE FACT SHEET

- Shawn Magee brought a lawsuit against Glen Mills for wrongful termination. In his lawsuit he alleged that he was terminated for reporting mistreatment of a student.
- Glen Mills disputed his allegation and noted that his report of alleged misconduct actually led to the termination of the person he accused and public congratulations to Mr. Magee for having made his report.
- Glen Mills also responded to the lawsuit by reporting that Mr. Magee's termination was related entirely to his own conduct which made it inappropriate for him to continue working with Glen Mills' students.
- The lawsuit was resolved and both sides entered into a standard agreement that no further details would be disclosed publicly. In adherence to its agreement, Glen Mills has no further comment to make.

The allegations that legal counsel for the Schools threatened Mr. Magee are false – Glen Mills has retained Mr. Vilim as outside counsel for nearly three decades. He is one of Pennsylvania's most accomplished child welfare attorneys. When Mr. Magee accused his supervisor of slapping a student, the supervisor denied that the event happened. At that point, we had two staff telling diametrically opposed stories. We asked Mr. Vilim to interview both to help us determine who was telling the truth. He did this and, immediately after concluding his interviews, reported to Glen Mills that he believed Mr. Magee and that he believed the supervisor was not being truthful." Mr. Vilim's assessment led to the termination of the supervisor and the restoration of Mr. Magee to full employment. Contrary to the article, Mr. Vilim supported Mr. Magee.

FACT SHEET 9

“VIOLENCE IS COMMON” / AW FACT SHEET

This statement is false, to the extent that this statement implies that staff perpetrating violence against students is common. In contrast, the potential for violence exists for the Glen Mills staff every day. GMS serves some of the most behaviorally troubled youths in our society. Most come to us with histories that show that the students rely on violence and aggression as an acceptable method of dealing with authority and conflict.

The AW incident in July, began with an unjustified and improper restraint by C. Medina. The verbal aggression directed at the student at the end of the incident was likewise improper. The final result of this incident, however, is that the student, AW, was not seriously injured. His full medical examination conducted the day after the incident showed that his only injuries were some minor abrasions on his face, neck and chest, which the doctor described as “minor abrasions noted, no skin breaks.” AW also complained of lower back pain. The pain was apparently not serious as he spent the weekend playing basketball with other students. In fact, on July 21, 2018, when state investigators came out to interview him, he was engaged in a game of basketball.

In his lawsuit seeking monetary damages, AW has grossly exaggerated what happened and now claims in his “sworn” court documents that two staff “continually beat, choked, punched, slapped, kicked and slammed Plaintiff’s body . . .” In interviews with the Inquirer, AW also claimed that he “floated in and out of consciousness as Medina choked him with his sweater for 5 minutes. These statements are entirely disproven by a video that was taken by security cameras on the site. At most, that video shows that one staff person performed an unjustified restraint and that this same person may have punched AW in the abdomen one time. While, if verified, that punch was completely wrong and completely unacceptable, the video entirely contradicts AW’s false and exaggerated version of the event. After reviewing the video, a criminal court judge dismissed all assault charges against the second staff person AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING stage, meaning that the judge found that there was not even probable cause shown in the video to prosecute, let alone evidence to convict, the second person.

FACT SHEET 10

ADDITIONAL STUDENT INJURY REPORTS

Working to educate and rehabilitate court adjudicated teens can be enormously rewarding work. It can also be dangerous and difficult work. Not everyone, no matter how well-intentioned, is suited for the challenges that the work can present. Sometimes, despite best efforts to hire suitable staff, Glen Mills does not learn of an employee's unsuitability for the work until something bad happens. Several of the incidents raised by the Inquirer that resulted in injuries from improper restraints illustrate this, as do several of the incidents reported in a recent survey of License Inspection Reports over more than 20 years. As for the incidents cited by the Inquirer:

- M.A.
 - This student suffered a broken jaw during an altercation with staff.
 - Initially, M.A. confirmed that he suffered the break when he fell accidentally against a table.
 - The truth emerged the next morning when upper level staff talked to M.A. and became suspicious that the table story might not be true. Encouraged to tell the truth, M.A. reported to these staff (Rostik) that he had been beaten. Glen Mills staff, with full knowledge and approval of the administration, immediately reported this new assertion to ChildLine and triggered an abuse investigation.
 - What M.A. did not report at the time, but what he later testified to in criminal court, was that once one staff person approached him about telling a sexual joke about the staff person's sister and tried to slap M.A., M.A. rose to a standing position and began punching the staff. As he said, "once they put their hands on me, I put my hands on them back." "I punched them back" and "I was fighting staff."
 - The judge listening to this testimony concluded that what occurred was "mutual combat" making it impossible to know when or how M.A. suffered the broken jaw.
 - Based on its own internal investigation, Glen Mills terminated all staff involved based not only on the injury, but on suspicions that they were not telling the truth about what happened. These terminations culminated several weeks later, when credible evidence emerged that Jonathan Mitchell had spearheaded the conspiracy to cover up the real cause of M.A.'s injury.
- Stairwell Choking
 - This did not happen. There was one attempted escape by a student from California that Glen Mills is aware of. That student left the campus and was later picked up by State police. The police took the student to their barracks for fingerprinting where the student registered no complaints

about anything or anyone at Glen Mills other than his apparent desire to go home. Glen Mills has no record of any complaint by the student that he was choked or otherwise mistreated in any way.

