

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE
125th OHIO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE MEMBERS

Mark Mallory, Chair
James Jordan, Secretary
Stephen Austria
Robert Hagan

HOUSE MEMBERS

John Willamowski, Vice Chair
Todd Book
Michael Debose
Robert Latta

BIENNIAL REPORT

TO THE

126th OHIO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

January 18, 2005

Prepared by the
Correctional Institution Inspection Committee staff:

Director Shirley Pope
Inspector Elizabeth Curtis
Inspector Gregory Geisler

Inspector Adam Jackson
Inspector Carol Robison
Inspector Richard Spence

**CIIC
BIENNIAL REPORT
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. CIIC COMPOSITION	13
A. MEMBERS	13
B. STAFF	13
II. CIIC DUTIES AND ACTIVITIES	15
A. STATUTORY CHARGE	15
B. INSTITUTIONS	16
<u>TABLE 1.</u> INSTITUTIONS BY REGION WITH ABBREVIATIONS	16
C. CIIC MEETINGS	17
D. INSPECTIONS	21
<u>TABLE 2.</u> INSTITUTIONS INSPECTED, CIIC MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE, IN ORDER OF INSPECTION DATE	21
E. INSPECTION REPORTS	22
F. ON SITE VISITS	23
G. MEETINGS ATTENDED BY STAFF	23
III. CIIC DATABASE	24
A. CONTACTS RECEIVED	25
<u>TABLE 3.</u> NUMBER OF CONTACTS BY INSTITUTION FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005	26
B. REPORTED CONCERNS	27
1. SUBJECT CATEGORIES	27
<u>TABLE 4.</u> NUMBER OF LOGGED CONCERNS BY INSTITUTION FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005	28
<u>TABLE 5.</u> NUMBER OF LOGGED CONCERNS BY SUBJECT SYSTEM WIDE, INCLUDING PRISON WITH THE LARGEST NUMBER OF CONCERNS IN EACH CATEGORY, FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
k. VISITING	35
<u>TABLE 16.</u> INSTITUTIONS WITH VISITING AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	35
l. HOUSING ASSIGNMENT	36
<u>TABLE 17.</u> INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH HOUSING ASSIGNMENT IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	36
m. SAFETY/SANITATION	36
<u>TABLE 18.</u> INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH SAFETY/ SANITATION IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	36
n. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	37
<u>TABLE 19.</u> INSTITUTIONS WITH SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	37
o. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING	37
<u>TABLE 20.</u> INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	37
p. DISCRIMINATION	38
<u>TABLE 21.</u> INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH DISCRIMINATION IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	38
q. PROTECTIVE CONTROL	38
<u>TABLE 22.</u> INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH PROTECTIVE CONTROL IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN	38
3. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY AT EACH INSTITUTION FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005	39
<u>TABLE 23.</u> SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	39
<u>TABLE 24.</u> MANSFIELD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	40
<u>TABLE 25.</u> PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	41
<u>TABLE 26.</u> OHIO STATE PENITENTIARY	42
<u>TABLE 27.</u> LAKE ERIE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	43
<u>TABLE 28.</u> TRUMBULL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	44
<u>TABLE 29.</u> TOLEDO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	45
<u>TABLE 30.</u> MADISON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	46
<u>TABLE 31.</u> GRAFTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	47
<u>TABLE 32.</u> CHILLICOTHE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	48
<u>TABLE 33.</u> NORTH CENTRAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	49
<u>TABLE 34.</u> LONDON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>TABLE 35.</u> WARREN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	51
<u>TABLE 36.</u> OHIO REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN	52
<u>TABLE 37.</u> LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	53
<u>TABLE 38.</u> ALLEN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	54
<u>TABLE 39.</u> MARION CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	55
<u>TABLE 40.</u> "OTHER/JAIL" FACILITIES	56
<u>TABLE 41.</u> BELMONT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	57
<u>TABLE 42.</u> NOBLE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	58
<u>TABLE 43.</u> RICHLAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	59
<u>TABLE 44.</u> CORRECTIONAL RECEPTION CENTER	60
<u>TABLE 45.</u> ROSS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	61
<u>TABLE 46.</u> SOUTHEASTERN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	62
<u>TABLE 47.</u> HOCKING CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	63
<u>TABLE 48.</u> CORRECTIONS MEDICAL CENTER	64
<u>TABLE 49.</u> LORAIN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	65
<u>TABLE 50.</u> OAKWOOD CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	66
<u>TABLE 51.</u> DAYTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	67
<u>TABLE 52.</u> NORTH COAST CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT FACILITY	68
<u>TABLE 53.</u> LIMA CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	69
<u>TABLE 54.</u> NORTHEAST OHIO CORRECTIONAL CENTER	70
<u>TABLE 55.</u> FRANKLIN PRE-RELEASE CENTER.	71
<u>TABLE 56.</u> NORTHEAST PRE-RELEASE CENTER	72
<u>TABLE 57.</u> MONTGOMERY EDUCATION PRE-RELEASE CENTER	73
C. WRITTEN INQUIRIES	74
<u>TABLE 58.</u> LETTERS OF INQUIRY BY INSTITUTION FROM MARCH 17, 2004 THROUGH DECEMBER 23, 2004	75
1. RESPONSES TO INQUIRIES	75
2. SUBJECT CATEGORY OF WRITTEN INQUIRIES <u>TABLE 59.</u> NUMBER OF WRITTEN INQUIRIES BY SUBJECT FROM MARCH 17, 2004 THROUGH DECEMBER 23, 2004	76
3. INQUIRIES TO THE MANSFIELD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	77
<u>TABLE 60.</u> SUBJECT CATEGORIES OF 19 LETTERS OF INQUIRY TO THE MANSFIELD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	77
4. INQUIRIES TO THE SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	78
<u>TABLE 61.</u> SUBJECT CATEGORIES OF 15 LETTERS OF INQUIRY TO THE SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	78

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
5. INQUIRIES TO THE PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	78
<u>TABLE 62.</u> SUBJECT CATEGORIES OF NINE LETTERS OF INQUIRY TO THE PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	78
IV. PRISON OPERATIONS, CONDITIONS AND PROGRAMS MONITORED	79
A. DATA REVIEW AND MONITORING	79
B. INMATE POPULATION	79
<u>TABLE 63.</u> INMATE POPULATION BY INSTITUTION ON NOVEMBER 1, 2003 AND ON NOVEMBER 1, 2004 WITH INCREASE OR DECREASE	80
1. EXPANSION OF BEDS FOR FEMALES	83
C. INMATE ON INMATE ASSAULTS	84
<u>TABLE 64.</u> NUMBER OF INMATE ON INMATE ASSAULTS IN 2003 AND IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION	84
D. INMATE ON STAFF ASSAULTS	85
<u>TABLE 65.</u> NUMBER OF INMATE ON STAFF ASSAULTS IN 2003 AND IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION	85
E. USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS	86
<u>TABLE 66.</u> NUMBER AND TYPE OF USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS IN NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION WITH NUMBER ASSIGNED TO A USE OF FORCE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE	86
<u>TABLE 67.</u> PERCENTAGE OF USE OF FORCE PER INMATE POPULATION AT THE CORRECTIONS MEDICAL CENTER, SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, OHIO STATE PENITENTIARY, LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AND ROSS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION IN NOVEMBER 2004	87
1. DISCIPLINARY REPORTS BY RACE	88
<u>TABLE 68.</u> THE NUMBER OF CONDUCT REPORTS BY RACE AND BY INSTITUTION IN NOVEMBER 2004	89

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
G. MENTAL HEALTH	98
<u>TABLE 74.</u> DRC MENTAL HEALTH CASELOAD BY INSTITUTION WITH BREAKDOWN OF MENTAL HEALTH CLASSIFICATION FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2004	98
1. RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNITS	99
<u>TABLE 75.</u> RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNITS WITH NUMBER OF BEDS AND INSTITUTION SERVED	99
2. SUICIDES	100
<u>TABLE 76.</u> NUMBER OF INMATE SUICIDES BY INSTITUTION FROM OCTOBER 25, 2003 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2004	100
H. SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAMS	104
1. CLASSIFICATION OF SEX OFFENDERS	104
2. COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMMING	105
3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND FACTS CONCERNING SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT AND DEPARTMENT SEX OFFENDERS	106
I. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS	107
1. THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITIES	108
2. ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION	109
<u>TABLE 77.</u> ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION WITH PROGRAM LENGTH AND CAPACITY	110
3. INTENSIVE PROGRAM PRISON (IPP)	110

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
J. EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS	112
1. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	113
<u>TABLE 78. ENROLLMENT IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS</u> BY INSTITUTION, WITH COMPLETIONS, GED TESTS TAKEN AND PASSED, AND TUTORIAL HOURS	113
2. CAREER-TECHNICAL PROGRAMS	115
3. MISCELLANEOUS INSTRUCTION	115
<u>TABLE 79. CAREER-TECHNICAL PROGRAMS BY</u> INSTITUTION WITH ENROLLMENT, COMPLETIONS AND WAIT LIST AS OF NOVEMBER 2004	116
K. OHIO PENAL INDUSTRIES	117
1. PRISON LABOR ADVISORY COUNCIL (PLAC)	117
2. OPI EMPLOYMENT OF INMATES	117
<u>TABLE 80. OHIO PENAL INDUSTRIES SHOPS BY</u> INSTITUTION , WITH TYPE OF PRODUCT, AND NUMBER OF INMATES EMPLOYED	118
V. INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	119
A. EVALUATION MANDATE	119
B. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	121
C. RELEVANCE OF <u>TAYLOR</u>	122
1. OUTSIDE REVIEW COMMITTEE	122
2. INTERPRETING VOLUME OF GRIEVANCES	123
D. THE ACA STANDARD	124
E. ACA RECOMMENDATIONS	125
1. WRITTEN RESPONSES INCLUDING REASONS	126
2. RESPONSE IN REASONABLE TIME LIMIT	126
3. ODRC TIME LIMITS ON USING THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	127

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>TABLE 97.</u> MANSFIELD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	157
<u>TABLE 98.</u> MARION CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	158
<u>TABLE 99.</u> MONTGOMERY EDUCATION PRE-RELEASE CENTER	158
<u>TABLE 100.</u> NOBLE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	159
<u>TABLE 101.</u> NORTH CENTRAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	160
<u>TABLE 102.</u> NORTH COAST CORR. TREATMENT FACILITY	161
<u>TABLE 103.</u> NORTHEAST PRE-RELEASE CENTER	161
<u>TABLE 104.</u> OAKWOOD CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	162
<u>TABLE 105.</u> OHIO REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN	162
<u>TABLE 106.</u> OHIO STATE PENITENTIARY	163
<u>TABLE 107.</u> PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	164
<u>TABLE 108.</u> RICHLAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	165
<u>TABLE 109.</u> ROSS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	166
<u>TABLE 110.</u> SOUTHEASTERN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	166
<u>TABLE 111.</u> SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	167
<u>TABLE 112.</u> TOLEDO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	168
<u>TABLE 113.</u> TRUMBULL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	169
<u>TABLE 114.</u> WARREN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	170
2) GRIEVANCES FILED BY SUBJECT	170
<u>TABLE 115.</u> SUBJECT OF GRIEVANCES FILED FROM OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004	171
<u>TABLE 116.</u> HEALTH CARE GRIEVANCES	172
<u>TABLE 117.</u> FORCE/SUPERVISION GRIEVANCES	173
<u>TABLE 118.</u> PERSONAL PROPERTY GRIEVANCES	174
<u>TABLE 119.</u> STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY GRIEVANCES	175
<u>TABLE 120.</u> SAFETY AND SANITATION GRIEVANCES	176
<u>TABLE 121.</u> MAIL/PACKAGE GRIEVANCES	177
<u>TABLE 122.</u> GRIEVANCES ON NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS	178
<u>TABLE 123.</u> FOOD SERVICE GRIEVANCES	179
<u>TABLE 124.</u> INMATE ACCOUNT GRIEVANCES	180
<u>TABLE 125.</u> HOUSING ASSIGNMENT GRIEVANCES	181
<u>TABLE 126.</u> DISCRIMINATION GRIEVANCES	182
<u>TABLE 127.</u> JOB ASSIGNMENT GRIEVANCES	183
<u>TABLE 128.</u> LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER GRIEVANCES	184
<u>TABLE 129.</u> DENTAL CARE GRIEVANCES	185
<u>TABLE 130.</u> VISITING GRIEVANCES	186
<u>TABLE 131.</u> SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING GRIEVANCE	187
<u>TABLE 132.</u> RECREATION GRIEVANCES	188
<u>TABLE 133.</u> COMMISSARY GRIEVANCES	189
<u>TABLE 134.</u> RELIGIOUS SERVICES GRIEVANCES	190
<u>TABLE 135.</u> EDUCATION/VOCATIONAL TRAINING GRIEVANCES	191
<u>TABLE 136.</u> FACILITIES MAINTENANCE GRIEVANCES	192
<u>TABLE 137.</u> LIBRARY GRIEVANCES	193
<u>TABLE 138.</u> PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHIATRIC GRIEVANCES	194
<u>TABLE 139.</u> LEGAL SERVICES GRIEVANCES	195
<u>TABLE 140.</u> RECORDS GRIEVANCES	196
<u>TABLE 141.</u> INSTITUTION ASSIGNMENT GRIEVANCES	197
<u>TABLE 142.</u> SECURITY CLASSIFICATION GRIEVANCES	198
<u>TABLE 143.</u> RECOVERY SERVICES GRIEVANCES	199

TABLE OF CONTENTS(CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>TABLE 144.</u> INMATE GROUPS GRIEVANCES	200
<u>TABLE 145.</u> PROTECTIVE CONTROL GRIEVANCES	201
<u>TABLE 146.</u> TELEPHONE GRIEVANCES	202
b. RESOLVED AND UNRESOLVED GRIEVANCES	203
<u>TABLE 147.</u> RESOLVED GRIEVANCES FROM OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION WITH PERCENTAGE OF RESOLVED GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION AND SYSTEMWIDE	207
<u>TABLE 148.</u> UNRESOLVED GRIEVANCES FROM OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION WITH PERCENTAGE OF UNRESOLVED GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION AND SYSTEMWIDE	208
<u>TABLE 149.</u> RESOLVED GRIEVANCE DISPOSITIONS BY TYPE FROM JULY 2004 TO NOVEMBER 2004 WITH RACIAL BREAKDOWN OF GRIEVANT	209
<u>TABLE 150.</u> REASONS FOR NOT RESOLVED GRIEVANCES FROM JULY 2004 TO NOVEMBER 2004 WITH RACIAL BREAKDOWN OF GRIEVANT	209
<u>TABLE 151.</u> RATIO OF GRIEVANCES FILED TO INMATE POPULATION FROM JULY 2004 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION, WITH NUMBER RESOLVED, NOT RESOLVED, WITHDRAWN, AND EXTENSIONS	210
J. CONCLUSION	211

I. CIIC COMPOSITION

MEMBERS

Section 103.71 of the Ohio Revised Code created the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, a Subcommittee of the Legislative Service Commission as follows:

The Committee shall consist of eight persons, four of whom shall be members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party, and four of whom shall be members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party.

The above referenced section requires that appointments to the Committee be made within 15 days after the commencement of the first regular session of the Ohio General Assembly. According to Section 103.72, the CIIC, by a vote of at least five members, must select from its membership a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and a Secretary. Further, per the same section, members of the Committee must serve without compensation, though they are reimbursed for their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their official duties.

Members and Officers of the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee from 2003 through 2004 are listed below:

Senators

Mark Mallory, Chairman
James Jordan, Secretary
Stephen Austria
Robert Hagan

Representatives

John Willamowski, Vice Chairman
Michael DeBose
Robert Latta
Robert Otterman (2003)
Todd Book (2004)

STAFF

According to Section 103.74, “The General Assembly shall biennially appropriate to the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee an amount sufficient to enable the Committee to perform its duties.” Further, the same section provides that the Committee may employ a Director and “any other nonlegal staff, who shall be in the unclassified service of the state, that are necessary for the committee to carry out its duties.” Per Section 103.71, the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, subject to the oversight and direction of the Legislative Service Commission, directs the work of the Director and staff of the Committee.

Due to budget cuts for FY 2002 and FY 2003, effective July 1, 2001, the CIIC office was temporarily closed. The statutory duties of the CIIC remained unchanged, and the closure

of the staff office made it extremely difficult for the Committee to perform its statutory duties in the same manner that occurred in the past.

CIIC funding was partially restored for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The CIIC office was reopened in October 2003, when the CIIC Director and two CIIC Inspector positions were filled. As of January 2005, the CIIC staff includes the Director and four full time Inspectors, plus one part time Inspector as follows:

<u>CIIC Staff Person</u>	<u>Position</u>
Shirley Pope	Director
Gregory Geisler	Inspector
Adam Jackson	Inspector
Carol Robison	Inspector
Richard Spence	Inspector
Elizabeth Curtis	Inspector (Part Time)

II. CIIC DUTIES AND ACTIVITIES

STATUTORY CHARGE

The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee (CIIC) was established through the enactment of Sections 103.71 through 103.74 of the Ohio Revised Code, which became effective on November 9, 1977. Section 103.73 outlines the Committee's authority and duties as provided below:

- (A) The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee shall do all of the following:
 - (1) Subject to division (C) of this section, establish and maintain a continuing program of inspection of each state correctional institution used for the custody, control, training, and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime and of each private correctional facility. Subject to division (C) of this section, the Committee may inspect any local correctional institution used for the same purposes. Subject to division (C) of this section, the Committee, and each member of the Committee, for the purpose of making an inspection, shall have access to any state or local correctional institution, to any private correctional facility, or to any part of the institution or facility and shall not be required to give advance notice of, or to make prior arrangements before conducting an inspection.
 - (2) Evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition or operation of correctional institutions.
 - (3) Prepare a report for submission to the succeeding General Assembly of the findings the Committee makes in its inspections and of any programs that have been proposed or developed to improve the condition or operation of the correctional institutions in the state. The report shall contain a separate evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure at each state correctional institution. The Committee shall submit the report to the succeeding General Assembly within fifteen days after commencement of the General Assembly's first regular session.
- (B) Subject to division (C) of this section, the Committee shall make an inspection of each state correctional institution each biennium and of each private facility each biennium. The inspection shall include attendance at one general meal period and one rehabilitative or educational program.

INSTITUTIONS

The institutions, including the privately operated Lake Erie Correctional Institution (LAECI) and North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility (NCCTF), are divided by the ODRC into the North Region or South Region. LAECI and NCCTF are institutions owned by the ODRC, but they are operated by Management and Training Corporation per contract with ODRC to house ODRC inmates. The institutions are listed below in alphabetical order by region, with the inclusion of the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center (NEOCC), which opened in 2004 and houses federal inmates. NEOCC is privately owned and operated by Corrections Corporation of America. Lima Correctional Institution is also included below because it was in operation in 2003 and was inspected, but it was subsequently closed on June 26, 2004.

TABLE 1. INSTITUTIONS BY REGION WITH ABBREVIATIONS

NORTH REGION	ABBREVIATION	SOUTH REGION	ABBREVIATION
Allen Correctional Institution	ACI	Chillicothe Correctional Institution	CCI
Belmont Correctional Institution	BCI	Corrections Medical Center	CMC
Grafton Correctional Institution	GCI	Correctional Reception Center	CRC
Lake Erie Correctional Institution*	LAECI*	Dayton Correctional Institution	DCI
Lima Correctional Institution	LCI	Franklin Pre -Release Center	FPRC
Lorain Correctional Institution	LORCI	Hocking Correctional Facility	HCF
Mansfield Correctional Institution	MANCI	Lebanon Correctional Institution	LECI
Marion Correctional Institution	MCI	London Correctional Institution	LOCI
North Central Correctional. Institution	NCCI	Madison Correctional Institution	MACI
North Coast Correctional. Treatment. Facility*	NCCTF*	Montgomery Education Pre -Release Center	MEPRC
Northeast Ohio Correctional. Center	NEOCC**		
Northeast Pre-Release Center	NEPRC	Noble Correctional Institution	NCI
Oakwood Correctional Facility	OCF	Pickaway Correctional Institution	PCI
Ohio Reformatory for Women	ORW	Ross Correctional Institution	RCI
Ohio State Penitentiary	OSP	Southeastern Correctional Institution	SCI
Richland Correctional Institution	RICI	Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	SOCF
Trumbull Correctional Institution	TCI	Warren Correctional Institution	WCI
Toledo Correctional Institution	TOCI		

* Denotes privately operated ODRC prison.

**Denotes privately owned and operated prison.

CIIC MEETINGS

Meetings of the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee were scheduled on dates when the House and Senate were both in session. The Committee held nine meetings from September 18, 2003 to August 17, 2004. The meetings served as an excellent means of communication, not only between staff and Committee Members, but also with the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC), as well as with other individuals and groups with interest or concern regarding the prisons. Details regarding each meeting are provided below, including information on the agendas, presenters, and CIIC staff briefings and progress reports.

Meeting Date: **September 18, 2003**
Agenda: Election of the CIIC Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary
 Proposal and adoption of the Restart Plan
 Hiring of CIIC Director and two Inspectors
 Members Concerns: Prison Health Care and Safety Issues
 Prison Inspections

Presenters: ODRC Legislative Liaison

Meeting Date: **October 15, 2003**
Agenda: Organizational Issues
 Introduction of CIIC Director and Inspectors
 CIIC Restart Memo
 Inspection Schedule
 ODRC Briefing on Prison Health Care
 Impact of Litigation on Reforms
 Educational Opportunities in Prison

Presenters: ODRC Legislative Liaison

Meeting Date: **November 13, 2003**
Agenda: CIIC Staff Briefing
 Security Presentation by Technology Systems International

Presenters: CIIC Director
 Representative of Technology Systems International

Staff Briefing: Office Set-Up
 CIIC Letterhead
 CIIC Handbook for Members
 CIIC Restart Memo Distribution
 CIIC Website Update
 Completed Inspections

Completed Inspection Reports
 CIIC Database Status
 Correspondence from Institutions
 Access to DOTS (Departmental Offender Tracking System)
 Monthly ODRC Institutional Data Request
 ODRC Re-Entry Conference at London Correctional Institution

Meeting Date: **December 10, 2003**

Agenda:
 CIIC Staff Briefing
 DRC Briefing on Prison Health Care
 Stop Prison Rape Group Testimony

Presenters:
 CIIC Director
 ODRC Legislative Liaison
 Former Inmate Testimony on Prison Rape
 Director of the Ohio Coalition on Sexual Assault
 Representative of the Stop Prison Rape Group
 ODRC Deputy Director of Institutions

Staff Briefing:
 Completed Inspections
 Completed Inspection Reports
 Correspondence from Institutions
 CIIC Database
 Access to DOTS Status
 Prison Labor Advisory Council
 Ohio Corrections Technology Network
 Monthly Reports from Institutions

Meeting Date: **January 21, 2004**

Agenda:
 CIIC Staff Briefing
 Summary of CIIC Correspondence
 Health Care Review Team Report
 Public Testimony

Presenter:
 CIIC Director
 CIIC Inspector
 ODRC Assistant Director

Staff Briefing:
 Completed Inspections
 Inspection Reports
 ODRC Response to Reports
 Prison Labor Advisory Council Meeting
 Mental Health Services and Recovery Services Meeting
 Monthly Reports from Institutions

Inmate Deaths
 CIIC Database Completion
 CIIC Staff Access to DOTS

Meeting Date: **February 4, 2004**
Agenda: CIIC Staff Briefing
 CIIC Member Concerns
 Public Testimony

Presenter: CIIC Director
 CCA Director of Facilities Operations
 Northeast Ohio Correctional Center Warden and Assistant Warden

Staff Briefing: CIIC Staff Additions
 Completed Inspections
 Schedule of Inspections

Meeting Date: **March 17, 2004**
Agenda: CIIC Staff Briefing
 ODRC Ohio Correctional Institution Sexual Assault Abatement
 Public Testimony

Presenter: CIIC Director
 ODRC Director
 Representative from the Ohio Coalition on Sexual Assault
 Representative from the Prison Reform Advocacy Center
 Ex-Offender Testimony on Prison Rape

Staff Briefing: Inspections
 Evaluations: Inmate Grievance Procedure
 On-Site Visits: Corrections Training Academy and Southern Ohio
 Correctional Facility
 CIIC/ODRC Quarterly meeting
 ORW Allegations: Chief Inspector's Findings
 Northeast Ohio Correctional Center/Corrections Corporation of
 America Meeting
 Website Update
 PCI Report Follow-Up from ODRC Deputy Director of
 Correctional Health Care
 ODRC Health Care Review Team Report: Synopsis

Meeting Date: **May 26, 2004**
Agenda: CIIC Staff Briefing
 Status Report from NEOCC Warden
 Public Testimony

Presenter: CIIC Director
 DRC Director
 Representative from the Ohio Coalition on Sexual Assault
 Representative from the Prison Reform Advocacy Center
 Ex-Offender Testimony on Prison Rape

Staff Briefing: Inspections
 Inspection Reports
 Report on Delayed 911 Call at London Correctional Institution
 CIIC Database: Contacts and Concerns
 Other Data: Grievances, Mental Health Caseloads, Operating Costs, Assaults
 Ohio Corrections Substance Abuse Advisory Council Meeting
 On-Site Visits to the Ohio Reformatory for Women: Talent Show by Tapestry Therapeutic Community Program and In Service Training
 Prison Labor Advisory Commission Meeting
 Religious Services Chaplains' Meeting

Meeting Date: **August 17, 2004**
Agenda: CIIC Staff Briefing
 Department of Youth Services on Alleged Abuses at Juvenile Correctional Institutions
 Public Testimony by Attorney/Author of Lucasville:Untold Story of a Prison Uprising

Presenter: CIIC Director
 DYS Director
 DRC Deputy Director of Office of Health Care
 Attorney/Author of Lucasville:Untold Story of a Prison Uprising

Staff Briefing: Completed Inspections
 Inspection Reports
 CIIC Database: Contacts and Concerns
 Communication from Jails
 Communication from Juvenile Institutions
 Mental Health Data
 Suicides in Ohio Prisons
 Prison Rape Elimination Act Videoconference
 Death Row Visitation Issue

INSPECTIONS

Per section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code, the CIIC must “establish and maintain a continuing program of inspection of each state correctional institution used for the custody, control, training, and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime and of each private correctional facility.” Per the same section, “The Committee shall make an inspection of each state correctional institution each biennium and of each private correctional facility each biennium. The inspection shall include attendance at one general meal period and one rehabilitative or educational program.” Due to lack of funding until July 2003, and lack of CIIC staff until October 2003, the Committee did not have the benefit of a full biennium in which to inspect all institutions.

Even though the CIIC restart occurred after the ninth month of the biennium, from October 2003 to January 2005, the Committee conducted 20 inspections. All but the inspection of the Franklin Pre-Release Center were unannounced inspections. Completed inspections are shown below in chronological order, including the institution and CIIC Member(s) who conducted the inspection. One or more CIIC staff accompanied CIIC Members on inspections at all institutions except for the Franklin Pre-Release Center. Per Section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code, the inspections included “attendance at one general meal period and one rehabilitative or educational program.”

TABLE 2. INSTITUTIONS INSPECTED, CIIC MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE, IN ORDER OF INSPECTION DATE

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTED	CIIC MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE	INSPECTION DATE
Pickaway Correctional Institution	Senator Mark Mallory	October 16, 2003
Richland Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Otterman	October 27, 2003
Mansfield Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Otterman	Oct. 27 and 28, 2003
Franklin Pre-Release Center	Senator Stephen Austria	October 28, 2003
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	Rep. Robert Otterman	November 7, 2003
Grafton Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Otterman	November 7, 2003
Belmont Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Otterman	November 10, 2003
Noble Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Otterman	November 21, 2003
Trumbull Correctional Institution	Senator Robert Hagan Rep. Michael DeBose	December 29, 2003
Allen Correctional Institution	Rep. John Willamowski Senator James Jordan	January 5, 2004
Oakwood Correctional Facility	Rep. John Willamowski Senator James Jordan	January 23, 2004
Lima Correctional Institution	Rep. John Willamowski Senator James Jordan	January 23, 2004
Ohio State Penitentiary	Senator Mark Mallory Senator Robert Hagan Rep. Michael DeBose	January 29, 2004
North Central Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Latta	February 12, 2004
Hocking Correctional Facility	Rep. Todd Book	February 23, 2004
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Rep. Todd Book	March 1, 2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	Rep. Michael DeBose Rep. Robert Latta	March 12, 2004
Lebanon Correctional Institution	Senator Mark Mallory	May 3, 2004
Toledo Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Latta	July 8, 2004
Marion Correctional Institution	Rep. Robert Latta	November 22, 2004

As of January 18, 2005, there are 14 prisons due for an inspection. The following institutions will therefore be prioritized in the upcoming schedule of inspections:

Chillicothe Correctional Institution	Madison Correctional Institution
Corrections Medical Center	Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center
Correctional Reception Center	Northeast Ohio Correctional Center
Dayton Correctional Institution	Northeast Pre-Release Center
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	Ross Correctional Institution
London Correctional Institution	Southeastern Correctional Institution
Lorain Correctional Institution	Warren Correctional Institution

INSPECTION REPORTS

According to Section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code, the Committee is required to:

Prepare a report for submission to the succeeding General Assembly of the findings the Committee makes in its inspections and of any programs that have been proposed or developed to improve the condition or operation of the correctional institutions in the state. The report shall contain a separate evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure at each state correctional institution. The committee shall submit the report to the succeeding General Assembly within fifteen days after commencement of that General Assembly's first regular session.

Inspection reports have been completed for the following 15 institutions:

Allen Correctional Institution	North Central Correctional Institution
Belmont Correctional Institution	North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility
Franklin Pre-Release Center	Oakwood Correctional Facility
Grafton Correctional Institution	Ohio State Penitentiary
Hocking Correctional Facility	Pickaway Correctional Institution
Lima Correctional Institution	Richland Correctional Institution
Mansfield Correctional Institution	Trumbull Correctional Institution
Noble Correctional Institution	

Each of the inspection reports on the above listed institutions is accessible on the CIIC website, in the Legislative Service Commission Library, and in the State Library. The Inspection Report on the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility is near completion. Priority effort will be devoted to completion of the remaining four reports on the inspection of the Ohio Reformatory for Women, Lebanon Correctional Institution, Toledo Correctional Institution and Marion Correctional Institution at the earliest possible date.

Each inspection report includes information on findings made in the inspection, attendance at a general meal period, attendance at an educational or rehabilitative program, available programs, contacts and reported concerns relevant to operations, conditions, programs and grievance procedure, and ODRC data on assaults and

grievances. Inspection reports incorporate observations made by CIIC Members and staff during the inspection, as well as information gathered outside the inspection in the continuing evaluation of operations, conditions, programs and grievance procedure.

Immediate feedback on observations is provided on site to the Warden or designee prior to leaving the institution on the day of the inspection. On return to the CIIC office following an inspection, immediate communication is also provided to the ODRC Deputy Director of Institutions. Preparation of the written report is given priority attention, with the goal of submission within 30 days of the inspection.

ON SITE VISITS

On invitation or approval of the Warden, and approval of the CIIC Chair, nine on site visits to institutions were made by CIIC staff in 2004. Two visits each were made to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Ohio Reformatory for Women, and one on site visit was made to the Richland Correctional Institution. The complete list is provided below:

Date	Site	Purpose	CIIC Staff
02-18-04	Corrections Training Academy	Prison Labor Advisory Commission Presentation on PCI Meat Processing Career Center	Shirley Pope
02-26-04	Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Mental Health Services	Shirley Pope
03-31-04	Ohio Reformatory for Women	Tapestry Therapeutic Community Program Talent Show	Shirley Pope, Elizabeth Curtis, Greg Geisler, Adam Jackson
05-06-04	Ohio Reformatory for Women	Overview of ORW operations	Elizabeth Curtis, Greg Geisler Adam Jackson
08-19-04	Corrections Training Academy	SOCF Memorial Groundbreaking	Shirley Pope
08-24-04	Marion Correctional Institution	Promise Keeper's Conference	Carol Robison
09-29-04	Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Investigators	Shirley Pope
11-05-04	Pickaway Correctional Institution and Corrections Training Academy	Opening of Meat Processing Career Center	Shirley Pope
12-01-04	Richland Correctional Institution	Response to Inquiry	Shirley Pope Carol Robison

MEETINGS ATTENDED BY STAFF

In addition to the meetings listed below, CIIC staff met with parolees, citizens, and ODRC institution staff at the CIIC office. Further, the CIIC Director or designee attended each monthly meeting of the ODRC Prison Labor Advisory Commission.

Date	Site	Purpose	CIIC Staff Present
10-22-03	ODRC Best Practices Institute	ODRC Re-Entry Conference	Shirley Pope Greg Geisler
10-24-03	ODRC Central Office	CIIC/ODRC Meeting	Shirley Pope Greg Geisler
12-24-03	CIIC Office	Mental Health and Recovery Services overview	Shirley Pope Greg Geisler
03-02-04	DRC Central Office	CIIC/DRC Quarterly Meeting	Shirley Pope Elizabeth Curtis Greg Geisler Adam Jackson
03-15-04	DRC Central Office	Stop Prisoner Rape Report and ORW Findings	Shirley Pope Elizabeth Curtis Greg Geisler Adam Jackson
03-19-04	DRC Central Office	Substance Abuse Advisory Council	Shirley Pope
07-21-04	Corrections Training Academy	National Institute of Corrections Videoconference	Shirley Pope Elizabeth Curtis Greg Geisler Adam Jackson Carol Robison
09-29-04	Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Investigators	Shirley Pope
10-21-04	CIIC Office	Art for a Child's Safe America Foundation in Prison Programs	Shirley Pope
11-16-04	State House	State Agency Information Fair	Adam Jackson Carol Robison
01-07-05	Jewish Community Center (Columbus)	Economic and Community Development Institute	Greg Geisler

III. CIIC DATABASE

CONTACTS RECEIVED

Section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code requires the CIIC to “Evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition or operation of correctional institutions,” and to prepare a report on inspection findings, as well as “of any programs that have been proposed or developed to improve the condition or operation of the correctional institutions in the state.” Further, the report is to include “a separate evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure at each institution.

In order to effectively evaluate prison operations, conditions, programs and the grievance procedure, and in order to identify areas in need of improvement, it is essential to have an ongoing knowledge base of information on specific institutional and system-wide problems, issues and concerns. Communication to the CIIC from prison staff and inmates provides a primary source of such information, which assists the Committee in determining areas in need of focus in its inspections, evaluations and inquiries. Therefore, an important initial task of the Committee consisted of re-opening the line of communication from within the institutions.

On October 30, 2003, notification of the reopening of the CIIC office was communicated via memo to all inmates and staff in Ohio prisons. The ODRC Deputy Director of Institutions assisted in ensuring posting of the memo in all housing units and libraries through communication with the Wardens. The memo included the CIIC duties and the following: “The Committee welcomes communication from inmates, staff, and others who are interested in the correctional institutions in the State of Ohio. Such communication guides the Committee in inspections, evaluations, and inquiries.”

Legislative Service Commission staff assisted in the development of a CIIC database to record contacts and concerns reported to the CIIC. Prior to January 6, 2004, the database was not available for use. However, based on the internal logging system maintained in the interim, as of December 10, 2003, the first 156 letters were received from or regarding one of 30 prisons. Over 300 letters were received by January 6, 2004, when the new database system began to be used.

As noted below, from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005, the largest volume of contacts has come from the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 292 contacts or 16.2% of the total 1,803 contacts from throughout the prison system. The Mansfield Correctional Institution and the Pickaway Correctional Institution ranked second and third respectively, in volume of contacts. In all, the three prisons accounted for 560 or 31.06% of all contacts received.

Further, 45 contacts were received from or in regard to local jail facilities. The Committee is not required to inspect jails, but the Committee has enabling authority to inspect such facilities. Section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code states that “The Committee may inspect any local correctional institution,” and “for the purpose of

making an inspection, shall have access to any state or local correctional institution, to any private correctional facility, or to any part of the institution or facility and shall not be required to give advance notice of, or to make prior arrangements before conducting an inspection.” No local jails were inspected in the biennium. However, in response to contacts and reported areas of concern, inquiries were made to Jail Administrators at local jails and/or contact was made with the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction’s Bureau of Adult Detention Facilities and Services.

**TABLE 3. NUMBER OF CONTACTS BY INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

INSTITUTION	# of CONTACTS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	292
Mansfield Correctional Institution	146
Pickaway Correctional Institution	122
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	85
Ohio State Reformatory	83
Madison Correctional Institution	78
Trumbull Correctional Institution	78
Grafton Correctional Institution	74
Warren Correctional Institution	70
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	66
North Central Correctional Institution	64
Toledo Correctional Institution	64
Lebanon Correctional Institution	58
London Correctional Institution	55
Marion Correctional Institution	52
Belmont Correctional Institution	49
Allen Correctional Institution	48
Other	45
Noble Correctional Institution	43
Ohio Reformatory for Women	40
Richland Correctional Institution	38
Correctional Reception Center	33
Ross Correctional Institution	26
Hocking Correctional Facility	17
Lorain Correctional Institution	16
Southeastern Correctional Institution	16
Oakwood Correctional Facility	13
Corrections Medical Center	11
Dayton Correctional Institution	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	6
Lima Correctional Institution- closed	5
North East Pre Release Center	2
Franklin Pre Release Center	1
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center	1
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Total	1803

REPORTED CONCERNS

With each contact from or regarding a particular institution, the problem, issue or concern is logged into the CIIC Database, using subject categories similar to those used by the ODRC in categorizing their inmate grievances.

Subject Categories

The “Complaint Code List” from the ODRC Inspectors’ monthly reports was used as the basis of the CIIC database to log and categorize the reported concerns relayed by those who contact the CIIC. According to the ODRC list, and as standardized in the CIIC database, the categories consist of the following:

- I. INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS
 - A. HEALTH CARE
 - B. DENTAL CARE
 - C. PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHIATRIC
 - D. SAFETY/SANITATION
 - E. FACILITIES MAINTENANCE
 - F. FOOD SERVICE
 - G. LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER
 - H. COMMISSARY
 - I. INMATE ACCOUNT
 - J. PERSONAL PROPERTY

- II. INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS
 - A. EDUCATION/VOCATIONAL TRAINING
 - B. INMATE GROUPS
 - C. JOB ASSIGNMENTS
 - D. LIBRARY
 - E. RECOVERY SERVICES
 - F. RECREATION
 - G. RELIGIOUS SERVICES

- III. COMMUNICATIONS
 - A. MAIL/PACKAGE
 - B. VISITING
 - C. TELEPHONE

- IV. ADMINISTRATION
 - A. RECORDS
 - B. LEGAL SERVICES

- V. STAFF/INMATE RELATIONS
 - A. FORCE/SUPERVISION
 - B. DISCRIMINATION
 - C. STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY

- VI. CUSTODY AND HOUSING STATUS
 - A. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
 - B. INSTITUTION ASSIGNMENT
 - C. HOUSING ASSIGNMENT
 - D. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING
 - E. PROTECTIVE CONTROL

- VII. NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS

As noted below, the largest volume of concerns has been reported from or in regard to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 845 concerns, comprising 16.8% of the total 5038 logged concerns received from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005. The number of concerns reported from or in regard to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Mansfield

Correctional Institution, and Pickaway Correctional Institution totaled 1,638, comprising 32.5%.

**TABLE 4. NUMBER OF LOGGED CONCERNS BY INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

INSTITUTION	# of CONCERNS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	845
Mansfield Correctional Institution	419
Pickaway Correctional Institution	374
Ohio State Penitentiary	262
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	256
Trumbull Correctional Institution	216
Toledo Correctional Institution	205
Madison Correctional Institution	193
Grafton Correctional Institution	190
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	170
North Central Correctional Institution	167
London Correctional Institution	163
Warren Correctional Institution	156
Ohio Reformatory for Women	145
Lebanon Correctional Institution	128
Allen Correctional Institution	126
Marion Correctional Institution	126
Other	125
Belmont Correctional Institution	122
Noble Correctional Institution	106
Richland Correctional Institution	92
Correctional Reception Center	91
Ross Correctional Institution	59
Southeastern Correctional Institution	58
Hocking Correctional Facility	49
Corrections Medical Center	43
Lorain Correctional Institution	43
Oakwood Correctional Facility	29
Dayton Correctional Institution	28
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	26
Lima Correctional Institution (closed)	16
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center	4
Franklin Pre Release Center	3
Northeast Pre Release Center	3
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
Total	5,038

TABLE 5. NUMBER OF LOGGED CONCERNS BY SUBJECT SYSTEM WIDE, INCLUDING PRISON WITH THE LARGEST NUMBER OF CONCERNS IN EACH CATEGORY, FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005

REPORTED AREA OF CONCERN	PRISON WITH LARGEST # OF CONCERNS IN CATEGORY		LOGGED CONCERNS IN CATEGORY SYSTEM WIDE	PERCENT
	PRISON	NUMBER	NUMBER	
FORCE/SUPERVISION	SOCF	136	646	12.8%
STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY	SOCF	82	573	11.4
NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS	SOCF	102	530	10.5
HEALTH CARE	PCI	107	487	9.7
INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	SOCF	66	400	7.9
INSTITUTIONAL ASSIGNMENT	SOCF	69	203	3.9
OTHER	SOCF	37	200	3.9
PERSONAL PROPERTY	OSP	34	173	3.4
MAIL/PACKAGES	SOCF	44	170	3.4
FOOD SERVICES	OSP	25	139	2.8
VISITING	MANCI	23	131	2.6
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	SOCF	51	130	2.6
HOUSING ASSIGNMENT	SOCF	18	129	2.6
SAFETY/SANITATION	PCI	24	128	2.5
SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING	MANCI	20	121	2.4
DISCRIMINATION	MANCI	12	110	2.2
PROTECTIVE CONTROL	SOCF	38	90	1.8
JOB ASSIGNMENT	PCI	13	86	1.7
LEGAL SERVICES	SOCF	12	81	1.6
FACILITIES MAINTENANCE	ORW	12	73	1.5
PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHIATRIC	SOCF	17	71	1.4
INMATE ACCOUNT	SOCF	7	48	.9
RECREATION	PCI JAILS	6 6	45	.9
LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER	PCI	7	40	.8
RECORDS	CCI	6	38	.8
EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL TRAINING	TCI	4	36	.7
RELIGIOUS SERVICES	NCCI	12	34	.7
COMMISSARY	SOCF	5	31	.6
RECOVERY SERVICES	GCI	8	25	.5
LIBRARY	PCI	5	25	.5
DENTAL CARE	SOCF	7	22	.4
TELEPHONE	MANCI	3	14	.3
INMATE GROUPS	NCI	2	9	.2
TOTAL LOGGED CONCERNS			5038	100%

MOST FREQUENTLY REPORTED CONCERNS

Force/Supervision

Under the broader category of Staff/Inmate Relations, the group titled “Force/Supervision” includes the following subcategories: **Use of force with no report, abusive language, racial or ethnic slurs, conduct report for no reason, intimidation/threats, retaliation for filing grievance, retaliation for filing lawsuit, retaliation for voicing complaints, privacy violations, harassment and other.**

The category “Force/Supervision” is the largest category of concerns reported to the CIIC from or in regard to the institutions, with a total of 646 logged concerns, comprising 13% of all reported concerns. SOCF has the largest number of concerns in the category with 136, comprising 21% of all Force/Supervision concerns in the system. Institutions in which logged concerns regarding Force/Supervision were among their top five reported areas of concern are provided below:

TABLE 6. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH FORCE/SUPERVISION IS ONE OF THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
SOCF 136	TCI 28	MANCI 67	MCI 15	MACI 19
OSP 45	CCI 21	NCCI 17	RICI 9	ORW 11
LAECI 41	JAILS 12	LOCI 14		
TOCI 34	NCI 14	WCI 17		
GCI 21	CRC 11	LECI 15		
BCI 16		RCI 7		
SCI 11		HCF 6		
CMC 11				
DCI 10				
NEOCC 1				
FPRC 1				
NEPRC 2				
SYSTEM WIDE TOTAL 646				

Staff Accountability

The category “Staff Accountability” is also a subcategory of “Staff/Inmate Relations.” The Staff Accountability category includes concerns pertaining to the following: **Access to staff, failure to perform job duties, failure to respond to communication, failure to follow policies, and other.**

The category of Staff Accountability is the second largest system wide, according to the number of logged concerns. Of the 573 concerns in the category from all institutions, comprising 11.4% of all concerns, the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of such concerns with 82.