- Broken Nose
 - The description provided is inaccurate. The incident occurred when two students jumped a staff person and began punching him. To defend himself, the staff person fought back, breaking one student's nose. The staff person suffered a concussion as a result of the attack.
- Three students suffered lacerations during restraints.
 - The descriptions provided are also not accurate.
 - In one case, a student was in a classroom disrupting other students. After a number of attempts to quiet the student, two teachers approached the desk where he was seated. As they first came within reach of the desk, the student stood up quickly and grabbed at the teacher. The desk is a normal classroom desk with the desk surface attached to the chair. Trying to stand as he did left the student in an awkward and unbalanced position and he fell out of the desk striking his head and causing a laceration. His injury was not the result of a restraint attempt.
 - A second student was found by staff in an unauthorized area outside of staff supervision. When questioned, the student claimed another staff person had given him permission to be where he was. When that second staff approached, he denied giving permission and reacted angrily to the student's claim. He pushed the student, who struck his head, causing a laceration. The staff person was terminated for pushing the student.
 - A third student required stitches in his shoulder when a staff person confronted him verbally and then removed the student to a hall area alone. At first the student claimed that he was injured when staff turned to confront him and he jumped away, banging into the window. Later, the student changed his story and claimed that staff punched him in the face and threw him into the window. His injuries did not support either version and the staff person denied the latter version and Glen Mills was never able to confidently determine what really happened. According to Glen Mills' policy and training, solo restraints are to be avoided except in immediate safety emergencies. The staff person was terminated by Glen Mills for failing to follow proper restraint practices.

FACT SHEET 11

ROBERT TAYLOR LAWSUIT FACT SHEET

- Taylor filed an EEOC Complaint alleging that staff at Glen Mills used racial slurs when referring to students and that Muslim students were denied food during Ramadan.
- He also alleged that he was fired as retaliation for objecting to these events.
- His allegations are false.
- During his employment at Glen Mills, Taylor made no reports of any mistreatment to anyone prior to his termination.
- Taylor was fired from Glen Mills after he gave students in his dormitory improper haircuts as punishment for not telling him that two students were planning an escape.
- Group punishment and attempts to degrade students in this manner are a direct violation of Glen Mills' values, policies, and its students' rights.
- Glen Mills reported the haircuts to state investigators, who conducted a thorough investigation of the incident. At no time during this investigation did Taylor report to the state investigators any of the allegations that he later included in his EEOC complaint.
- Upon reviewing his claims, the EEOC dismissed his charge, ruling that its investigators were unable to find any basis for believing them.
- Taylor has filed a Writ of Summons in Delaware County. A writ does nothing more than state someone's intention to sue in the future. It is not, by itself, a lawsuit. Taylor has not filed an actual lawsuit. We learned this week that Mr. Taylor's lawyer is dropping him as a client.

FACT SHEET 12

J.S. LAWSUIT FACT SHEET

- J.S. was a student at Glen Mills
- During a verbal confrontation with staff, J.S. became aggressive and, in pulling away from staff who moved to restrain him, fell backward and suffered a fractured elbow.
- This version of events was confirmed by multiple other staff and students who were present at the time. No witness, including J.S. contradicted this version of the incident.
- As required by law, given the nature of the injury, Glen Mills reported the incident to state authorities. In doing so, Glen Mills requested a legal opinion to determine if the incident also needed to be reported as an incident of suspected child abuse. Based on the eye-witness reports, legal counsel opined that there was no basis for any suspicion that the injury was the result of abuse or mistreatment. Based on this opinion, Glen Mills decided not to report the injury to ChildLine, although it was reported as an injury incident on required forms and the state was made fully aware of the facts and circumstances involved.
- When state investigators interviewed J.S. about the incident, J.S. alleged for the first time that he had been thrown to the floor by the staff person involved. This allegation was then reported to ChildLine for investigation. Following the investigation, the report was marked unfounded.
- After the investigation, state authorities recommended to Glen Mills that, in the future, Glen Mills report all significant injuries to students as possible incidents of child abuse “as a precaution.” Since receiving this advice, Glen Mills has expanded the circumstances in which it reports incidents and injuries even if the legal test of a mandated report is not met.

J.S. did file a lawsuit against Glen Mills for his injuries. That lawsuit was resolved and both sides entered into an agreement not to reveal any additional information publicly. In adherence to its agreement, Glen Mills has no further comment on the lawsuit.

FACT SHEET 13

STAFF PUNCH KICK AND CHOKE STUDENTS AND THREATEN FAMILIES

- In the period between 1999 and 2017, The Glen Mills Schools (“GMS”) had ONE indicated report of abuse and ZERO founded reports.
- From 2003 to present, Glen Mills provided care and education to 15,528 students on its campus, which calculates to 2,724,131 days of service to individual students with ONE indicated report.
- We have, of course, received allegations over the years from students who allege that they were punched, kicked, or choked. Whenever GMS received such information, no matter how credible or non-credible it appeared, GMS reported it to ChildLine for investigation.
- No one has ever reported to GMS that family members of students complained that staff had threatened them in any way.