TABLE 7. INSTITUTIONS WITH STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
MANCI 74	PCI 45	SOCF 82	NCI 10	RCI 6
TCI 30	OSP 39	LAECI 34		
ACI 17	TOCI 30	GCI 18		
LORCI 8	MACI 23	CCI 16		
	WCI 19	ORW 13		
	LOCI 18	BCI 11		
	MCI 17	RICI 11		
	CMC 5	OCF 3		
	NEPRC 1	DCI 2		
	SYSTEM WIDE TOTAL 573			

Non-Grievable Matters

The category of concerns titled “Non-Grievable Matters” includes concerns pertaining to the following: **Rules Infraction Board/Hearing Officer, Parole, Court, Legislative Action, Separate Appeal Process and Other.**

The CIIC logged 530 concerns pertaining to Non-Grievable Matters, the third largest category of concerns. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had the largest number of concerns in the category, with 102, comprising 19.2% of the concerns in the category.

TABLE 8. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS ARE AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
LOCI 32	SOCF 102	PCI 29	LECI 11	TCI 19
NCCI 21	MANCI 72	GCI 17	NCCTF 1	TOCI 14
WCI 20	LAECI 37	CCI 16		
RICI 19	MCI 17	JAILS 10		
RCI 10	ACI 14	CRC 9		
FPRC 1	BCI 13	SCI 5		
	LORCI 5	OCF 3		
	LCI 2			
		SYSTEM WIDE TOTAL 530		

Health Care

Health Care is one of 10 categories under the grouping “Institutional Operations.” Areas of concern logged under Health Care include the following subcategories: **Access/delay in receiving medical care, improper/inadequate medical care, delay/denial of medication, medical records, eye glasses, forced medical testing, medical transfer, prosthetic device, medical co-pay, medical restriction, medical aide/device, and other.**

Health Care is the fourth largest category of logged concerns system wide, with 487 logged concerns. The Pickaway Correctional Institution has the largest number of concerns in the category, with 107, comprising 22% of the system wide concerns regarding Health Care.

TABLE 9. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH HEALTH CARE IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
PCI 107	LECI 16	TCI 22	LAECI 25	SCI 3
ORW 30	RICI 14	MCI 15	MACI 20	
CCI 24	CMC 5	NCI 13	TOCI 15	
JAILS 23	NCCTF 4	BCI 11	GCI 15	
CRC 13		LCI 1	NCCI 14	
HCF 9			WCI 13	
OCF 5			RCI 6	
			SYSTEM WIDE TOTAL 487	

INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The category for logged concerns pertaining to the inmate grievance procedure includes concerns pertaining to the **Inspector, Chief Inspector, Informal Complaint and Other**.

The number of reported concerns regarding the Inmate Grievance Procedure totals 400, comprises 8% of all logged concerns, and is the fifth largest category of logged concerns. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of concerns in the category, with 66, comprising nearly 17% of the reported concerns pertaining to the grievance procedure system wide.

TABLE 10. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THE INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
MCI 21	NCCI 19	TCI 22	OSP 30	SOCF 66
LECI 20		MACI 22	CCI 12	MANCI 22
NCI 19		TOCI 20	LOCI 12	PCI 21
NCCTF 10		ACI 11	CMC 3	LAECI 14
		CRC 9		GCI 13
		LORCI 4		HCF 3
		DCI 2		OCF 1
				SYSTEM WIDE TOTAL 400

Institution Assignment

The category of concerns titled “Institution Assignment” is a subcategory of the “Custody and Housing Status” group. Concerns logged as “Institution Assignment” include concerns regarding “**transfer or denial,**” and “**other**” category.

Reported concerns pertaining to Institution Assignment total 203, comprising the sixth largest area of concern. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of concerns in the category, with 69 or 34% of all logged concerns in the category.

TABLE 11. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH “INSTITUTION ASSIGNMENT” IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
	RCI 8		SOCF 69	WCI 8
			LECI 11	BCI 7
			OCF 2	MCI 4
			DCI 2	
			NCCTF 1	

Other

The seventh largest category of logged concerns is “Other” with a total of 200. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of concerns in the group, with 37 or 19% of the concerns in the system wide group. The large volume in the category may indicate that there is a need to add specific categories to better document the content of the communication to the CIIC. Follow-up review of the content logged into the category will be made in the upcoming biennium.

TABLE 12. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THE “OTHER” CATEGORY OF CONCERN IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
MACI 26	DCI 3	JAILS 10	SCI 4	CRC 7
		CMC 4		RICI 7
		LORCI 4		MCI 4
		LOCI 1		

Personal Property

The category of Personal Property is a subcategory of Institutional Operations. The Personal Property grouping includes the following concerns: **Lost, damaged, confiscated by staff; stolen or damaged by inmate; denied permission to receive/possess; and other.** In all, the CIIC received 173 reported concerns regarding property, with the largest number from the Ohio State Penitentiary with 34 such concerns reported from that facility.

TABLE 13. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH PERSONAL PROPERTY CONCERNS ARE AMONG THE TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
	LORCI 5	OSP 34		
	DCI 3			

Mail/Packages

The category titled “Mail/Packages” is a subgroup of “Communications.” Concerns regarding “Mail/Packages” includes the following subcategories: **Delay/failure in delivery, Delay/failure in sending, Publication screening, Handling of legal mail, Handling of packages, Damaged or missing, Denial, Postage charges, Other.**

In all, there were 170 logged concerns regarding Mail/Packages, with the largest number in the group from SOCF with 44.

TABLE 14. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH MAIL/PACKAGES ARE AMONG THE TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
NEOCC 1			LOCI 12	CRC 7
			ACI 9	RCI 4
				OCF 1

Food Services

The category of Food Services is a subgroup of Institutional Operations. The specific concerns included in the Food Service category consist of the following: **Food temperature, Food not properly prepared, Poor quality, Deviation from menu, Inadequate substitute, Foreign object in food, Food portions, Medical diet, Religious diet, Unsanitary cooking conditions, Denial and Other.**

In all, 139 complaints regarding Food Service were received, the tenth largest category of concern. The Ohio State Penitentiary has the largest number of logged concerns regarding Food Service with 25.

TABLE 15. INSTITUTIONS WITH FOOD SERVICE AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
	HCF 7	LORCI 4		OSP 25
		NCCTF 2		NCI 8
				SCI 3

Visiting

The Visiting category is a subgroup of Communications. Concerns in the Visiting category include: **Visitor not approved/removed from list, visitor denied access, visit cut short, hours, rules, special visit, and other.**

A total of **131** visiting concerns were received by the CIIC, the eleventh largest reported concern. Mansfield Correctional Institution has the largest number of concerns in the group, with **23**.

TABLE 16. INSTITUTIONS WITH VISITING AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
	GCI 18		MANCI 23	OCF 1
			ACI 9	
			MCI 5	
			DCI 1	

Housing Assignment

The Housing Assignment category is a subgroup of Custody and Housing Status. The Housing Assignment category includes concerns regarding the following: **Unit assignment, cell/bed assignment, racial bunching, and other.**

A total of **129** concerns pertaining to Housing Assignment were received, the twelfth largest reported concern. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of concerns in the category, with 18 or 14% of the total concerns in the category.

TABLE 17. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH HOUSING ASSIGNMENT IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
		LCI 1	LORCI 3	WCI 8
				CMC 2

Safety/Sanitation

Safety/Sanitation is a subcategory of Institutional Operations. The following more specific concerns are included within the Safety/Sanitation category: **Fire safety measures, dirty living quarters/work areas, cleaning supplies, vermin, unsafe living areas, smoking/non-smoking, unsafe work areas, unsafe work practices, handicapped facilities, overcrowding, air/water quality, other.**

A total of **128** concerns pertaining to Safety/Sanitation were received and logged, the thirteenth largest reported concern. The Pickaway Correctional Institution has the largest number in the category, with **24**.

TABLE 18. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH SAFETY/SANITATION IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
	ORW 18		PCI 24	LECI 9
	SCI 7		BCI 8	JAILS 6
			HCF 5	
			DCI 1	

Security Classification

The category of Security Classification is a subcategory of Custody and Housing Status. Areas of reported concern within the Security Classification category include: **Instrument overdue, instrument incorrect, instrument overridden, procedural issues and other.** The “instrument” refers to the form completed by ODRC staff to determine an inmate’s security classification, termed the “Classification Instrument.” There are five classification levels, one through five. Level one is equivalent to the former minimum security classification, and level five is equivalent to the former High Max or Super Max.

As shown below, Security Classification is among the top five concerns at only one of the prisons. A total of **128** concerns pertaining to Security Classification were received and logged. Security Classification is the fourteenth largest category of reported concerns. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of complaints in the category, with **51**, or 40% of all concerns in the Security Classification category.

TABLE 19. INSTITUTIONS WITH SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
				RCI 4

Special Management Housing

Special Management Housing is one of the subcategories of the larger group titled “Custody and Housing Status.” Specific concerns within the Special Management Housing group consist of: **Placement, release, privileges, and other.**

A total of **121** concerns regarding Special Management Housing were received and logged. The Mansfield Correctional Institution has the largest number in the category with **20**.

TABLE 20. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
FPRC 1		DCI 2	CMC 3	LOCI 11

Discrimination

The Discrimination category is part of the larger category of Staff/Inmate Relations. Areas of concern within the Discrimination category consist of: **Programs, jobs, benefits, disciplinary action, transfer and other.**

A total of **110** concerns regarding Discrimination were received and logged. Mansfield Correctional Institution has the largest number of reported concerns in the category, with **12**.

TABLE 21. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH DISCRIMINATION IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
		LCI 1	DCI 1	MCI 4
			NCCTF 1	CMC 2
				LORCI 2

Protective Control

Protective Control is one of the subcategories of the larger Custody and Housing Status category. Reported concerns pertaining to Protective Control include: **Placement, release, privileges, and other.**

A total of **90** concerns in the Protective Control category were received and logged. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number in the category with **38**.

TABLE 21. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH PROTECTIVE CONTROL IS AMONG THEIR TOP FIVE REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN

#1 REPORTED CONCERN	#2 REPORTED CONCERN	#3 REPORTED CONCERN	#4 REPORTED CONCERN	#5 REPORTED CONCERN
	LCI 2		RCI 6	

NUMBER AND TYPE OF REPORTED CONCERNS AT EACH INSTITUTION

In the following pages, a table is provided on each correctional institution, detailing the number of reported concerns by category. Institutions are presented according to the number of reported concerns, beginning with the institution with the largest volume of concerns.

**TABLE 23. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	136
Non-Grievable Matters	102
Staff Accountability	82
Institution Assignment	69
Inmate Grievance Procedure	66
Security Classification	51
Health Care	49
Mail/Packages	44
Protective Control	38
Other	37
Personal Property	24
Housing Assignment	18
Psychological/Psychiatric	17
Food Services	16
Special Management Housing	15
Legal Services	12
Discrimination	11
Job Assignment	8
Dental Care	7
Inmate Account	7
Visiting	7
Safety and Sanitation	5
Commissary	5
Records	5
Facilities Maintenance	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	3
Recreation	2
Religious Services	2
Telephone	2
Education/Vocational Training	1
Recovery Services	1
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Total	845

**TABLE 24. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE MANSFIELD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Staff Accountability	74
Non-Grievable Matters	72
Force/Supervision	67
Visiting	23
Inmate Grievance Procedure	22
Special Management Housing	20
Mail/Packages	17
Security Classification	14
Personal Property	13
Institution Assignment	13
Food Services	12
Other	12
Discrimination	12
Protective Control	9
Health Care	6
Housing Assignment	6
Religious Services	4
Psychological/Psychiatric	3
Job Assignment	3
Recreation	3
Telephone	3
Legal Services	3
Inmate Account	2
Safety and Sanitation	1
Facilities Maintenance	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	1
Education/Vocational Training	1
Inmate Groups	1
Records	1
Dental Care	0
Commissary	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Total	419

**TABLE 25. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY AT THE
PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	107
Staff Accountability	45
Non-Grievable Matters	29
Safety and Sanitation	24
Inmate Grievance Procedure	21
Force/Supervision	19
Housing Assignment	17
Food Services	15
Job Assignment	13
Institution Assignment	10
Other	9
Facilities Maintenance	8
Laundry/Quartermaster	7
Personal Property	6
Recreation	6
Mail/Packages	6
Library	5
Discrimination	5
Education/Vocational Training	3
Visiting	3
Records	3
Dental Care	2
Inmate Account	2
Legal Services	2
Security Classification	2
Special Management Housing	2
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Commissary	1
Protective Control	1
Inmate Groups	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Total	374

**TABLE 26. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE OHIO STATE PENITENTIARY
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	45
Staff Accountability	39
Personal Property	34
Inmate Grievance Procedure	30
Food Services	25
Non-Grievable Matters	15
Security Classification	14
Mail/Packages	9
Discrimination	6
Religious Services	5
Special Management Housing	5
Protective Control	5
Inmate Account	4
Visiting	4
Facilities Maintenance	3
Education/Vocational Training	3
Recreation	3
Other	3
Library	2
Institution Assignment	2
Health Care	1
Safety and Sanitation	1
Inmate Groups	1
Job Assignments	1
Recovery Services	1
Housing Assignment	1
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Total	262

**TABLE 27. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE LAKE ERIE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	41
Non-Grievable Matters	37
Staff Accountability	34
Health Care	25
Inmate Grievance Procedure	14
Housing Assignment	12
Special Management Housing	12
Institution Assignment	9
Personal Property	8
Visiting	8
Safety and Sanitation	7
Other	7
Legal Services	6
Security Classification	5
Job Assignment	4
Mail/Packages	4
Facilities Maintenance	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	3
Records	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	2
Commissary	2
Inmate Account	2
Recovery Services	2
Recreation	2
Discrimination	2
Food Services	1
Education/Vocational Training	1
Dental Care	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Protective Control	0
Total	256

**TABLE 28. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE TRUMBULL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Staff Accountability	30
Force/Supervision	28
Health Care	22
Inmate Grievance Procedure	22
Non-Grievable Matters	18
Job Assignments	11
Facilities Maintenance	8
Legal Services	8
Security Classification	8
Housing Assignment	7
Institution Assignment	6
Dental Care	5
Mail/Packages	5
Discrimination	5
Special Management Housing	5
Safety and Sanitation	4
Education/Vocational Training	4
Psychological/Psychiatric	3
Inmate Account	3
Food Services	2
Commissary	2
Personal Property	2
Recreation	2
Telephone	2
Other	2
Laundry/Quartermaster	1
Library	1
Inmate Groups	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Visiting	0
Records	0
Protective Control	0
Total	216

**TABLE 29. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE TOLEDO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	34
Staff Accountability	30
Inmate Grievance Procedure	20
Health Care	15
Non-Grievable Matters	14
Personal Property	10
Other	9
Mail/Packages	8
Discrimination	8
Institution Assignment	7
Special Management Housing	7
Protective Control	7
Visiting	6
Psychological/Psychiatric	5
Food Services	4
Facilities Maintenance	3
Recreation	3
Security Classification	3
Commissary	2
Education/Vocational Training	2
Library	2
Legal Services	2
Safety and Sanitation	1
Inmate Account	1
Recovery Services	1
Religious Services	1
Records	1
Dental Care	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignments	0
Telephone	0
Housing Assignment	0
Total	205

**TABLE 30. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE MADISON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Other	26
Staff Accountability	23
Inmate Grievance Procedure	22
Health Care	20
Force/Supervision	19
Non-Grievable Matters	14
Institution Assignment	8
Housing Assignment	8
Visiting	7
Discrimination	7
Education/Vocational Training	6
Personal Property	5
Food Services	4
Job	3
Recovery Services	3
Records	3
Dental Care	2
Commissary	2
Religious Services	2
Legal Services	2
Protective Control	2
Inmate Account	1
Inmate Groups	1
Mail/Packages	1
Security Classification	1
Special Management Housing	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Library	0
Recreation	0
Telephone	0
Total	193

**TABLE 31. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE GRAFTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	21
Visiting	18
Staff Accountability	18
Non-Grievable Matters	17
Health Care	15
Inmate Grievance Procedure	13
Housing Assignment	11
Other	10
Discrimination	9
Food Services	8
Recovery Services	8
Personal Property	6
Institution Assignment	6
Job Assignments	4
Facilities Maintenance	3
Mail/Packages	3
Special Management Housing	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Inmate Account	2
Religious Services	2
Records	2
Legal Services	2
Security Classification	2
Dental Care	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Safety and Sanitation	1
Inmate Groups	1
Recreation	1
Education/Vocational Training	0
Library	0
Telephone	0
Protective Control	0
Commissary	0
Total	190

**TABLE 32. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE CHILLICOTHE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	24
Force/Supervision	21
Staff Accountability	16
Inmate Grievance Procedure	12
Non-Grievable Matters	11
Other	10
Laundry/Quartermaster	9
Visiting	8
Personal Property	8
Records	6
Safety and Sanitation	5
Mail/Packages	5
Discrimination	5
Facilities Maintenance	4
Legal Services	4
Institution Assignment	4
Inmate Account	3
Security Classification	3
Library	2
Recreation	2
Housing Assignment	2
Dental Care	1
Food Services	1
Commissary	1
Job Assignment	1
Telephone	1
Special Management Housing	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Account	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Protective Control	0
Inmate Groups	0
Total	170

**TABLE 33. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE NORTH CENTRAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Non-Grievable Matters	21
Inmate Grievance Procedure	19
Force/Supervision	17
Health Care	14
Religious Services	12
Staff Accountability	12
Personal Property	10
Institution Assignment	9
Visiting	8
Mail/Packages	7
Other	7
Housing Assignment	4
Safety and Sanitation	3
Education/Vocational Training	3
Legal Services	3
Protective Control	3
Library	2
Security Classification	2
Special Management Housing	2
Recreation	2
Dental Care	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Facilities Maintenance	1
Food Services	1
Inmate Account	1
Records	1
Discrimination	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignments	0
Recovery Services	0
Telephone	0
Total	167

**TABLE 34. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE LONDON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Non-Grievable Matters	32
Staff Accountability	18
Force/Supervision	14
Mail/Packages	12
Inmate Grievance Procedure	12
Special Management Housing	11
Safety and Sanitation	10
Job Assignment	10
Personal Property	6
Housing Assignment	6
Facilities Maintenance	5
Institution Assignment	5
Security Classification	4
Visiting	3
Other	3
Health Care	2
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Education/Vocational Training	2
Discrimination	2
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Food Services	1
Inmate Account	1
Legal Services	1
Dental Care	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Protective Control	0
Total	163

**TABLE 35. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE WARREN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Non-Grievable Matters	20
Staff Accountability	19
Force/Supervision	17
Health Care	13
Institution Assignment	8
Housing Assignment	8
Mail/Packages	7
Visiting	7
Special Management Housing	7
Inmate Grievance Procedure	7
Other	6
Protective Control	5
Discrimination	5
Inmate Account	5
Security Classification	4
Records	3
Legal Services	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	2
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Recreation	2
Religious Services	2
Safety and Sanitation	1
Facilities Maintenance	1
Commissary	1
Personal Property	1
Dental Care	0
Food Services	0
Recovery Services	0
Library	0
Job Assignment	0
Inmate Groups	0
Educational/Vocational Training	0
Telephone	0
Total	156

**TABLE 36. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE OHIO REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONERNS
Health Care	30
Safety and Sanitation	18
Staff Accountability	13
Facilities Maintenance	12
Force/Supervision	11
Special Management Housing	10
Psychological/Psychiatric	6
Mail/Packages	6
Visiting	5
Non-Grievable Matters	5
Food	3
Commissary	3
Inmate Account	3
Legal Services	3
Security Classification	3
Other	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Housing Assignment	2
Institution Assignment	2
Inmate Grievance Procedure	2
Library	1
Recreation	1
Discrimination	1
Dental Care	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignments	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Protective Control	0
Total	145

**TABLE 37. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Inmate Grievance Procedure	20
Health Care	16
Force/Supervision	15
Institution Assignment	11
Non-Grievable Matters	11
Safety and Sanitation	9
Staff Accountability	9
Protective Control	5
Other	5
Job Assignment	4
Psychological/Psychiatric	3
Security Classification	3
Food Services	2
Inmate Account	2
Personal Property	2
Mail/Packages	2
Visiting	2
Discrimination	2
Special Management Housing	2
Dental Care	1
Legal Services	1
Housing Assignment	1
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Total	128

**TABLE 38. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE ALLEN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Staff Accountability	17
Non-Grievable Matters	14
Inmate Grievance Procedure	11
Mail/Packages	9
Visiting	9
Force/Supervision	8
Safety and Sanitation	7
Housing Assignment	7
Health Care	6
Facilities Maintenance	6
Food Services	6
Legal Services	4
Institution Assignment	4
Protective Control	4
Personal Property	2
Discrimination	2
Other	2
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	1
Commissary	1
Inmate Account	1
Job Assignments	1
Recovery Services	1
Religious Services	1
Records	1
Inmate Groups	1
Dental Care	0
Inmate Account	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Library	0
Recreation	0
Telephone	0
Security Classification	0
Special Management Housing	0
Total	126

**TABLE 39. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE MARION CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Inmate Grievance Procedure	21
Non-Grievable Matters	17
Staff Accountability	17
Force/Supervision	15
Health Care	15
Visiting	5
Legal Services	4
Discrimination	4
Institution Assignment	4
Other	4
Security Classification	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Personal Property	2
Job Assignment	2
Library	2
Mail/Packages	2
Protective Control	2
Inmate Account	1
Education/Vocational Training	1
Inmate Groups	1
Records	1
Special Management Housing	1
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Commissary	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Housing Assignment	0
Total	126

**TABLE 40. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
FROM "OTHER/JAIL" FACILITIES
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	23
Force/Supervision	12
Non-Grievable Matters	10
Other	10
Legal Services	9
Staff Accountability	9
Safety and Sanitation	6
Recreation	6
Housing Assignment	5
Facilities Maintenance	4
Food Services	4
Personal Property	4
Laundry/Quartermaster	3
Special Management Housing	3
Inmate Grievance Procedure	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	2
Commissary	2
Library	2
Visiting	2
Discrimination	2
Inmate Account	1
Education/Vocational Training	1
Telephone	1
Security Classification	1
Dental Care	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignment	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Records	0
Institution Assignment	0
Protective Control	0
Total	125

**TABLE 41. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE BELMONT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	16
Non-Grievable Matters	13
Staff Accountability	11
Health Care	11
Safety and Sanitation	8
Institution Assignment	7
Personal Property	6
Inmate Grievance Procedure	6
Psychological/Psychiatric	4
Food Services	4
Commissary	4
Religious Services	4
Housing Assignment	4
Job Assignment	3
Library	3
Legal Services	3
Special Management Housing	3
Inmate Account	2
Discrimination	2
Education/Vocational Training	1
Recovery Services	1
Mail/Packages	1
Visiting	1
Telephone	1
Records	1
Security Classification	1
Other	1
Dental Care	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Inmate Groups	0
Recreation	0
Protective Control	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Total	122

**TABLE 42. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE NOBLE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Inmate Grievance Procedure	19
Force/Supervision	14
Health Care	13
Staff Accountability	10
Food Services	8
Mail/Packages	7
Personal Property	6
Discrimination	6
Psychological/Psychiatric	2
Safety and Sanitation	2
Education/Vocational Training	2
Inmate Groups	2
Recreation	2
Legal Services	2
Security Classification	2
Non-Grievable Matters	2
Commissary	1
Inmate Account	1
Job Assignments	1
Recovery Services	1
Visiting	1
Housing Assignment	1
Other	1
Dental Care	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Library	0
Religious Services	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Security Classification	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Institution Assignment	0
Total	106

**TABLE 43. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE RICHLAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Non-Grievable Matters	19
Health Care	14
Staff Accountability	11
Force/Supervision	9
Other	7
Personal Property	6
Inmate Grievance Procedure	4
Education/Vocational Training	3
Discrimination	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	2
Food Services	2
Commissary	2
Mail/Packages	2
Records	2
Institution Assignment	2
Dental Care	1
Safety and Sanitation	1
Inmate Account	1
Special Management Housing	1
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignments	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Legal Services	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Protective Control	0
Total	92

**TABLE 44. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE CORRECTIONAL RECEPTION CENTER
FROM JANUARY, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	13
Force/Supervision	11
Inmate Grievance Procedure	9
Non-Grievable Matters	9
Psychological/Psychiatric	8
Staff Accountability	8
Mail/Packages	7
Other	7
Recovery Services	6
Food Services	4
Records	2
Dental Care	1
Personal Property	1
Job Assignment	1
Recreation	1
Legal Services	1
Institution Assignment	1
Protective Control	1
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Religious Services	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Discrimination	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Total	91

**TABLE 45. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE ROSS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCENS
Non-Grievable Matters	10
Institution Assignment	8
Force/Supervision	7
Health Care	6
Staff Accountability	6
Protective Control	6
Mail/Packages	4
Security Classification	4
Special Management Housing	3
Housing Assignment	2
Other	2
Personal Property	1
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Inmate Groups	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Job Assignments	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Discrimination	0
Inmate Grievance Procedure	0
Total	59

**TABLE 46. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE SOUTHEASTERN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	11
Safety and Sanitation	7
Recreation	5
Non-Grievable Matters	5
Facilities Maintenance	4
Other	4
Health Care	3
Food Services	3
Staff Accountability	3
Job Assignment	2
Institution Assignment	2
Inmate Grievance Procedure	2
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Education/Vocational Training	1
Inmate Groups	1
Library	1
Visiting	1
Records	1
Discrimination	1
Dental Care	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Telephone	0
Legal Services	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Total	58

**TABLE 47. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE HOCKING CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	9
Food Services	7
Force/Supervision	6
Safety and Sanitation	5
Facilities Maintenance	3
Job Assignment	3
Inmate Grievance Procedure	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Personal Property	2
Discrimination	2
Library	1
Visiting	1
Institution Assignment	1
Housing Assignment	1
Special Management Housing	1
Non-Grievable Matters	1
Other	1
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Staff Accountability	0
Security Classification	0
Protective Control	0
Total	49

**TABLE 48. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE CORRECTIONS MEDICAL CENTER
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	11
Health Care	5
Staff Accountability	5
Other	4
Special Management Housing	3
Inmate Grievance Procedure	3
Telephone	2
Legal Services	2
Discrimination	2
Housing Assignment	2
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Facilities Maintenance	1
Inmate Account	1
Job Assignment	1
Dental Care	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Visiting	0
Records	0
Security Classification	0
Institution Assignment	0
Protective Control	0
Non-Grievable Matters	0
Total	43

**TABLE 49. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE LORAIN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Staff Accountability	8
Personal Property	5
Non-Grievable Matters	5
Food Services	4
Inmate Grievance Procedure	4
Other	4
Job Assignment	3
Housing Assignment	3
Force/Supervision	2
Discrimination	2
Safety and Sanitation	1
Inmate Account	1
Records	1
Health Care	0
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Telephone	0
Visiting	0
Legal Services	0
Security Classification	0
Institution Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Total	43

**TABLE 50. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE OAKWOOD CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	5
Psychological/Psychiatric	4
Staff Accountability	3
Non-Grievable Matters	3
Legal Services	2
Force/Supervision	2
Institution Assignment	2
Education/Vocational Training	1
Library	1
Recreation	1
Mail/Packages	1
Visiting	1
Telephone	1
Records	1
Inmate Grievance Procedure	1
Dental Care	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignment	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Discrimination	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Institution Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Other	0
Protective Control	0
Total	29

**TABLE 51. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE DAYTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	10
Personal Property	3
Other	3
Staff Accountability	2
Institution Assignment	2
Special Management Housing	2
Inmate Grievance Procedure	2
Safety and Sanitation	1
Visiting	1
Telephone	1
Discrimination	1
Health Care	0
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Commissary	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Inmate Account	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignment	0
Library	0
Mail/Packages	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Protective Control	0
Non-Grievable Matters	0
Total	28

**TABLE 52. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE NORTH COAST CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT FACILITY
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Inmate Grievance Procedure	10
Health Care	4
Food Services	2
Commissary	2
Job Assignment	2
Force/Supervision	2
Recreation	1
Discrimination	1
Institution Assignment	1
Non-Grievable Matters	1
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Staff Accountability	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Other	0
Total	26

**TABLE 53. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE LIMA CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005
(CLOSED JUNE 26, 2004)**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Job Assignment	5
Protective Control	2
Non-Grievable Matters	2
Health Care	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Legal Services	1
Force/Supervision	1
Discrimination	1
Housing Assignment	1
Other	1
Dental Care	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Staff Accountability	0
Security Classification	0
Institution Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Inmate Grievance Procedure	0
Total	16

**TABLE 54. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE NORTHEAST OHIO CORRECTIONAL CENTER
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Inmate Account	1
Mail/Packages	1
Legal Services	1
Force/Supervision	1
Health Care	0
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignment	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Discrimination	0
Staff Accountability	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Institution Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Inmate Grievance Procedure	0
Non-Grievable Matters	0
Other	0
Total	4

**TABLE 55. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE FRANKLIN PRE-RELEASE CENTER
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	1
Special Management Housing	1
Non-Grievable Matters	1
Health Care	0
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignments	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Discrimination	0
Staff Accountability	0
Security Classification	0
Institution Assignment	0
Housing Assignment	0
Protective Control	0
Inmate Grievance Procedure	0
Other	0
Library	0
Total	3

**TABLE 56. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE NORTHEAST PRE-RELEASE CENTER
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	2
Staff Accountability	1
Health Care	0
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignment	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Discrimination	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Institution Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Inmate Grievance Procedure	0
Non-Grievable Matters	0
Other	0
Total	3

**TABLE 57. NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS BY CATEGORY
AT THE MONTGOMERY EDUCATION PRE-RELEASE CENTER
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Health Care	0
Dental Care	0
Psychological/Psychiatric	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Safety and Sanitation	0
Food Services	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Commissary	0
Inmate Account	0
Personal Property	0
Education/Vocational Training	0
Inmate Groups	0
Job Assignments	0
Library	0
Recovery Services	0
Recreation	0
Religious Services	0
Mail/Packages	0
Visiting	0
Telephone	0
Records	0
Legal Services	0
Force/Supervision	0
Discrimination	0
Staff Accountability	0
Security Classification	0
Housing Assignment	0
Institution Assignment	0
Special Management Housing	0
Protective Control	0
Inmate Grievance Procedure	0
Non-Grievable Matters	0
Other	0
Total	0

WRITTEN INQUIRIES

As a part of the monitoring and evaluation role of the CIIC, when warranted, inquiries are made to the institutions or ODRC Central Office staff, to ensure that they are aware of an allegation or a particular problem reported to the CIIC, and to request information on the findings of any investigation and/or their assistance to ensure the concern is addressed. Telephone inquiries to appropriate staff at the institutions or their Central Office are made far more frequently than written inquiries. Written inquiries are generally reserved for more complex matters, or to accurately communicate detailed information, rather than rely on a brief summary exchange via phone inquiry.

In March 2004, CIIC staff implemented a tracking system for letters of inquiry. The system provides a better alternative than reviewing individual files to determine the status of inquiries in terms of receipt of a response. In addition, the knowledge gathered from the number and subject of inquiries at each institution and system wide, is valuable in the identification of issues. Such is relevant to the need to identify problems or areas in need of improvement, referenced in Section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code. That is, the CIIC has the authority to “Evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition or operation of correctional institutions,” and to identify “any programs that have been proposed or developed to improve the condition or operation of the correctional institutions in the state.”

Based on a review of the letters of inquiry written from March 17, 2004 through December 23, 2004, a total of 86 inquiries were written, with 75 inquiries to institutions, nine to ODRC Central Office staff, one to a jail, and one to the Mohican Juvenile Correctional Facility. The 75 letters of inquiry to Wardens were sent to one of 19 institutions, with the largest number sent to the Mansfield Correctional Institution, and the second largest number sent to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 19 and 15 inquiries respectively. Letters of inquiry to correctional institutions sent from March 17, 2003 through December 23, 2004 are as follows:

**TABLE 58. LETTERS OF INQUIRY BY INSTITUTION
FROM MARCH 17, 2004 THROUGH DECEMBER 23, 2004**

INSTITUTIONS	NUMBER OF WRITTEN INQUIRIES
Mansfield Correctional Institution	19
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	15
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9
ODRC Central Office	9
Toledo Correctional Institution	5
Ohio Reformatory for Women	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3
Marion Correctional Institution	3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	3
Dayton Correctional Institution	2
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center	2
Richland Correctional Institution	2
Allen Correctional Institution	1
Correctional Reception Center	1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1
Lorain Correctional Institution	1
Madison Correctional Institution	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	1
Richland Correctional Institution	1
DYS Mohican Juvenile Correctional Institution	1
Jails	1
TOTAL	86

Responses to Inquiries

The 86 letters of inquiry sent between March 17, 2004 and December 23, 2004, were reviewed by subject category as well as by responsiveness. There are nine letters of inquiry for which there is no record of response to date. Follow-up communication will be initiated to address the concerns prompted by the unanswered written inquiries. Beginning in January 2005, pending responses to inquiries will be closely monitored, and communication will be initiated with the institution or Central Office staff regarding non-response after a 30-day period. Information on unanswered inquiries, dates of the inquiries, and the institution to which the inquiry was sent, is provided below:

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Pending</u>	<u>Date of Written Inquiry</u>
Pickaway Correctional Institution	4	June 23, 2004 August 31, 2004 September 10, 2004 September 21, 2004
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	November 9, 2004
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	July 14, 2004
Marion Correctional Institution	1	October 14, 2004
Allen Correctional Institution	1	August 27, 2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	October 25, 2004
TOTAL	9	6-23-04 through 11-9-04

Subject Category of Written Inquiries

The 86 inquiries pertained to 129 problems or concerns categorized as follows:

**TABLE 59. NUMBER OF WRITTEN INQUIRIES BY SUBJECT
FROM MARCH 17, 2004 THROUGH DECEMBER 23, 2004**

SUBJECT OF INQUIRIES	NUMBER OF INQUIRIES
Force/Supervision	24
Health Care	15
Confidential Informants	12
Inmate Conflicts	9
Housing Assignment	8
Protective Control	7
Mental Health	6
Inmate Deaths	5
Rules Infraction Board	4
Other	4
Discrimination	3
Gang Related	3
Legal Services	3
Parole Board	2
Extortion	2
Facilities Maintenance	2
Food Services	2
Inmate Account	2
Inmate Grievance Procedure	2
Library	2
Personal Property	2
Staff Accountability	2
Safety and Sanitation	2
Drug Testing	1
Educational/Vocational Testing	1
Institutional Assignment	1
Mail/Package	1
Visiting	1
Security	1
TOTAL	129

Of the 129 problems, issues or concerns contained in the written inquiries, 48.8% or 63 were contained in letters of inquiry to the following three prisons: Mansfield Correctional Institution, Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, and Pickaway Correctional Institution.

Inquiries to the Mansfield Correctional Institution

Mansfield Correctional Institution was the recipient of the largest number of inquiries, with 19 letters of inquiry regarding 25 problems, issues or concerns as follows:

TABLE 60. SUBJECT CATEGORIES OF 19 LETTERS OF INQUIRY TO THE MANSFIELD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

<u>Subject Category</u>	<u>Number of Concerns</u>
Confidential Informants	12
Rules Infraction Board	3
Gang Related	2
Shakedown	2
Force/Supervision	1
Housing Unit	1
Inmate Conflict	1
Other	1
Protective Control	1
Visiting	1
TOTAL	25

As shown above, 12 or 48% of the written inquiries to the Mansfield Correctional Institution pertained to the alleged practices pertaining to the use of informants and use of confidential information as sole evidence to convict inmates of serious rule violations resulting in potentially serious consequences for the accused, including increase in security classification to level four, and subsequent transfer to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Issues pertaining to the alleged routine use of informants also prompted concern due to the linked safety and security issues, and multitude of issues stemming from the alleged solicitation of and/or “dealing” with inmate informants, including the impact on credibility of the informant whenever rewards or punishments are involved. Since late 2004, the absence of ongoing complaints on the issue from MANCI tends to indicate that the concerns have been addressed.

Still, it is recommended that ODRC provide clear written guidelines to all Investigators on the use of confidential information, use of informants, and “dealing” as prohibited in the ODRC Employee Code of Conduct. That is, rule violation 45 prohibits, “Without express authorization, giving preferential treatment to any individual under the supervision of the Department, to include but not limited to: The offering, receiving, or giving of favor; the offering, receiving, or giving of anything of value; and Dealing.”

It is also recommended that serious consideration be given to how best to increase support services, monitoring and supervision of Investigators throughout the prison system by Central Office staff.

Inquiries to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility received the second largest number of written inquiries, with 15 letters of inquiry regarding 20 problems, issues or concern. One of the reasons why there were not more written inquiries at SOCF is that staff on site have been accessible by phone, as well as extremely cooperative and responsive to telephone inquiries. Of the 20 problems, issues or concern, four inquiries pertained to Force/Supervision, and four inquiries pertained to Inmate Conflict. Three inquiries included concerns regarding Protective Control, and three inquiries pertained to Mental Health. The subject categories of the 15 letters of inquiry directed to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility are provided below:

TABLE 61. SUBJECT CATEGORIES OF 15 LETTERS OF INQUIRY TO THE SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

<u>Subject Category</u>	<u>Number of Concerns</u>
Force/Supervision	4
Inmate Conflicts	4
Mental Health	3
Protective Control	3
Death	1
Extortion	1
Facility Maintenance	1
Parole Board	1
Transfers	1
Other	1
TOTAL	20

Inquiries to the Pickaway Correctional Institution

The Pickaway Correctional Institution received the third largest number of written inquiries, with nine letters of inquiry regarding 18 problems, issues or concerns. As noted below, six of the 18 pertained to Medical Care, and five pertained to Force/Supervision.

TABLE 62. SUBJECT CATEGORIES OF NINE LETTERS OF INQUIRY TO THE PICKAWAY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

<u>Subject Category</u>	<u>Number of Concerns</u>
Medical Care	6
Force/Supervision	5
Death	2
Facility Maintenance	2
Food Services	1
Protective Custody	1
Other	1
TOTAL	18

IV. PRISON OPERATIONS, CONDITIONS AND PROGRAMS MONITORED

DATA REVIEW AND MONITORING

One way to evaluate prison operations, conditions, programs and grievance procedure is to monitor data contained in monthly reports, which are prepared at the institutions and submitted to the ODRC Central Office staff. One of the first priorities of the CIIC was to resume receipt of selected ODRC monthly reports for monitoring purposes.

Following a meeting with the CIIC staff and ODRC Central Office staff, on October 30, 2003, the ODRC Deputy Director of Institutions requested each Warden to begin sending specific monthly reports to the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee office. The requested reports included the Inspector's Monthly Report on the Inmate Grievance Procedure, Monthly Education Enrollment Report that also provides information on vocational training, and the Report of Racial Breakdown and Use of Force pertaining to use of force incidents. Medical Monthly reports were requested through the Deputy Director of the ODRC Office of Correctional Health Care who contacted the institutions with the request.

Additional information was requested from ODRC Central Office staff who have provided data regarding Recovery Services, Mental Health, Inmate/Inmate Assaults, Inmate/Staff Assaults, and Special Incident Reports of Inmate Deaths. Annual data was provided on Recovery Services. In addition, annual data on assaults was provided most recently through the Central Office Bureau of Research, and initially through the ODRC Legislative Liaison. In regard to Mental Health Caseload data, institutional mental health staff submit the data via computer to Central Office. Such data has been forwarded to the CIIC office by Central Office Mental Health staff on a monthly basis.

The information referenced above has been reviewed either immediately on receipt, during the preparation of the inspection reports, in preparation for CIIC meetings regarding particular issues, and/or in preparation of this biennial report.

INMATE POPULATION

The inmate population by institution and gender on November 1, 2003 and on November 1, 2004 is provided below. As shown, the November 2004 population totaled 44,159, which is an overall decrease of 1,311 from the prior year. The number of male inmates decreased by 1,071, while the number of female inmates increased by 251.

TABLE 63. INMATE POPULATION BY INSTITUTION ON NOVEMBER 1, 2003 AND ON NOVEMBER 1, 2004 WITH INCREASE OR DECREASE

	<u>INMATE POPULATION</u>		
	<u>11-1-04</u>	<u>11-1-03</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>
<u>PRISONS FOR MEN:</u>			
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2660	2587	+73
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2399	2359	+40
Richland Correctional Institution	2324	2201	+123
Ross Correctional Institution	2261	2264	-3
North Central Correctional Institution	2242	2251	-9
Belmont Correctional Institution	2129	2030	+99
Noble Correctional Institution	2127	2023	+104
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2095	2151	-56
London Correctional Institution	2021	2060	-39
Madison Correctional Institution	1914	2121	-207
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1911	1828	+83
Correctional Reception Center	1810	1955	+145
Marion Correctional Institution	1804	1648	+156
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1607	1533	+74
Lorain Correctional Institution	1420	1904	-484
Grafton Correctional Institution	1407	1376	+31
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1369	1389	-20
Allen Correctional Institution	1274	1242	+32
Warren Correctional Institution	1047	1051	-4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1039	1392	-353
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	965	1072	-107
Toledo Correctional Institution	793	795	-2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	529	538	-9
Hocking Correctional Facility	471	451	+20
Ohio State Penitentiary	439	478	-39
Dayton Correctional Institution	413	408	+5
Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center	327	332	-5
Oakwood Correctional Facility (MALE)	120	137	-17
Corrections Medical Center (MALE)	106	110	-4
LCI	0	504	-504
<u>MALE TOTAL</u>	<u>41023</u>	<u>42094</u>	<u>-1071</u>
<u>PRISONS FOR WOMEN:</u>			
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2053	1818	+235
Northeast Pre-Release Center	596	601	-5
Franklin Pre-Release Center	479	460	+19
Oakwood Correctional Facility (FEMALE)	5	1	+4
Corrections Medical Center (FEMALE)	3	5	-2
<u>FEMALE TOTAL</u>	<u>3136</u>	<u>2885</u>	<u>+251</u>
<u>COMBINED TOTAL</u>	<u>44159</u>	<u>45470</u>	<u>-1311</u>

The Chillicothe Correctional Institution, a level two (medium) security facility, has the largest inmate population as of the November 1, 2004 data, with 2,660 male inmates, up 73 from November 1, 2003. The Mansfield Correctional Institution, a level three (close) security facility that also houses Death Row, has the second largest population at 2,399 male inmates, up 40 from the previous year. The third largest prison is Richland Correctional Institution, also in Mansfield. It is a level two (medium) security prison, with 2,324 male inmates. Ross Correctional Institution, a level three (close) security facility, is the fourth largest prison, with 2,324 men. Remaining institutions with populations ranging from 2,021 to 2,242 include London Correctional Institution, Pickaway Correctional Institution, Noble Correctional Institution, Belmont Correctional Institution and North Central Correctional Institution.

The two reception centers for all male inmates in the prison system, Lorain Correctional Institution and the Correctional Reception Center, have inmate populations of 1,420 and 1,810 respectively. The population of the Lorain Correctional Institution decreased by 484 from November 1, 2003 to November 1, 2004. However, the Correctional Reception Center' population increased by 145 in the same time period.

The Ohio State Penitentiary, a level five (High Max or Supermax) facility which also houses level four (maximum) security inmates, has a population of 439, down by 39 from the previous year. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, a level four (maximum) security facility, has 965 inmates. The SOCF population decreased by 107 from the previous year, and is believed to be its lowest population in SOCF history.

Level four inmates may request transfer from the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility to the Ohio State Penitentiary. Those who make such requests are placed on a transfer request list, and each person must be thoroughly evaluated by mental health professionals to ensure that they do not meet the exclusionary mental illness criteria, which would prevent them from transferring to the Ohio State Penitentiary. The criteria was created in part due to the highly isolated and restrictive environment at the Ohio State Penitentiary, and its potential impact on one's mental health. At various intervals throughout 2004, it was reported that from 250 to 300 inmates had requested transfer from SOCF to OSP and were awaiting mental health screening.

The ODRC classifies inmates by security level, either Level One (minimum), Level Two (medium), Level Three (close), Level Four (maximum) or Level Five (High Max, Supermax). Institutions are similarly designated a particular classification, from Level One to Level Five.

There are a number of institutions which potentially house all security levels, due to their particular mission, such as providing special medical or mental health services, or because they serve as a reception center for the prison system. The facilities which potentially house all security levels include: the Corrections Medical Center, Oakwood Correctional Facility, Lorain Correctional Institution, Correctional Reception Center and Ohio Reformatory for Women. Further, although the Pickaway Correctional Institution is listed as a Level One and Two facility due to its operation of the Frazier Health Center

which provides a dialysis unit, hospice, and medical step down unit, the facility could be considered as serving all security levels. Even the Mansfield Correctional Institution which is classified as a Level Three facility, could be considered in this group, due to the fact that it houses Death Row. Madison Correctional Institution, which is classified as a Level One and Three facility serves multiple classifications in their operation of the Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center to which all male sex offenders are transferred from the reception centers.

Only the Ohio State Penitentiary houses Level Five inmates, and as noted above, it also houses Level Four inmates who otherwise would be at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

The Mansfield Correctional Institution was built with the expressed purpose of providing a maximum security facility for the northern region, in part to enable the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility to reduce its population to relieve crowding and to eliminate double celling. In addition, the provision of a maximum security facility in the northern region was desirable to address the needs of visitors from northern Ohio. Therefore, when the Mansfield Correctional Institution opened, SOCF inmates classified as either close or maximum security, were transferred to the Mansfield Correctional Institution. Following the fatal stabbing of an Officer at the Mansfield Correctional Institution by a close security inmate, in 1992 the administrative decision was made to return all maximum security inmates in general population to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Therefore, SOCF was unable to accomplish its goal to reduce the population to its single cell capacity prior to the 1993 riot. Still, due to its construction as a maximum security facility, the Mansfield Correctional Institution has the potential to house inmates in a maximum security status. It currently houses Death Row, which was formerly located within the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Further security-based renovations were made at the Mansfield Correctional Institution subsequent to the Death Row riot.

In addition to the potential of the Mansfield Correctional Institution to serve a Level Four population, the Toledo Correctional Institution was reportedly constructed with the potential to house high security populations, though it is currently housing primarily Level Three inmates. In addition, with the Ohio State Penitentiary now accommodating Level Four inmates, a lower security level than the Level Five inmates for whom it was constructed, ODRC appears to have no shortage of potential bed space to meet any future demand for high security beds.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility is the only facility that houses solely Level Four inmates. Level Three (close) security facilities include the Mansfield Correctional Institution, Ross Correctional Institution, Madison Correctional Institution, Lebanon Correctional Institution, Warren Correctional Institution, Trumbull Correctional Institution, and Toledo Correctional Institution. In addition, a number of the facilities noted above as potentially housing all security levels, are typically considered to be close security facilities.

It is recommended that ODRC assess its existing bed space, and examine the current and potential use of that space, particularly for underutilized institutions, with consideration of how possible changes could accommodate special needs populations. No greater improvement could be made to impact the entire operations, conditions and programs of the Level Three facilities than to eliminate double celling not only in segregation, but also in general population.

Expansion of Beds for Females

According to ODRC population data, as of November 1, 2004, ODRC had a total inmate population of 44,159, with 41,023 men and 3,136 women. In comparison, as of November 1, 2003, there were 42,094 male inmates, and 2,885 female inmates, with a combined total of 45,470. Therefore, while the total inmate population decreased by 1,311 and the number of men decreased by 1,071, the number of women increased by 251.

On July 9, 2004, ODRC conducted a problem analysis based on the fact that their three female prisons were operating at an average crowding rate of 124.6%, which was beyond the ODRC total average crowding rate of 123.4%. Reports showed that while the **overall ODRC inmate population is expected to increase by 14% over the next eight years, the female inmate growth rate is projected to climb by 28%**. Due to the complexity of the female population needs, ODRC proposed to increase the number of female beds. Per the proposal, which was implemented in the subsequent months in 2004, an existing male prison camp was converted into a female prison camp. Since more than 60% of the female inmate population is from Cuyahoga County and surrounding counties, Trumbull Correctional Camp was chosen based on geographic location, physical structure, and increased reentry opportunities for the female offenders. The goal was to create 300 female beds.

To ensure that the continuity of care and quality of life issues were fully examined, ODRC created a diversified committee to explore all operational procedures and processes to change the Trumbull Correctional Camp into a female prison to meet the needs of female offenders. The committee also developed timeframes for implementation. Areas of review included: Medical, Segregation, Staff Training, Sensitivity and Gender Specific Training, Programming, commissary, Fiscal Concerns, Quarter Master, Transportation, Visiting and Staffing Patterns. Programming included educational and vocational opportunities, employment issues (post release), job assignment and selection options including community service/ outside work crews, and re-entry programming.

On November 4, 2004, TCI administrative staff reported that less than 60 male inmates remained at the camp, which has a 400 bed capacity. Due to the progress made, the target date for operation was moved from early January 2005 to early December 2004. In further follow-up communication on December 13, 2004, it was relayed that the TCI camp has 59 women, and 40 more were scheduled to arrive in each of the next two

weeks, which would fill one side of the camp. The process would continue until the other side of the camp is filled.

INMATE ON INMATE ASSAULTS

As shown in the table below, the number of inmate on inmate assaults in the prisons totaled 482 in 2003, and decreased to 411 in 2004. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had the largest number of inmate on inmate assaults in both years, with 139 in 2003, comprising 29% of all assaults in the prison system. However, inmate on inmate assaults at SOCF decreased by 71 in 2004 to their total of 85 inmate on inmate assaults, comprising 21% of the system wide assaults. One possible factor in the decrease in assaults at SOCF is the reduction in their inmate population from 1072 on November 1, 2003 to 965 in 2004, a decrease of 107 inmates.

TABLE 64. NUMBER OF INMATE ON INMATE ASSAULTS IN 2003 AND IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

2003		2004	
INSTITUTION	Number of Assaults	INSTITUTION	Number of Assaults
Southern Ohio Corr. Facility	139	Southern Ohio Corr. Facility	85
Oakwood Correctional Facility	38	Oakwood Correctional Facility	38
North Central Correctional Inst.	25	North Central Correctional Inst.	28
Ross Correctional Inst.	23	Richland Correctional Inst.	24
Mansfield Correctional Inst.	21	Belmont Correctional Inst.	23
Southeastern Correctional Inst.	20	Lake Erie Correctional Inst.	23
Ohio Reformatory for Women	19	Ross Correctional Inst.	23
Allen Correctional Inst.	17	Noble Correctional Inst.	22
Trumbull Correctional Inst.	17	Southeast Correctional Inst.	18
Belmont Correctional Inst.	16	Trumbull Correctional Inst.	18
Noble Correctional Inst.	16	Mansfield Correctional Inst.	16
Richland Correctional Inst.	16	Madison Correctional Inst.	13
Warren Correctional Inst.	15	Ohio Reformatory for Women	12
Correctional Reception Center	12	Allen Correctional Inst.	8
Madison Correctional Inst.	12	Lebanon Correctional Inst.	8
Franklin Pre-Release Center	11	Warren Correctional Inst.	8
Lake Erie Correctional Inst.	11	North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	7
North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	8	Correctional Reception Center	5
Chillicothe Correctional Inst.	7	Toledo Correctional Inst.	5
Lebanon Correctional Inst.	7	Chillicothe Correctional Inst.	4
Lorain Correctional Inst.	7	Ohio State Penitentiary	4
Ohio State Penitentiary	6	Pickaway Correctional Inst.	4
Marion Correctional Inst.	5	Northeast Pre-Release Center	3
Toledo Correctional Inst.	5	Franklin Pre-Release Center	2
London Correctional Inst.	4	Grafton Correctional Inst.	2
Lima Correctional Inst.	3	Hocking Correctional Inst.	2
Grafton Correctional Inst.	1	London Correctional Inst.	2
Northeast Pre-Release Center	1	Mont Ed and Pre-Rls Center	1
Corrections Medical Center	0	Dayton Correctional Inst.	1
Dayton Correctional Inst.	0	Marion Correctional Inst.	1
Hocking Correctional Inst.	0	Mont Ed and Pre-Rls Center	1
Mont Ed and Pre-Release Center	0	Corrections Medical Center	0
Pickaway Correctional Inst.	0	Lima Correctional Inst.	0
Total Assaults	482	Total Assaults	411

INMATE ON STAFF ASSAULTS

As shown below, in 2004, there were 432 inmate on staff assaults in Ohio prisons, down 112 from the previous year. The largest number of inmate on staff assaults occurred at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility in both years, with 130 in 2003 and 133 in 2004. In 2003, SOCF inmate on staff assaults comprised 24% of all such assaults. In 2004, SOCF inmate on staff assaults comprised 31% of all such assaults.

**TABLE 65. NUMBER OF INMATE ON STAFF ASSAULTS
IN 2003 AND IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION**

DRC INSTITUTION	2003 Assaults	DRC INSTITUTION	2004 Assaults
Southern Ohio Corr. Facility	130	Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	133
Ohio Reformatory for Women	51	Ohio Reformatory for Women	40
Oakwood Correctional Facility	38	Mansfield Correctional Inst.	31
Chillicothe Correctional Inst.	37	Oakwood Correctional Facility	25
Mansfield Correctional Inst.	36	Ohio State Penitentiary	24
Lorain Correctional Inst.	28	Trumbull Correctional Inst.	19
Ohio State Penitentiary	24	Lebanon Correctional Inst.	15
Toledo Correctional Inst.	24	Toledo Correctional Inst.	15
Lebanon Correctional Inst.	22	North Central Correctional Inst.	14
Trumbull Correctional Inst.	21	Richland Correctional Inst.	12
Richland Correctional Inst.	16	Madison Correctional Inst.	12
Allen Correctional Inst.	15	Belmont Correctional Inst.	10
Ross Correctional Inst.	14	Lorain Correctional Inst.	10
North Central Correctional Inst.	13	Correctional Reception Center	9
Lake Erie Correctional Inst.	12	Chillicothe Correctional Inst.	8
Correctional Reception Center	12	Lake Erie Correctional Inst.	8
London Correctional Inst.	9	London Correctional Inst.	7
Madison Correctional Inst.	7	Southeast Correctional Inst.	7
Marion Correctional Inst.	6	Grafton Correctional Inst.	6
North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	5	Allen Correctional Inst.	5
Southeast Correctional Inst.	5	Pickaway Correctional Inst.	5
Pickaway Correctional Inst.	4	Ross Correctional Inst.	5
Noble Correctional Inst.	3	Noble Correctional Inst.	4
Warren Correctional Inst.	3	North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	4
Belmont Correctional Inst.	2	Warren Correctional Inst.	2
Corrections Medical Center	2	Corrections Medical Center	1
Franklin Pre -Release Center	2	Mont Ed and Pre-Rls Center	1
Grafton Correctional Inst.	2	Dayton Correctional Inst.	0
Lima Correctional Inst.	1	Franklin Pre -Release Center	0
Dayton Correctional Inst.	0	Hocking Correctional Inst.	0
Hocking Correctional Inst.	0	Lima Correctional Inst.	0
Mont Ed and Pre-Rls Center	0	Marion Correctional Inst.	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	Northeast Pre-Release Center	0
Total Assaults	544	Total Assaults	432

USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS

The CIIC staff request for monthly information submitted to ODRC Central Office included the request for completed forms on the Racial Breakdown and Use of Force at each institution. Due to inconsistent reporting from month to month and from institution to institution, it is not possible to currently provide system wide data on use of force incidents in 2004. Improvements in reporting will be sought in 2005. A new CIIC database designed specifically for tracking, reviewing and monitoring monthly and other periodic data, is in the process of development.

The results of the November 2004 reports are provided below, noting the institutions in which no information has been made available. As shown in the table, the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had the largest number of use of force incidents in the month, followed by Ross Correctional Institution and Lebanon Correctional Institution. In contrast, only eight use of force incidents occurred at the Level Five Ohio State Penitentiary.

**TABLE 66. NUMBER AND TYPE OF USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS
IN NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION
WITH NUMBER ASSIGNED TO A USE OF FORCE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE**

Institution	Use of Force Incidents			Assigned to Use of Force Committee			Logged as Slight Use of Force			Total
	B	W	O	B	W	O	B	W	O	
SOCF	24	16	0	10	10	0	14	6	0	40
RCI	27	4	0	0	0	0	27	4	0	31
LECI	15	13	0	7	5	0	8	8	0	28
BECI	7	7	0	3	6	0	1	4	0	14
MANCI	11	2	0	0	0	0	11	2	0	13
NCCI	7	5	0	2	1	0	5	4	0	12
RICI	6	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	10
LOCI	5	4	0	1	1	0	4	3	0	9
CCI	5	3	0	4	0	0	1	3	0	8
CRC	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	8
MACI	4	4	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	8
OSP	6	2	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	8
CMC	6	1	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	7
WCI	6	1	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	7
LORCI	3	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	5
TOCI	3	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	5
LAECI	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
ACI	3	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	4
NCCTF	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
MCI	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
MEPRC	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
ORW	1	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
TCI	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3
HCF	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
NEPRC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
FPRC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
GCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
OCF	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

"X" denotes lack of data. No data was received from DCI, GCI, NCI, OCI, PCI, and SCI.

The institutions with the highest percentage of use of force incidents based on the size of population include: the Corrections Medical Center, Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Ohio State Penitentiary, Lebanon Correctional Institution and Ross Correctional Institution. As shown below, the Corrections Medical Center has the highest rate of use of force incidents per inmate population.

**TABLE 67. PERCENTAGE OF USE OF FORCE PER INMATE POPULATION
AT THE CORRECTIONS MEDICAL CENTER, SOUTHERN OHIO
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, OHIO STATE PENITENTIARY, LEBANON
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AND ROSS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
IN NOVEMBER 2004**

Institution	Number of Reported UOF Incidents	Population for November 2004	Percentage of UOF per Total Population
CMC	7	112	6.3
SOCF	40	946	4.2
OSP	8	434	1.8
LECI	28	1929	1.5
RCI	31	2252	1.4

Guidelines regarding the degree and application of force by staff are detailed in Administrative Rule (AR) 5120-9-01, titled "Use of Force." Force is defined in the Administrative Rule as the "exertion or application of a physical compulsion or restraint." The different grades of force are: less than deadly force, excessive force, and deadly force. Per Administrative Rule 5120-9-02, titled "Use of Force Report and Investigations," after every report of the use of force, supervisory staff must ensure that the appropriate actions are performed and that reports are completed, to include:

1. Each staff member that used or witnessed force,
2. Statements of inmates on which force was used describing the inmate's version of events,
3. Written assessment by the medical staff member who performed the examination of the inmate on which force was used, and
4. Consideration of the need for consultation with a member of the Ohio State Highway Patrol if there is reason to believe a criminal act has occurred.

A summary of the incident is to be forwarded to the Deputy Warden of Operations, who applies more scrutiny to the incident regarding the facts, any disputed versions of the events, actions taken that do not concur with policy, and then makes a recommendation to the Warden. The Warden then may accept the findings of the Deputy Warden of Operations, direct a further inquiry, refer the matter to a Use of Force Investigating Committee, or to the Chief Inspector for investigation. The Warden is required to refer the incident to a Use of Force Investigating Committee if:

1. The initial report does not provide enough information to determine if the appropriate amount of force was used,

2. There was any serious physical harm to any person,
3. There was significant disruption to the order of the institution, or
4. Weapons were used.

The Use of Force Committee consists of three persons assigned by the Warden, excluding anyone directly involved in the incident, and excluding the Supervisor of any staff involved in the incident. The Use of Force Committee must conduct a review of the incident, review all the materials in the use of force packet, interview all staff and inmates, as well as any witnesses it considers relevant. The Use of Force Committee must complete these responsibilities within 20 working days from the date assigned to investigate the findings, and must submit a final report to the Warden who must review the report. If further investigation or clarification is needed, the Warden is to return it to the Use of Force Committee, assign it to another Use of Force Committee, or assign it to the Chief Inspector for further investigation and review. All completed reports of the Use of Force Committee are then forwarded to the appropriate Central Office Regional Security Administrator following the Warden's review.

DISCIPLINARY REPORTS BY RACE

In the same November 2004 monthly reports on use of force referenced above, information is provided on the number of conduct reports written at each institution in the month, which were handled at the Hearing Officer Level, instead of being referred to the Rules Infraction Board. Data from Chillicothe Correctional Institution, Dayton Correctional Institution, Grafton Correctional Institution, Noble Correctional Institution, Oakwood Correctional Facility, Pickaway Correctional Institution, Ross Correctional Institution, and Southeastern Correctional Institution was either not submitted, was illegible, or the information was incomplete.

The 2000 Ohio Census reported that the racial composition of Ohio is approximately **85% White, 12% African American, and 3% Other**. The ODRC **inmate population total for September 2004 consisted of 50.05% White, 48.89% Black, and 1.06% Other**. As shown below, **60% of the inmates who received conduct reports were Black, compared to 39% White**. Of the reporting institutions, the North Central Correctional Institution had the largest number of conduct reports, with 1,139.

**TABLE 68. THE NUMBER OF CONDUCT REPORTS BY RACE
AND BY INSTITUTION IN NOVEMBER 2004**

INSTITUTION	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER	TOTAL
NCCI	514	567	58	1139
BCI	527	352	0	879
MCI	431	204	22	657
MANCI	535	80	7	622
ORW	241	322	13	576
SOCF	324	162	0	486
MACI	265	166	11	442
RICI	214	134	7	355
LECI	174	106	0	280
LOCI	149	118	5	272
LAECI	146	107	4	257
FPRC	164	82	2	248
ACI	145	92	6	237
NCCTF	135	93	8	236
CRC	127	102	2	231
TCI	126	65	3	194
TOCI	113	61	0	174
WCI	92	75	1	168
OSP	91	32	6	129
LORCI	78	46	4	128
MEPRC	85	39	0	124
NEPRC	44	42	2	88
HCF	7	6	0	13
TOTAL	4727	3053	155	7935
PERCENT	60%	38%	2%	100%

HEALTH CARE

Medical Services

In light of the action taken by the ODRC to establish a Health Care Review Team, the completion of its report with recommendations, and ODRC commitment to implement the recommendations, CIIC staff prioritized ongoing data review in non-medical subject areas.

Each institution is required to submit monthly health care reports to the Office of Correctional Health Care at the ODRC Central Office, and each institution has been requested by the Office of Correctional Health Care to also provide a copy of the reports to the CIIC. A review of the monthly reports received by the CIIC shows that the monthly reporting itself is in need of improvement. In some instances the data is illegible, incomplete, or difficult to determine what month's data is being provided. It is therefore

not possible to provide accurate information or any meaningful comparison of the data. Many of the monthly reports displayed hours of the civil service staff and contract staff as “N/A”, or not available, unknown, marked with an X for the service, or merely left blank. **It is recommended that the Central Office staff ensure the accuracy of the reported number of hours worked by contract employees. It is strongly recommended that Central Office personnel ensure that complete and accurate monthly data is provided on the standardized form.**

It should be noted that some institutions use satellite facilities that are geographically close to one another to provide certain medical services. For example, Franklin Pre-Release Center is in close proximity to the Corrections Medical Center and uses the optometry and podiatry services provided at that facility. Other examples include Grafton Correctional Institution, which uses Lorain Correctional Institution’s X-Ray Technician, or the Oakwood Correctional Facility, which is a very small institution that relies on medical services provided at the Allen Correctional Institution.

The following tables provide information on hours worked by medical staff and medical services provided, according to the November 2004 institution monthly reports.

TABLE 69. NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY CIVIL SERVICE HEALTH CARE STAFF BY INSTITUTION FOR THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER 2004

Inst	RN	LPN	HCA	Physician	Dentist	Hygienist	Pharmacist	Pharmacist Tech	X-Ray	Lab Tech
ACI	1496	0	152							64
BECI	2346	160	172							328
CCI	1363	249	136						72	144
CMC										
CRC	2799	395	160						125	138
DCI										
FPRC	1035		118	112						
GCI	1655	0	168							
HCF										
LAECI	2220		144	170	130	121			10	
LECI	1600	0	120					120		
LOCI										
LORCI	2280	296	160	296					160	160
MCI	1440	160	144			159		152	80	160
MACI	1912	240	136						56	
MANCI	1728	440	144			144			128	
MEPRC	480									
NCI	1695		160							
NCCI	176		176						176	
NCCTF	832	0	160	66	68	68		4		
NEPRC	753	0	144							
OCF	3302		160				480	480		160
ORW	1440	488	152	113						162
OSP	1488		193							
PCI										
RICI	1878		152							
RCI	1692	259	106						145	
SCI	1144		152							
SOCF	1752	0	142					168	176	
TCI	1885	864	143	193	118	224		53	75	1
TOCI										
WCI	1324	1324	160							

*North East Ohio Correctional Center excluded.

TABLE 70. NUMBER OF ACTUAL HOURS OF CONTRACT HEALTH CARE STAFF BY INSTITUTION IN NOVEMBER 2004

Inst	RN	LPN	Physician	Dentist	Hygienist	Pharmacist	Pharmacist Tech	X- Ray	Lab Tech
ACI	176	0	62	65	65	0	0	11	
BECI	0	0	1	.8	1.8	1	1	1	1
CCI	240	0	80	112	144	184	528		
CMC									
CRC	348	280	125	96	352				
DCI									
FPRC	228								
GCI									
HCF									
LAECI	0	0	0	0	0				
LECI	128	0	60	112	224	120	80	24	128
LOCI									
LORCI	96	0	160	152	320	100	100		160
MCI	160	320	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MACI	96	0	38	65	134	120	151		
MANCI	368		256	88	110	176	258		
MEPRC		240	20						
NCI	125	147	269	241	149		136	62	93
NCCI	256		176	19	19	126	126		
NCCTF	12	0	1	1	1			1	
NEPRC	968	0	93	77	96			16	
OCF*	168		ACI	ACI	ACI	ACI	ACI	ACI	ACI
ORW	1189			100	160	178	48	110	
OSP	488		192	80	96	69	114		40
PCI									
RICI									
RCI	274	24	108	96	116				90
SCI	16								
SOCF		0	39	158	176			16	
TCI									
TOCI									
WCI			38	41	6	112	107	17	40

Figures reflect the data submitted to the CIIC for the month of November 2004.
North East Ohio Correctional Center not included.

*OCF: Hours shared with ACI

**TABLE 71. NUMBER OF INMATES SEEN FOR
SPECIALTY SERVICES, OPTOMETRY, AND PODIATRY, AND
NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS FILLED IN NOVEMBER 2004**

Inst	Specialty Care	Optometry	Podiatry	Number of Prescriptions	Number of Psychotropic Prescriptions
ACI	21	52	28	5505	2016
BECI	11	28	52	2974	362
CCI	12	39	44	6354	1680
CMC	*	*	*	*	*
CRC	2	14	26	4148	1629
DCI	0	13	8	113	0
FPRC	14	15	4	2356	933
GCI	69	35	41	2956	1182
HCF	39	45	96	3029	185
LAECI	235	12	11	1129	305
LECI	*	*	*	*	*
LOCI	42	14	32	2310	229
LORCI	1	54	39	2805	1714
MCI	21	35	50	3981	679
MACI	14	35	0	3099	710
MANCI	22	38	42	4633	1005
MEPRC	0	5	11	180	0
NEPRC	0	25	24	1572	294
NCI	124	20	32	2915	718
NCCI	23	64	90	3428	492
NCCTF	61	0	4	781	66
OCF	10	7	12	1831	1784
ORW	12	118	*	6404	2224
OSP	2	7	13	1434	23
PCI	*	*	*	*	*
RICI	7	48	29	2791	881
RCI	28	35	35	2942	583
SCI	*	*	*	*	*
SOCF	10	12	9	1982	959
TCI	114	20	20	1645	602
TOCI	*	*	*	*	*
WCI	13	30	27	2580	120

*The information was not provided or was illegible.

- Specialty Care consists of services provided on site such as surgery, pulmonary, cardiovascular, infectious disease, seizure disorder, Hepatitis C, and Orthopedic Specialist.
- Number of prescriptions represents the combined total of new prescriptions and prescription refills for the month.
- Psychotropic medication indicates the number of prescriptions for psychotropic drugs issued in a month to inmates.

Deaths

In 1984, following inquiries regarding several deaths at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, the ODRC Director initiated the practice of providing notification to the CIIC Director of all inmate deaths via provision of a copy of the Special Incident Report completed whenever an inmate death occurs. The ODRC Director recommended that the CIIC Director routinely review each Special Incident Report, and initiate any inquiry deemed warranted. This practice continued with the two subsequent ODRC Directors, and resumed again in October 2003 with the re-opening of the CIIC staff office. Death notices are promptly provided by ODRC Central Office staff, are immediately reviewed on receipt, and appropriate inquiries are made.

The following information is based on a careful review of Special Incident Reports received from October 25, 2003 to December 31, 2004. The number of deaths is listed by the parent institution of each deceased inmate. The death totals include the numbers for murders and suicides.

During the time period of October 25, 2003 to December 31, 2003, there were 19 deaths reported to the CIIC. Four deaths each involved inmates assigned to the Corrections Medical Center and Pickaway Correctional Institution. There were three deaths at the Lorain Correctional Institution. None of the remaining institutions had more than one death in the period.

From January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004, there were 125 reported deaths. Of that number, there were 27 deaths of inmates assigned to the Pickaway Correctional Institution. The second highest number of deaths involved inmates assigned to the Corrections Medical Center, which reported 19 deaths. The Pickaway Correctional Institution is believed to have the highest number of deaths due to the fact that they house chronically ill inmates in units such as Frazier Health Center. In regard to the number of deaths of inmates assigned to the Corrections Medical Center, it should be noted that CMC houses seriously ill inmates. There were eight deaths each at the Chillicothe Correctional Institution, Grafton Correctional Institution, and North Central Correctional Institution. Six deaths were reported for inmates assigned to the Hocking Correctional Facility, Lebanon Correctional Institution, and Mansfield Correctional Institution.

The CIIC staff reviewed all 144 incident reports on deaths from natural causes, homicide, and suicides that were received. Inquiries were made in 20 cases to request additional information or clarification.

Murder

During the time period of October 25, 2003 to December 31, 2003, there were no murders. However, during the time period of January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004, there was one reported murder that occurred at the North Central Correctional Institution.

TABLE 72. NUMBER OF INMATE DEATHS BY TYPE AND INSTITUTION FROM OCTOBER 25, 2003 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2004 WITH NUMBER OF INQUIRIES MADE								
Institution (Listed in alphabetical order)	Total Deaths (natural causes, murders, suicides)			Murders		Suicides		# CIIC Inquiries
	Total Deaths for the period	10/25/03 through 12/31/03	1/04 through 12/04	10/25/03 through 12/31/03	1/04 through 12/04	10/25/03 through 12/31/03	1/04 through 12/04	
ACI Allen	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
BeCI Belmont	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
CCI Chillicothe	9	1	8	0	0	0	1	3
CRC Corrections Reception Center	4	1	3	0	0	0	2	0
CMC Corrections Medical Center	23	4	19	0	0	0	0	0
DCI Dayton	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
FPRC Franklin Pre-Release Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GCI Grafton	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
HCF Hocking	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
LaeCI Lake Erie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LeCI Lebanon	6	0	6	0	0	0	1	0
LCI Lima (closed 1/04)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LoCI London	5	0	5	0	0	0	1	3
LorCI Lorain	6	3	3	0	0	1	1	1
MaCI Madison	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
ManCI Mansfield	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	1
MCI Marion	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1
MEPRC Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NCI Noble	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
NCCI North Central	9	1	8	0	1	0	0	1
NCCTF North Coast Corrections/Training Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEPRC North East Pre-Release Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OCF Oakwood	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ORW Ohio Reformatory for Women	5	1	4	0	0	0	1	1
OSP Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PCI Pickaway	31	4	27	0	0	0	0	3
RiCI Richland	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
RCI Ross	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	0
SCI Southeastern	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOCF Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
ToCI Toledo	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
TCI Trumbull	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
WCI Warren	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL all Institutions	144	19	125	0	1	1	11	20

**TABLE 73. INMATE DEATHS EXCLUDING MURDER AND SUICIDE FROM
OCTOBER 25, 2003 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2004**

*Institutions are ranked from highest to lowest

Institution	Total for the Period	10/25/03 through 12/31/03	1/04 through 12/04
PCI Pickaway	31	4	27
CMC Corrections Medical Center	23	4	19
CCI Chillicothe	8	1	7
GCI Grafton	8	0	8
NCCI North Central	8	1	7
HCF Hocking	7	1	6
ManCI Mansfield	6	0	6
LeCI Lebanon	5	0	5
LoCI London	4	0	4
LorCI Lorain	4	2	2
MaCI Madison	4	1	3
ORW Ohio Reformatory for Women	4	1	3
BeCI Belmont	3	0	3
MCI Marion	3	0	3
ACI Allen	2	1	1
CRC Corrections Reception Center	2	1	1
RiCI Richland	2	0	2
ToCI Toledo	2	1	1
NCI Noble	1	0	1
RCI Ross	1	0	1
SOCF Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0	1
TCI Trumbull	1	0	1
WCI Warren	1	0	1
DCI Dayton	0	0	0
FPRC Franklin Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
LaeCI Lake Erie	0	0	0
LCI Lima (closed 1/04)	0	0	0
MEPRC Montgomery Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
NCCTF North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
NEPRC Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
OCF Oakwood	0	0	0
OSP Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
SCI Southeastern	0	0	0
TOTAL (All Institutions)	131	18	113

Infectious Diseases

Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Testing and Treatment

All inmates entering a reception center undergo HIV testing. The institution physician or the institution infectious disease counselor informs the inmates of the results. Inmates who test positive for HIV infection receive appropriate counseling from the institution infectious disease counselor and are referred to the institution physician. HIV testing may also be performed for inmates who request it following consensual sex. Inmates who have a newly positive TB skin test are given a mandatory HIV test. HIV tests are also mandatory when inmates are convicted of the rule violation prohibiting sexual activity.

As of November 30, 2004, there were 399 inmates who have tested positive for HIV infection. Further, 131 of the 399 inmates were identified as being in the AIDS stage of the disease, and 268 of the 399 inmates were identified as being in the HIV positive stage of the disease. Inmates receive mandatory treatment, costing approximately \$30,000 per year, if their "T-cell" count drops below 200 and remains there. Other inmates are placed in treatment based on the individual dynamics of their disease. It was reported that the number of inmates in treatment fluctuates and is difficult to track, since inmates are in need of treatment on an intermittent basis.

Hepatitis A, B, and C Infections Testing and Treatment

All inmates entering a reception center are evaluated to identify risk factors related to viral hepatitis during the initial medical history assessment. Inmates who give information that strongly suggests that they presently have or have in the past been diagnosed with Hepatitis A, B, or C are referred to the institution advanced medical provider for evaluation, treatment and follow-up. Isolation procedures may be used if indicated. Inmates who have tested positive for HIV infection are also tested for Hepatitis C infection. Inmates who are at their parent institution and believe they have been infected can request testing.

As of November 30, 2004, there were 3,299 inmates who tested positive for Hepatitis C infection. Hepatitis C infection is a progressive disease, which takes a period of 20 to 30 years for liver problems to appear. Inmates who test positive for the disease are monitored through institution Hepatitis C chronic care clinics. Inmates are placed in treatment on an individual basis. Treatment lasts either six months or one year based on the "geneo-type" of the virus, and costs \$30,000 per year.

As of January 2005, it was reported that there are 15 inmates who are receiving treatment. The 15 inmates are assigned to the following institutions:

Allen Correctional Institution	1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	5
Ross Correctional Institution	3
Richland Correctional Institution	2
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2
Warren Correctional Institution	1
TOTAL	15

Inmates may choose not to receive treatment due to the debilitating effects, length of treatment, and/or the fact that the virus will mutate and become untreatable if treatment is stopped prior to completion. An inmate's institution assignment and job assignment are not effected if they test positive for Hepatitis C infection, since "blood to blood" transmission is required to spread the disease. Inmates who test positive for Hepatitis A infection are the only inmates restricted from working in kitchen areas since their disease is spread by hand. It was reported that there are approximately two inmates who have tested positive for Hepatitis A infection.

Tuberculosis (TB) Testing and Treatment

All inmates entering a reception center are given a Tuberculosis skin test unless they are exempted for medical reasons. Mandatory testing is done thereafter on a yearly basis in all institutions. Any inmate with a positive TB skin test is carefully evaluated for the possibility that active TB disease is present. Treatment, follow-up, and isolation are performed when necessary. As of November 30, 2004, there was one inmate who tested positive for the active TB disease.

The CIIC has received communication from inmates housed in level three (formerly known as close security) institutions, expressing their concerns about celling with inmates who have tested positive for the Hepatitis C infection and/or HIV infection. In some cases, inmates who have been diagnosed with Hepatitis C and/or HIV infection have relayed their own concerns about sharing a cell with another inmate. The Committee has also received communication from inmates expressing their concerns about inmates who have tested positive for the Hepatitis C infection and/or HIV infection being given job assignments such as working in the inmate dining room.

ODRC policies and procedures should be reviewed in regard to housing and job assignments of infected inmates, in an effort to alleviate inmate tension concerning these issues. The option of single celling inmates in the higher security institutions may be a viable alternative. Additional education for institution staff and inmates concerning infectious diseases would also assist in addressing the reported issues of concern.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mental health data is provided to the CIIC by the ODRC Bureau of Mental Health Services. Priority effort was given to reviewing the mental health information due to its importance. While reporting problems were apparent initially, significant improvement was made in reporting by the institutions through the assistance of the ODRC Bureau of Mental Health Staff. In some respects, reporting problems had been similar to those noted above in regard to medical services. Accurate and complete reporting by all institutions is essential for monitoring purposes by ODRC Central Office staff as well as by the CIIC. The October 2004 data is the most recent as of January 13, 2005.

TABLE 74. DRC MENTAL HEALTH CASELOAD BY INSTITUTION WITH BREAKDOWN OF MENTAL HEALTH CLASSIFICATION FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2004

INSTITUTION	Total Psych Caseload	Total Caseload	C1*	C2*	C3*
Ohio Reformatory for Women	668	778	418	250	110
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	546	555	387	159	9
Pickaway Correctional Institution	426	436	282	141	13
Richland Correctional Institution	337	359	187	150	22
Noble Correctional Institution	328	370	240	88	42
Mansfield Correctional Institution	327	386	115	212	59
Ross Correctional Institution	325	352	168	157	27
Belmont Correctional Institution	324	388	237	87	64
North Central Correctional Institution	298	343	97	201	45
Madison Correctional Institution	286	307	148	138	21
Allen Correctional Institution	280	323	202	78	43
London Correctional Institution	270	306	130	140	36
Warren Correctional Institution	259	270	213	46	11
Southeastern Correctional Institution	256	262	123	133	6
Lebanon Correctional Institution	249	295	132	117	46
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	242	254	123	119	12
Northeast Pre Release Center	236	256	144	92	20
Marion Correctional Institution	224	254	70	154	30
Correctional Reception Center	214	225	99	115	11
Grafton Correctional Institution	197	225	143	54	28
Franklin Pre Release Center	196	207	151	45	11
Trumbull Correctional Institution	142	173	52	90	31
Lorain Correctional Institution	139	153	65	74	14
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	135	161	86	49	26
Toledo Correctional Institution	100	111	42	58	11
Hocking Correctional Facility	94	96	56	38	2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	74	74	74	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	41	73	18	23	32
Corrections Medical Center	24	24	24	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	3	7	0	3	4
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	2	0	0	2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	5	0	0	5
Totals	7,237	8,030	4,226	3,011	793

*C1 Psychiatric Caseload (SMI)- the inmate is on the psychiatric caseload and meets criteria for SMI designation: a substantial disorder of thought or mood which **significantly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality or cope with the ordinary demands of life within the prison environment and which is manifested by substantial pain or disability. Serious mental illness requires a mental health diagnosis, prognosis and treatment, as appropriate, by mental health staff.**

C2 Psychiatric Caseload (non-SMI)- The inmate is on the psychiatric caseload but does not meet the criteria for SMI. Inmate is receiving mental health care and supportive services, which include **medication prescription and monitoring, individual and group counseling and therapy, crisis intervention and behavior management.**

C3 General Caseload- The inmate is receiving group or individual counseling, therapy and skill building services. He/she has a **mental health diagnosis and treatment plan** and is being treated by mental health staff other than the psychiatrist.

Residential Treatment Units

For the purpose of mental health service delivery, ODRC institutions are divided into “clusters” in which a full range of mental health resources are accessible. For example, if in the judgment of mental health professionals, an inmate needs to be placed in a Crisis Stabilization Unit or a Residential Treatment Unit (RTU), but the inmate’s current institution does not have such units on site, the inmate will be transferred to the institution within the cluster that has such units. Although called by different names, Residential Treatment Units existed within the ODRC prison system long before the creation of “clusters” per Dunn. The Residential Treatment Unit that formerly existed at the Mansfield Correctional Institution was closed post Dunn, reportedly as a cost cutting measure.

According to communication from the ODRC Deputy Director of the Office of Health Care, when possible, inmates in need of RTU services are transferred to an RTU of a similar security level, with minimum security or Level One inmates included in the medium security or Level Two RTUs. Inmates from the Lorain Correctional Institution who need an RTU placement are transferred to an institution depending on their security classification and potential parent institution. If the RTU that normally accepts patients from an institution is full, another RTU of the same security classification is used. Based on the information provided on October 8, 2004, institutions with an RTU, and the other institutions that generally use their RTU are as follows:

TABLE 75. RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNITS WITH NUMBER OF BEDS AND INSTITUTIONS SERVED

INSTITUTION	SECURITY LEVEL	NUMBER OF BEDS AVAILABLE	INSTITUTIONS SERVED
ALLEN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	2	80	MADISON CI.(LEVEL 1), LONDON CI, DAYTON CI, MONTGOMERY EPRC TOLEDO CI CAMP
CHILLICOTHE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	2	150	BELMONT CI, HOCKING CF, NOBLE CI, PICKAWAY CI, SOUTHEASTERN CI
GRAFTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	2	73	LAKE ERIE CI, LORAIN CI, NORTH COAST CTF, MARION CI, NORTH CENTRAL CI RICHLAND CI
CORRECTIONAL RECEPTION CENTER	3	106	MADISON CI, TOLEDO CI, ROSS CI, CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL CENTER (if medically stable), PICKAWAY CI
TRUMBULL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	3	77	MANSFIELD CI
WARREN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION	3	83	LEBANON CI
SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	4	80	(Also serves Level 5 inmates excluded from OSP due to mental illness)
OHIO REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN	ALL SECURITY LEVELS	74	FRANKLIN PRC NORTHEAST PRC

Suicides

During the time period of October 25, 2003 to December 31, 2003, there was one reported suicide that occurred at the Lorain Correctional Institution, which is one of two reception centers for ODRC. During the time period of January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004, there were 11 reported suicides. The Correctional Reception Center and Ross Correctional Institution had two suicides each. In addition, there was one suicide each at the following institutions: Chillicothe Correctional Institution, Dayton Correctional Institution, Lebanon Correctional Institution, London Correctional Institution, Lorain Correctional Institution, Ohio Reformatory for Women, and the Warren Correctional Institution.

Based on a review of ODRC incident reports on deaths received by the CIIC from October 25, 2003 through December 31, 2004, there were 12 suicides, with one occurring between October 25, 2003 and December 31, 2003, and 11 in 2004. As shown below, there were two suicides each at the Correctional Reception Center, Lorain Correctional Institution which is also a reception center, and at the Ross Correctional Institution. Six other institutions had one suicide each as follows: Chillicothe Correctional Institution, Dayton Correctional Institution, Lebanon Correctional Institution, London Correctional Institution, Ohio Reformatory for Women, and the Warren Correctional Institution.

Institution (Ranked from highest to lowest)	Total	10-25-03 through 12-31-03	1-04 through 12-04
CRC Corrections Reception Center	2	0	2
LorCI Lorain	2	1	1
RCI Ross	2	0	2
CCI Chillicothe	1	0	1
DCI Dayton	1	0	1
LeCI Lebanon	1	0	1
LoCI London	1	0	1
ORW Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	0	1
WCI Warren	1	0	1
ACI Allen	0	0	0
BeCI Belmont	0	0	0
CMC Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
FPRC Franklin Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
GCI Grafton	0	0	0
HCF Hocking	0	0	0
LaeCI Lake Erie	0	0	0
LCI Lima (closed 1/04)	0	0	0
MaCI Madison	0	0	0
ManCI Mansfield	0	0	0
MCI Marion	0	0	0
MEPRC Montgomery Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
NCI Noble	0	0	0
NCCI North Central	0	0	0
NCCTF North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	0	0	0
NEPRC Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
OCF Oakwood	0	0	0
OSP Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
PCI Pickaway	0	0	0
RiCI Richland	0	0	0
SCI Southeastern	0	0	0
SOCF Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0	0
ToCI Toledo	0	0	0
TCI Trumbull	0	0	0
TOTAL ALL INSTITUTIONS	12	1	11

The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction experienced a record number of suicides in calendar year 2004. According to testimony presented by the Department's Deputy Director of the Office of Correctional Health Care, to the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee on August 17, 2004, a 2004 Suicide Review Team was established to review the recent suicides and applicable policies and procedures. The Team's objectives include the following:

1. Conduct a literature review for suicide profiles, seeking comparison statistics and benchmarking with other jurisdictions,
2. Identify other high-risk situations, such as returns from court where sentences were extended and parole violator re-incarcerations, which should trigger a mental health evaluation,
3. Complete a thorough review, evaluation, and possible revision of the current mental health screening forms, to ensure that they are designed to identify to the greatest extent possible any potential suicidal behavior,
4. Encourage county jails to more consistently share detailed mental health information when transferring an offender to DRC custody.

Also according to the above referenced testimony, additional measures to help safeguard the lives of inmates entering the DRC reception centers were immediately being implemented, including the following:

1. Mental health staff will be immediately notified of any offender who was on suicide watch in the county jail prior to admission to the DRC.
2. Such inmates are to be placed on suicide constant watch until an independently licensed mental health professional can interview the inmate, review any collateral information, and complete a mental evaluation.
3. Such inmates must be maintained on at least close suicide watch for a minimum of 72 hours.
4. Inmates who are reported by a community contact to be at risk for suicidal behavior must be placed on suicide watch for at least 72 hours.
5. Obtain all applicable collateral information from the sending jail and family members as quickly as possible.
6. Medications prescribed for an inmate prior to admission to DRC are continued until the inmate's mental health needs are assessed by the attending psychiatrist.
7. Inmates non-compliant with their medication are to be maintained on close watch until seen by the psychiatrist.
8. Inmates requesting protective custody, whether at reception or in their parent institution, are to be referred to mental health staff for an evaluation to allow for assessment of their mental status.

Based on communication from suicidal inmates over the years, there has been a long-standing concern pertaining to an aspect of policy and practice, which may prevent some suicidal inmates from speaking to anyone at the institution about their suicidal thoughts. Many inmates are aware of the automatic "strip cell" (now

called safe cell) placement when an inmate is heard “verbalizing a desire or intent to commit suicide,” as cited in the policy. Even in the above referenced recent objectives in suicide prevention efforts, five of the eight points involve suicide watch placement as a primary response. Placement in a suicide or safe cell may in fact be effective in preventing suicide during the very temporary period while on suicide watch. However, there is no reason to believe that such placement will make a suicidal inmate want to live. Some clearly become focused on saying what they need to say to convince the mental health professional that they are fine, just so they can be released from the suicide cell placement.

Inmates have written to the CIIC regarding their suicidal thoughts or attempts, relaying that they did not speak to anyone about their suicidal thoughts because they have no desire to be placed in a strip cell. Just as inmates have refused placement in the infirmary for medical purposes due to viewing such conditions and restrictions as punitive, so also, but to a greater degree, some inmates who know the immediate suicide response policy, choose silence. Those who have communicated with the CIIC regarding suicidal thoughts, express that it is not that they want to die, but rather that they no longer want to live due to a variety of factors relevant to their circumstances, surroundings, or situation in the present or future. Placement in a safe, crisis or strip cell reportedly exacerbates rather than alleviates their depression. In some of the prisons inspected since October 2003, some safe cells in segregation have been found to be in less than satisfactory condition in terms of cleanliness. Such conditions surely have a negative effect on the already suicidal inmate.

Prior to July 2001, a suicidal inmate at one of the Crisis Stabilization Units in the southern region relayed that eating utensils were denied to all inmates in that status, so that inmates in crisis cells had to eat with their hands, which was regarded as demeaning and humiliating. More recently in 2004, some SOCF inmates have relayed concerns pertaining to alleged lack of placement in suicide cells of certain inmates who have harmed themselves. Some have relayed concerns about staff allegedly releasing inmates from their safe cell placement prematurely. Reportedly, staff in one case approved release of an inmate from the safe cell, noting “You’re OK,” even though the inmate reportedly was silent, totally non-responsive to the staff person’s questions.

A possible partial solution or proposed improvement is a renewed emphasis on a prompt mental health staff interview with the inmate who has verbalized a desire or intent to commit suicide. Litigation affecting the former Columbus Correctional Facility many years ago had such a provision, which specified a required face-to-face interview in a required time period. **If inmates knew that the automatic, certain response to relaying suicidal thoughts, would be immediate referral to a mental health staff person, they would be more likely to speak of their need for help, and more likely to urge other inmates with suicidal thoughts to seek help of staff.**

The above concerns and related information have been shared by CIIC with the Department's Chief of Mental Health Services. In addition, following the testimony of the ODRC Deputy Director of the Office of Correctional Health Care, one CIIC Member **recommended that DRC focus on the elimination of isolation of the suicidal inmates during strip/suicide/safe cell placement, and replacing the isolation with positive staff communication.** The idea of training inmates to be called upon to temporarily cell with a suicidal inmate was also discussed. In fact, American Correctional Association (ACA) Standard 4-4393 states, "Unless prohibited by state law, offenders (under staff supervision) may perform familial duties commensurate with their level of training. These Duties include: **Serving as a suicide companion or buddy if qualified and trained through a formal program that is part of a suicide prevention plan.**"

According to follow-up communication from the Chief of the Bureau of Mental Health Services, on November 19, 2004, a "Technical Assistance Report on Suicide Prevention Practices Within the ODRC" was submitted to ODRC by Lindsay M. Hayes, Project Director of the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, which provides Suicide Prevention and Liability Reduction Services. Recommendations were included in the report regarding Staff Training, Identification and Screening, Housing, Levels of Supervision, Intervention, and Follow-up/Mortality Review. A plan has since been developed by ODRC to implement each recommendation.

In addition, a Suicide Back to Basics Committee, as well as Suicide Prevention and Review Teams have been established at each institution to conduct monthly and quarterly reviews, including mock drills on all three shifts. Lastly, in October of 2004, the ODRC began using an internal team to assess areas not covered by the ACA Standards and audits. The format for such assessments includes the condition of the safe cells.

According to the above referenced Technical Assistance Report, almost all (seven of nine) of the 11 suicides in 2004 occurred in special housing units, including segregation, residential treatment units for the mentally ill, and the infirmary. Further, almost 50% were on a mental health caseload, and more than two thirds had a prior history of suicidal behavior. Lastly, almost 50% of the victims had been on, and were discharged from, suicide precautions (watches) less than 10 days prior to their deaths, with two victims released less than 48 hours prior to their deaths.

According to the Technical Assistance Report, housing is one of the critical components of a suicide prevention policy. The report contains the following regarding the housing issue:

Isolation should be avoided. Whenever possible, house in general population, mental health unit, or medical infirmary, located in close proximity to staff. Inmates should be housed in suicide-resistant, protrusion-free cells. Removal of an inmate's clothing (excluding belts and shoelaces), as well as use of physical restraints (e.g. restrain chairs/boards, straitjackets, leather straps, etc.) and cancellation of routine privileges (visits, telephone calls, recreation, etc.), should be

avoided whenever possible, and only utilized as a last resort for periods in which the inmate is physically engaging in self-destructive behavior.

In determining the most appropriate location to house a suicidal inmate, there is often the tendency for correctional officials in general to physically isolate and restrain the individual. These responses may be more convenient for staff, but they are detrimental to the inmate. The use of isolation not only escalates the inmate's sense of alienation, but also further serves to remove the individual from proper staff supervision. National correctional standards stress that, to every extent possible, suicidal inmates should be housed in the general population, mental health unit, or medical infirmary, located in close proximity to staff.

...Housing assignments should not be based on decisions that heighten depersonalizing aspects of incarceration, but on the ability to maximize staff interaction with inmates.

It is strongly recommended that the newly formed ODRC Suicide Prevention Committee seriously consider changes necessary in policy and practice to implement the above quote from the suicide prevention expert. Clearly changes would have to be made to comply with the above text. CIIC will continue to monitor inmate suicides, DRC efforts to prevent them, and to provide constructive input.

SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Classification of Sex Offenders:

Reception Center Sex Offender Screening is conducted on all inmates at the male reception centers (Correctional Reception Center and Lorain Correctional Institution) and the Ohio Reformatory for Women's Reception Unit, to determine whether or not the inmates are to be classified as sex offenders. An inmate is classified as a sex offender if he/she is sentenced to the Department for a sexually-oriented offense or has been convicted of a prior adult sexually-oriented offense or a substantially equivalent former state law, within 15 years from his/her current date of commitment to the Department.

Sex offenders at the male reception centers are sent to the Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center (SORRC) at the Madison Correctional Institution as part of the reception process. Sex offenders at the Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW) remain at the institution as part of the reception process. A Risk Assessment is completed on all sex offenders at SORRC and ORW, to determine their level of risk to re-offend (high, high moderate, low moderate, or low).

Inmates assigned a risk level of low are placed in Basic Education, a 20 hour psycho-educational regimen, which is completed prior to their transfer to their parent institutions. Inmates assigned a risk level of low moderate are reviewed by the program's clinical

director to determine whether they are placed in and complete Basic Education, and then are transferred to their parent institution, or given a Comprehensive Assessment, placed in and complete Basic Education, and then are transferred to their parent institution. A Comprehensive Assessment is a sex offender- specific assessment that involves a detailed examination of patterns of offending and personality functioning and includes recommended treatment goals and objectives.

Inmates assigned a risk level of high, high moderate, or low moderate and referred by the program clinical director are scheduled for Comprehensive Programming and the development of Personal Accountability Goal Summaries. They are given a Comprehensive Assessment, placed in and complete Basic Education, and then are transferred to their parent institution. (Note: SORRC has been in operation since December, 1995, and the comparable program at ORW has been in operation since January, 2000.)

Comprehensive Programming:

Comprehensive Programming is programming which addresses all sex offender treatment goals and objectives, is long-term, and focuses on relapse prevention strategies. DRC operates sex offender programs based on the premise that effective programming can reduce the risk of sexual re-offending when incarcerated sex offenders are released into the community. DRC's programming philosophy views sexual offending as a behavioral disorder which cannot be "cured". DRC's programming philosophy also states that sex offenders choose to commit sexually aggressive acts, but can choose to manage their thoughts, fantasies, and behaviors to the point that they do not commit more sex offenses.

Comprehensive Sex Offender Programs are provided at the following institutions: Chillicothe Correctional Institution, Southeastern Correctional Institution, Lebanon Correctional Institution, North Central Correctional Institution, Madison Correctional Institution, Hocking Correctional Facility, and the Ohio Reformatory for Women. Inmates are accepted into the Comprehensive Sex Offender Programs when they meet the following criteria: a) they are within three (3) years of release or their next Full Parole Board Hearing, b) their risk to re-offend score is high, high moderate, or low moderate and referred by the clinical director, and c) they admit to their offense.

Specialized sex offender programming is provided for sex offenders with mental retardation at the Sugar Creek Developmental Center at the Allen Correctional Institution and geriatric sex offenders at the Hocking Correctional Facility. Comparable specialized sex offender programming is provided for female sex offenders at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The Sugar Creek Developmental Center is in the process of being revamped with the direction and assistance of the Department of MRDD. There are presently 49 mentally retarded offenders in the program. The institution reported that, on average, 70 to 80 percent of the program's population is identified as sex offenders. It is noted that the majority of the inmates in the program have multiple treatment needs such as sex offender programming, alcohol/ drug programming, mental health programming, and life skills programming.

The standard length of programming is 18 to 24 months. The programs listed above have the total capacity to treat 520 sex offenders at a time. The current number of sex offenders enrolled, as of January 2005, is 450. The number of enrollees is not at capacity due to terminations from the programs and the restructuring of the program at the Southeastern Correctional Institution. Waiting lists exist for entrance into the programs, i.e. North Central Correctional Institution has a waiting list of approximately 75 to 80 inmates. The average wait to enter a program is 12 to 18 months, due to the "class" format that is utilized in the programming. A class completes the segment of programming, and no one is added, even if inmates are terminated from the class. DRC plans to reduce the waiting time to enter a program by modifying the "class" format and integrating the processing of inmates needing Comprehensive Programming with the Department's Reentry Management Process.

No Comprehensive Programming presently exists for sex offenders who deny the offense. A pilot Deniers Program was established and operated briefly at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. A proposal that could take effect in late Spring 2005, would establish a Denier's Program at each institution where a Comprehensive Program exists. The proposal would establish a total of 180 slots for deniers within the Department's present sex offender programming capacity.

The demand for Comprehensive Programming by inmates has diminished with the passage of Senate Bill 2, due to inmates serving determinate sentences, as opposed to indeterminate sentences, with parole eligibility. No data is presently available to indicate the decline. The number of inmates serving Senate Bill 2 sentences, who are presently in Comprehensive Programs was requested and is presently being tabulated by the Department.

Additional Information and Facts Concerning Sex Offender Treatment and Department Sex Offenders:

The total number of sex offenders incarcerated by the Department as of January 6, 2005, is 9,103. The Department has approximately 5,600 sex offenders on Adult Parole Authority supervision as of January 2005. The number of sex offenders on supervision increased 25% during the period of September 2003 to September 2004. The primary reason for the increase was the number of Parole Board releases that resulted from the re-hearings based on the *Layne v. Ohio Adult Parole Authority* decision.

Non-comprehensive programming previously existed at a number of other institutions, such as the Grafton Correctional Institution and Pickaway Correctional Institution, but the Department reports that this programming has been terminated. The programming was terminated due to non-compliance with the Department's philosophy of programming, program design, and/or staffing requirements. The only exception to this initiative is the sex offender training established pursuant the Department's Mental Health Standard Operating Procedure 29 (MH-SOP-29). Individualized sex offender training, consisting of viewing videotapes and completing a workbook, was established

for sex offenders who were incarcerated prior to the inception of SORRC, have not been involved in any institution sex offender programming, and have received a parole date by the Parole Board. The standard operating procedure became effective August 18, 2004.

The Prison Rape Elimination initiative has become a major initiative for the Department. The Inmate on Inmate Sexual Assault Policy, 79-ISA-01, was developed and became effective on February 1, 2004. The Sexual Assault Abatement Committee was created by the Department to address this issue. The Department does not have any specialized sex offender programming at this time, for the inmates who commit such acts. **The Department should consider requiring a mandatory sex offender program for such offenders, comparable to the mandatory substance abuse program that exists for substance abusers.**

The DRC Director established the Sex Offender Risk Reduction Reentry Task Force in 2004, following executive staff's input that the treatment of sex offenders was a major issue within the Department. The task force is scheduled to submit a report with numerous proposals at the end of January 2005.

The establishment and availability of sex offender treatment for all sex offenders is a primary need, as evidenced by the Department's executive staff's input to the Director in 2004. The Department's study, titled "Ten-Year Recidivism Follow-Up of 1989 Sex Offender Releases" and published in April 2001, indicated that paroled sex offenders completing basic sex offender programming while incarcerated appeared to have a somewhat lower recidivism rate than those who did not have programming. Sex-related recidivism was 7.1% for sex offenders with programming as compared to 16.5% for sex offenders without programming. CIIC will monitor the Department's sex offender initiatives during the coming biennium.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS

The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction provides a variety of programs to address alcohol and other drug abuse problems among the inmate population. According to the ODRC FY 2003 Recovery Services Report, there are approximately 70 programs at the 33 institutions. The following is a list of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse programs and services that were provided.

Individual and Group Counseling	17
Day Treatment Programs	15
AOD Education Groups	15
12-Step/ Peer	10
Residential Treatment Programs	7
Therapeutic Communities	5*
AOD/ Literacy Programs	1
TOTAL	70

*The total number of Therapeutic Communities actually operating in 2003 was four. The Noble Correctional Institution's TC program was canceled in December 2002.

According to the report, ODRC partners with other state agencies such as the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services (ODADAS) and the Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) to provide treatment and services to meet the needs of the inmate population. The Department also cooperates with community agencies such as Comp Drug Inc., Columbus, Ohio; Quest Recovery Services Inc., Columbus, Ohio; Lorain County Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, Inc., Lorain, Ohio; the Community Foundation Assessment Center, Cleveland, Ohio; Substance Abuse Services, Inc., Toledo, Ohio; Urban Minority Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Outreach Programs; Mahoning County Drug Court; Cuyahoga County Department of Justice Affairs; Lucas County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes; Mahoning County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime.

Therapeutic Communities:

A Therapeutic Community (TC) is a unique program that exists in four Ohio institutions, Pickaway Correctional Institution, Belmont Correctional Institution, Grafton Correctional Institution, and the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The TC units at each of these prisons are notably different than any of the other units or cell blocks in the prisons. The CIIC has observed each of these programs at their respective institutions and has reported that while the philosophy of the program is shared by the different institutions that host TC's, each has their own unique characteristics that makes them different from the rest.

The Therapeutic Community model has been nationally recognized as being most effective for high security inmates for whom traditional recovery services have had no effect. It is only reasonable to promote programs that have been proven to be effective in recovery from addiction and transforming the whole person, not just narrowly focusing on the addiction itself. While a decision was made in the Department to replace the TC at Noble Correctional Institution with a cognitive behavioral program, **it is strongly recommended that careful consideration be given to the merits of retaining not only the TC programs at Grafton Correctional Institution, Pickaway Correctional Institution and Ohio Reformatory for Women, but to seriously consider expanding availability of this program to higher security inmates. Level three inmates should be given an opportunity to participate in such a highly successful program.** If the replacement of the TC at Noble with another program with a different philosophy that is reportedly more "cost effective," is an indicator of a future trend, those inmates who may benefit most from this type of programming, may be deprived of a life-changing opportunity.

The Pickaway Correctional Institution's TC program is the product of the relationship cultivated between the ODRC, the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, and the PCI staff. As noted in the CIIC inspection report on the Pickaway Correctional Institution, OASIS is a six to 12 month voluntary residential program that uses the therapeutic community model to provide alcohol and other substance abuse treatment. The program promotes pro-social behavior, attitudes, and values as a method to stay drug and alcohol free and to eliminate anti-social behaviors. Participants make

each other aware of negative behaviors and habits, and work toward making positive changes.

However, as noted in the inspection report on the Grafton Correctional Institution, the TC unit did not resemble any other TC Unit that has been included on inspections in the recent or distant past. During the inspection, institution staff as well as inmates expressed concerns about the unit, which were also communicated in subsequent written and verbal communication to the CIIC. The main issues and concerns were included in a written inquiry submitted to the Warden.

Alcohol and Other Drug Treatment Programs by Institution

Every inmate is assessed in the reception centers for their history of substance abuse either by their record, or by self-admission. The 2003 Recovery Services Report provides a “services profile” of the location, type, program length and capacity of services at each institution when the report was published. There are three institutions that serve as reception centers for newly incarcerated felons: The Correctional Reception Center, the Lorain Correctional Institution, and the Ohio Reformatory for Women, which all include a mandatory Alcohol and Other Drug Education and Screening Program. The following table is a summary of the long-term Alcohol and Other Drug Treatment Programs.

TABLE 77. ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION WITH PROGRAM LENGTH AND CAPACITY

Institution	Therapeutic Community	Residential Program	Day Treatment	Program Length	Program Capacity
ACI			1	12 weeks	20 spaces
BeCI	1			12 months	120 beds
CCI		1		6 months	84 beds
FPRC		1		10 weeks	22 beds
GCI	1			10 months	110 beds
HCF			1	16 weeks	12 spaces
LAECI*			1	3 months	30 spaces
LOCI		1		8 months	80 beds
MACI			1	3 months	30 spaces
MANCI		1	1	12 weeks	25 spaces
MCI		1		14 weeks	25 beds
MEPRC			1	20 weeks	30 spaces
NCCTF*			1	13 weeks	100 spaces
NCCI			1	6 months	60 spaces
NCI			1	30 months	72 spaces
NEPRC			1	12 weeks	24 spaces
ORW	1		1	12 months 14 weeks	120 beds 24 spaces
PCI	1		1	9 +months 10 weeks	150 beds 40 spaces
RCI		1		6 months	150 spaces
RICI			1	90 day	16 spaces
SCI			1	11 weeks	24 spaces
TOCI			1	12 weeks	70 spaces
WCI		1**		5 months	45 spaces

* Indicates the institution is privately operated.

** Indicates that the Residential Program is an AOD literacy program

Intensive Program Prison (IPP):

Ohio Revised Code Sections 5120.031, 5120.032 and 5120.033 provide the statutory requirements for the Shock Incarceration Program and Intensive Prison Program which includes the IPP for certain DUI or OMVI offenders. Per the statute, ODRC has the authority to develop and implement Intensive Prison Programs for male and female prisoners who are sentenced to a mandatory prison term for a third or fourth degree felony OMVI offense. The Department was required to contract for the private operation and management of the initial IPP, and may contract for the private operation and management of any other IPP, which must include prisons that focus on educational achievement, vocational training, alcohol and other drug abuse treatment, community

service, conservation work, and other intensive regimens or combinations of intensive regimens.

The Department is in the process of modifying the IPP Programs at the Southeastern Correctional Institution and Ohio Reformatory for Women, from a boot camp modality to an education and community service modality. They are creating additional IPP Programs with an educational modality at the Northeast Pre-Release Center, North Central Correctional Institution, and Ohio Reformatory for Women. They are also creating IPP Programs with an alcohol and other drugs (AOD) modality at the Pickaway Correctional Institution and North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility. The program at the North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility is in addition to the OMVI IPP Program presently in operation at the facility.

Per the Statute, a prisoner who is sentenced to a mandatory prison term for a third or fourth degree felony OMVI offense is not eligible for an IPP if the prisoner is also serving or has served a prison term for aggravated murder, murder, for a felony of the first or second degree, or a comparable offense; the prisoner is serving a mandatory prison term in addition to the OMVI offense; or the prisoner is serving or previously served a prison term for a felony of the third, fourth or fifth degree that either is a sex offense, offense betraying public trust, or offense in which the prisoner caused or attempted to cause actual physical harm to a person or offense of that type or a comparable offense.

CIIC reviewed changes proposed by ODRC to the language of the Administrative Rules regarding eligibility and selection criteria for the IPP to coordinate with the expansion of the program. The proposed changes to the Administrative Rules present the opportunity for more prisoners to participate in the program, but also include those that would formerly have been ineligible.

The proposed change allows prisoners who are currently incarcerated for, or previously committed a felony offense of violence as defined in section 2901.01 of the Ohio Revised Code, to be considered for placement in the Program, if the offense of violence did not involve the prisoner causing or attempting to cause physical harm to a person or the additional restrictions listed in the above paragraph. This would allow prisoners convicted of Burglary and certain Aggravated Burglary and Robbery offenses to be considered for the Program.

Potential candidates for the DUI/IPP at NCCTF are initially identified at the two male reception centers, Lorain Correctional Institution and the Correctional Reception Center. Per a new DRC policy on NCCTF Admissions, effective December 22, 2003, within two days of arrival at the reception center, staff must complete eligibility screening of all felony 3 or felony 4 OMVI offenders. Such offenders who are classified as Security Level 1A or 1B (formerly Minimum 1 or 2), and who also are serving a sentence of two years or less, are transferred to NCCTF within 15 days of arrival in reception. Mental health and medical screening that is not completed at the reception center is conducted at NCCTF. In addition, DUI/IPP inmate orientation to determine inmate interest and

consent, is now conducted at NCCTF instead of at the reception centers. NCCTF has also taken on the responsibility of notifying the sentencing judges of the offenders' IPP eligibility, and requesting their decision on approval or disapproval of the offender's placement in the IPP early release program.

The ODRC proposed changes to the Administrative Rules regarding the eligibility criteria would incorporate the inmate consent form into the application, and would prohibit a participant from voluntarily withdrawing from the program within 21 days of admittance. The Department is proposing the time limitation on voluntary withdrawal from the Program based on a National Institute of Justice report that states the majority of voluntary withdrawals occur within the prisoners' first 21 days in the Program. Based on the Department eliminating the Boot Camp modality and replacing it with treatment, education and community service modalities, these proposed changes should not have a negative impact on the Programs or inmates.

The Intensive Prison Program (IPP) at the North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility is a 90-day early release program for eligible DUI offenders. Although NCCTF has an IPP capacity of up to 100, according to the December 2004 monthly report, there were only five clients at the beginning of the month, six new admissions, two successful completions, one unsuccessful completion, and eight clients carried over to the next month.

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Each of the adult correctional institutions in Ohio provides education programs for inmates who are housed in their facilities. The Department of Rehabilitation and Correction acts as the administrator over all institutional educational programs, which collectively comprise the Ohio Central School System (OCSS), one of Ohio's chartered public school districts under the Ohio Board of Education. Teachers for OCSS must hold valid and appropriate Ohio teaching licenses.

Per the Ohio Central School System of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, statewide enrollment in the system was 31,516 in FY 2003 and 29,722 in FY 2004 with OCSS reporting an additional 3,222 completion certificates awarded to DRC students in FY 2004.

The educational programs taught by OCSS play a central role in the ODRC emphasis on rehabilitation and re-entry. While there are some differences in the specific courses that are offered within each institution, all institutions offer a group of core academic courses that includes the GED and ABE and a variety of vocational courses that vary from institution to institution. Educational programs are consistently grouped under five types: Academic, Career/Technical, Advanced Job Training, Apprenticeship, and Library Services.

Academic Programs

Academic programs include Literacy, GED, ABLE, and High School Options.

The data in the following table is based on information submitted to CIIC from each institution from October 2003 through November 2004. This 13-month period comprehensively includes the months of peak attendance and the summer months when classes are in low attendance or not offered in certain cases.

The data represented in this report consists of information that was produced and supplied to CIIC from the institutions. Data has been shown in the form that the committee received it. Errors or omissions in data are therefore due to institutional errors or omissions.

The first education table represents an analysis of *Academic Programs* offered in correctional institutions. Data is shown in descending order by institution based upon *academic enrollment*. (Other columns in this table may or may not reflect the exact order of descent.) An academic enrollment is counted as each course taken by an inmate. For example, if one inmate is taking two courses, that would count for two enrollments. The table displays, from left to right, institutional academic enrollments, academic completions and the percent of enrollments completed, General Education Diploma (GED) statistics, and finally tutorial statistics.

Simply because the GED is one of the most fundamental and essential foundation courses leading to further education and potentially to the success of reentry for inmates, data is collected and shown for GED tests administered and GED tests passed. The data is shown as a ratio of tests taken to tests passed and also as the percent of passage.

Further, because the success of many academic courses is frequently dependent upon the prevalence of tutors in the institutions, the total number of tutorial hours that were delivered for the period is shown. This column is followed by the average number of tutorial hours per enrollment, based upon the number of hours of tutoring delivered. These data are presented in the fifth and sixth columns.

TABLE 78. ENROLLMENT IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION, WITH COMPLETIONS, GED TESTS TAKEN AND PASSED, AND TUTORIAL HOURS					
Institution	Total Academic Enrollment	Total Academic Completion and % Completion	GEDs Taken/ GEDs passed and % Passed	Total Tutorial Hours	Average Tutorial Hours per Enrollment
CRC Correction Reception Center	4010	90 = 2.2%	83/38 = 45.8%	0	0
ORW Ohio Reformatory for Women	2766	249 = 9%	108/70 = 64.8%	22,435.5	8.11
NCCI North Central CI	1758	288 = 16.4 %	177/115 = 65%	26,757	15.2
ToCI Toledo CI	1678	127 = 7.6%	99/48 = 48.5%	2,553	1.5

TABLE 78 CONTINUED. ENROLLMENT IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION, WITH COMPLETIONS, GED TESTS TAKEN AND PASSED, AND TUTORIAL HOURS

Institution	Total Academic Enrollment	Total Academic Completion and % Completion	GEDs Taken/ GEDs passed and % Passed	Total Tutorial Hours	Average Tutorial Hours per Enrollment
MCI Marion CI	1326	252 = 19.0%	263/151 = 57.4%	7,592	5.7
SCI Southeastern CI	1293	196 = 15.2%	57/18 = 31.6%	7981	6.2
LoCI London CI (main+camp)	1248	124 = 9.9%	164/34 = 20.7%	3,767	3.54
CCI Chillicothe CI	1238	274 = 22.1%	1776/92 = 52.3%	20,607	16.6
RiCI Richland CI	1140	181 = 15.9%	231/121 = 52.4%	21,353	18.7
ManCI Mansfield CI	1135	349 = 30.7%	294/169 = 57.5%	15,614.5	13.76
LorCI Lorain CI	988	138 = 14.0%	130/81 = 62.3%	0	0
LeCI Lebanon CI (main+camp)	986	326 = 33.1%	136/77 = 56.6%	21,571	21.9
MaCI Madison CI	965	148 = 15.3%	139/117 = 84.2%	12,914	13.4
TCI Trumbull CI	903	128 = 14.2%	87/37 = 42.5%	10,299	11.4
RCI Ross CI	839	209 = 24.9%	270/64 = 23.7%	16,618	19.8
BeCI Belmont CI	837	230 = 27.5%	151/29 = 19.2%	11,883.25	14.2
NEPRC Northeast Pre-Release Center	756	107 = 14.2%	46/29 = 63.0%	8,253.5	10.9
FPRC Franklin Pre-Release Center	684	74 = 10.8%	181/113 = 62.4%	8,602	12.6
NCI Noble CI	672	327 = 48.7%	285/172 = 60.4%	18,506	27.5
LaeCI Lake Erie CI	658	295 = 44.8%	280/134 = 47.9%	26,664.5	40.5
ACI Allen CI	647	193 = 29.8%	64/36 = 56.3%	12,470	19.3
NCCTF North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	596	106 = 17.8%	137/61 = 44.5%	5,433	9.1
MEPRC Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	499	164 = 32.9%	61/14 = 23%	423	0.9
GCI Grafton CI	459	98 = 21.4%	104/53 = 51%	21,114	46
SOCF Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	450	92 = 20.4%	49/30 = 61.2%	0	0
OSP/OSPCC Ohio State Penitentiary (main & camp)	384	142 = 31.5%	70/49 = 70%	1,203	3.1
DCI Dayton CI	370	126 = 34.1%	86/28 = 32.6%	0	0
WCI Warren CI	337	150 = 44.5%	67/38 = 56.7%	6,882	20.4
HCF Hocking CF	269	37 = 13.8%	24/7 = 29.2%	9,042	33.6
CMC Corrections Medical Center	4	1 = 20%	0	0	0
PCI Pickaway CI (data submitted only through May 04; limited analysis presented)	750	106 = 14.1%	174/96 = 55.2%	4,800	6.4
OCF Oakwood CF (Partial/incomplete data only through October 2004; no analysis possible)	82	XX	XX	XX	XX

Career-Technical Programs

Data supplied to CIIC from correctional institutions revealed that a wide variety of Career-Tech Programs are offered to inmates. Not all career-tech curricula are offered in each institution. Further, some institutions, indicated by zeros in the table on the following page, do not offer career-tech curricula. Data revealed that a significantly large 'wait list' exists for career-technical programs in some institutions, as shown in the last column of the table.

Career-Tech programs are offered in areas that include accounting, agricultural production, auto mechanics, auto body maintenance, automated/administrative office technology, baking, barbering, building maintenance, carpentry, commercial arts, computer aided drafting and design (CADD), computer repair, cosmetology, culinary arts, drywall and painting, electrical circuit technology, electronics, environmental management, floor installation, graphic communication/arts, heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC), landscaping/horticulture, leather crafting, masonry, multi-media communication, network cabling, plumbing, power equipment technology, turf management, upholstery, and welding.

Miscellaneous Instruction

Some miscellaneous instruction is offered under categories that include Apprenticeships, Advanced Job Training, English Second Language (ESL), Special Education, and Title I. Further, some curricula use Distance Learning (DL) as a delivery format. In some cases, distance learning is chosen for the delivery of select Academic and Advanced Job Training courses.

During the October 2003 through November 2004 period, nearly every correctional institution offered Apprenticeships, Advanced Job Training, and either Special Education or Title I instruction.

A few variations in the miscellaneous programs area could be found across the state. *English as Second Language (ESL)* programs was offered at Lake Erie Correctional Institution, London Correctional Institution, and Noble Correctional Institution. *Distance Learning* delivery for both Academic Programs and/or Advanced Job Training programs was found at London Correctional Institution, Northeast Pre-Release Center, Ohio Reformatory for Women, Pickaway Correctional Institution, Richland Correctional Institution, Ross Correctional Institution, and Trumbull Correctional Institution.

TABLE 79. CAREER-TECHNICAL PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION WITH ENROLLMENT, COMPLETIONS AND WAIT LIST AS OF NOVEMBER 2004			
Institution	Total C-T Enrollment	Total C-T Completion and % Completion	C-T Wait List as of November 2004
ACI Allen CI	160	28 = 17.5%	
BeCI Belmont CI	338	87 = 25.7%	
CCI Chillicothe CI	144	36 = 25%	
CMC Corrections Medical Center	0	0	
CRC Correctional Reception Center	0	0	
DCI Dayton CI (only through 5/04)	105	19 = 18.1%	
FPRC Franklin Pre-Release Center	41	8 = 19.5%	
GCI Grafton CI	143	36 = 25.2%	
HCF Hocking Correctional Facility	66	2 = 3%	
LaeCI Lake Erie CI	390	109 = 27.9%	
LeCI Lebanon CI	230	42 = 18.3%	
LoCI London CI	252	73 = 29%	
LorCI Lorain CI	0	0	
MaCI Madison CI	68	53 = 77.9%	
MCI Marion CI	316	56 = 17.7%	1,449
ManCI Mansfield CI	112	35 = 31.3%	
MEPRC Montgomery Pre-Release Cntr	93	23 = 24.7%	
NCCI North Central CI	348	90 = 28.9%	700
NCCTF North Coast Correctional Treatment Center	231	408 = 176.6% (*unexplainable disproportionately large completion)	
NEPRC Northeast Pre-Release Center	98	22 = 22.4%	
NCI Noble CI	181	73 = 40.3%	249
OCF Oakwood Corrections Facility	0	0	
OSP/OSPCC Ohio State Penitentiary and Camp	0	0	
ORW Ohio Reformatory for Women	314	115 = 36.6%	325
PCI Pickaway CI	40	10 = 25%	
RiCI Richland CI	591	145 = 24.5%	1,546
RCI Ross CI (main + camp)	243	87 = 35.8%	643
SCI Southeastern CI	274	43 = 15.7%	
SOCF Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	46	10 = 21.7%	
ToCI Toledo CI	20	0 = 0%	123
TCI Trumbull CI (main + camp)	130	23 = 17.7%	
WCI Warren CI	135	32 = 23.7%	561

OHIO PENAL INDUSTRIES

Prison Labor Advisory Council (PLAC)

Among the other statutory requirements of the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, the Director of the office of the CIIC per 5145.162 of the Ohio Revised Code, shall serve as an ex-officio member of the ODRC Prison Labor Advisory Council (PLAC). The Council was effectively established on April 9, 1981.

The CIIC Director or designee has attended the meetings of the PLAC from December 2003 through January 2005. The group meets monthly to discuss issues and developments related to Ohio Penal Industries.

OPI Employment of Inmates

According to information provided by the ODRC, 19 of the 33 prisons in Ohio have OPI shops, and employ approximately 1,931 inmates, or 4.8% of the total prison population. The remaining inmate population is employed in other services such as institutional operations, or enrolled in educational programs, except for those considered unavailable for assignment, such as inmates in reception centers, disciplinary segregation, medically idle, pre-release, or other. This group of inmates comprises 7,468 (18.69%) of the total population.

Institutional Operations employs the largest number of inmates, 23,118 or 57.85%, which consists of Maintenance and Food Service 12,168 (30.45%), Agriculture 386 (.97%), Cleaning 10,113 (25.31%), and Clerks 451 (1.13%).

There are 7,446 (18.36%) inmates enrolled in Educational Programs such as College 1,273 (3.19%), Academic/GED Prep 3,629 (9.08%), Apprenticeship 472 (1.18%), Vocational Programs 1,336 (3.34%), and Other 736 (1.84%).

The table on the following page provides detail regarding the OPI shops which are located at 19 institutions. The following institutions have no OPI shop located on their compound:

Belmont Correctional Institution	Noble Correctional Institution
Corrections Medical Center	North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility*
Corrections Reception Center	Northeast Ohio Corrections Center*
Hocking Correctional Facility	Northeast Pre Release Center
Lorain Correctional Institution	Oakwood Correctional Facility
Madison Correctional Institution	Ohio State Penitentiary
Montgomery Education and Pre Release	Richland Correctional Institution

*Denotes private facility

TABLE 80. OHIO PENAL INDUSTRIES SHOPS BY INSTITUTION, WITH TYPE OF PRODUCT, AND NUMBER OF INMATES EMPLOYED

Institution	Products	Inmates Employed*
London Correctional Institution	Dental	308
	Brush	
	Garment	
Lebanon Correctional Institution	Data Entry	296
	Tags	
	Metal	
	Validation	
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	Buckeye	251
	Chairs	
	Mattress	
	Vehicle	
Marion Correctional Institution	Glass	175
	GIS	
	Wood	
	Metal	
Pickaway Correctional Institution	Garment	156
	Print Shop	
	Beverage Processing Center	
Mansfield Correctional Institution	Multiple	138
Allen Correctional Institution	Garments	130
Ohio Reformatory for Women	Admin	119
	Data Entry	
	Blue Print	
	Flags	
	Optical	
Ross Correctional Institution	Furniture	118
Southeastern Correctional Institution	Mulch	37
	Health Tech	
Warren Correctional Institution	Binders	58
	Metal/ Binders	
Dayton Correctional Institution	Signs	50
North Central Correctional Institution	GIS	46
	Data Entry	
	TCI-Bag	
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Shoe Shop	41
Trumbull Correctional Institution	Recycling	39
Grafton Correctional Institution	Multi	36
Lake Erie Correctional Institution (Private)	Recycling	36
Toledo Correctional Institution	Plastic Bags	14
Franklin Pre -Release Center		7

* Number of inmate workers fluctuates month to month

V. INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

EVALUATION MANDATE

The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee (CIIC), pursuant to Ohio Revised Code 103.73 (Duties of inspection committee), has the statutory duty to submit a biennial report that “shall contain a separate evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure at each state correctional institution.” In partial fulfillment of the requirement, a section has been included in each of the separate inspection reports, which provide data from the Inspector’s monthly grievance reports, and also include any significant information relevant to the grievance procedure received on site during the inspection, as well as in communication from staff and inmates outside of the inspection.

This section of the biennial report, which is devoted solely to the grievance procedure, provides an opportunity to present the results of our system wide and individual institution review and analysis of grievance data. Such data is regarded as a necessary, but not sufficient part of any meaningful evaluation. In addition to data from the Inspectors Monthly Reports, the CIIC has the benefit of information entered into the CIIC Database regarding communication logged from 1,803 persons from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005. **The 5,038 logged concerns system wide, include 400 logged concerns specifically regarding the inmate grievance procedure.**

Through the receipt of the ODRC monthly grievance reports of the Inspectors, an ongoing review has been conducted since 1978. In addition, the continuous flow of communication from the institutions to the CIIC has provided extensive information regarding experiences with, and views of the grievance procedure. Through correspondence and inquiries, CIIC staff have reviewed informal complaints, responses, grievances, Inspector’s dispositions, appeals to the Chief Inspector, and appeal dispositions. Firsthand reviews of such grievance documents provide valuable information on the grievance procedure. In CIIC responses to correspondence, inmates were reminded of the CIIC duty to evaluate the inmate grievance procedure, and were assured that their input on the subject would be welcomed. Many responded in detail with their input, providing specific problems and recommendations for improvement of the inmate grievance procedure.

In summary, the following sources of information were taken into account in this separate report on the evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure:

1. Statistical and non-statistical ODRC reports relevant to the inmate grievance procedure,
2. CIIC Database of contacts and logged concerns,
3. Information received from staff and inmate communication during individual institution inspections,
4. Communication with ODRC Central Office and institution staff, including the Chief Inspector’s Office and Institutional Inspectors in the course of making inquiries,

5. Communication from inmates, their families and friends, inmate advocacy groups, concerned citizens, and elected officials who have been contacted by constituents,
6. The American Correctional Association's Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, and
7. Attorney Vincent Nathan's Evaluation of the Inmate Grievance System Report.

The Statute requires the Committee to “maintain a continuing program of inspection” of each institution. To “inspect” is defined as “to view closely in critical appraisal; to examine officially.” It is an ongoing process which includes, but is not limited to the on site inspection. In the same way, the Committee’s ongoing evaluation of operations, conditions, programs and grievance procedure is a fluid, continuous process. With that, this report provides an opportunity to communicate our current assessment, based on all that is known regarding the inmate grievance procedure in Ohio prisons.

With the cooperation of the ODRC, the CIIC hopes to conduct a more detailed and comprehensive assessment of the grievance procedure in the coming biennium using a variety of methods, such as conducting a survey of inmates and staff, spending a day or more with each Inspector and Assistant Chief Inspectors, and reviewing a random sample of informal complaint responses, grievance decisions and appeal decisions. Based on its statutory duty and belief in the procedure, the CIIC plans a more extensive evaluation and greater interaction with the Department during the upcoming biennium. The CIIC plans to increase communication with the Department’s Chief Inspector. Efforts will be made to acquire additional data/information concerning the procedure, including informal complaints and grievance appeals. Efforts will also be made to increase the understanding of issues faced by the Chief Inspector, Assistants of the Chief Inspector, and Institutional Inspectors. The CIIC plans to acquire additional data/information through the utilization of the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, additional inquiries regarding the Inspector of Institutional Services Monthly Reports, accessing monthly data regarding informal complaint resolutions, and conducting an inmate and Department staff survey regarding the inmate grievance procedure. A greater understanding of the issues faced by staff involved in the procedure will be obtained from increased communication and the possible shadowing of staff. The Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee need to work as interested stakeholders to effect positive improvements in the effectiveness of the inmate grievance procedure in order to reap the tremendous benefits for all concerned.

Just as the Statute requires the CIIC to “Evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition or operation of correctional institutions,” a primary purpose of evaluating the grievance procedure is to identify any areas in need of improvement. Just as the Statute states that the CIIC may include in its report “any programs that have been proposed or developed to improve the condition or operation of the correctional institutions in the state,” this section on the grievance procedure includes recommendations to assist in the development of improvements in the grievance procedure.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The ODRC publication, “Three Decades of Progress: A Retrospective of Growth” (1972-2002), subsection titled “Thirty Year Historical Perspective,” provides the following chronology relevant to the grievance procedure in Ohio prisons:

- 1972 The **Office of Correctional Ombudsman** was created to provide a **responsive action to inmate grievances and complaints as well as resolution of staff questions**. DRC was the first in the nation to establish this program. During its existence, **former offenders staffed this office**.
- 1975 Grievance procedures revised providing for **Resident Liaison Officers responsible for investigating and resolving inmate grievances**. The Office of Correctional Ombudsman was eliminated as a result of this new practice.
- A Special Master appointed by U.S. District Court in the case of **Taylor vs. Perini**. The first report indicates, “**No effective grievance procedure maintained to process complaints related to racial discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or insult.**”
- 1976 Findings of a **special committee established in 1976 made recommendations for implementation of the inmate grievance procedure**. As a result of these recommendations the **position of Institutional Inspector was established to administer the grievance process**. This office was assigned the task to **investigate and respond to individual grievances from inmates and inspect institutional services provided to offenders**.
- 1978 Tentative agreement reached in **Taylor vs. Perini**. DRC agreed to adopt numerous measures including: procedures for legal mail, inmate assistance in the preparation of legal materials, law library contents, legal packs, incoming mail, publication of an inmate conduct manual, placement in segregation, job assignments, appropriate supervision, **establishes the position of Institutional Inspector, and establishes a formal grievance procedure**.
- 1987 Inmate Grievance Procedure for DRC was fifth in the nation to be **certified** under Title 42 of the U.S. Code by the U.S. Department of Justice.
- 1991 **Taylor vs. Perini lawsuit settled after 22 years of litigation.**

RELEVANCE OF TAYLOR

On one level, to “evaluate” is defined by Webster as “to determine or fix the value of; to determine the significance or worth of, usually by careful appraisal and study.” The CIIC has carefully appraised and studied the inmate grievance procedure (IGP) since the Committee’s inception in 1978, and fully appreciates the importance of the grievance procedure for its potential as a problem solving mechanism, as well as a management tool, alerting the Inspector and Chief Inspector to problems, issues and concerns in need of their attention. There is reason to believe that an effective grievance procedure can actually prevent costly litigation, and can prevent the tremendous financial and human cost of violence and uprisings, thereby serving fundamental safety and security purposes. The importance of having an effective grievance procedure cannot be overstated.

The importance of the grievance procedure was made clear to the CIIC in its first year of operation in 1978 at one of the first Committee meetings. Testimony was received from Attorney Vincent Nathan, then Special Master in the above referenced class action, Taylor vs. Perini affecting the Marion Correctional Institution. During the initial hearings of the previously proposed legislation to create the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, he urged Legislators to include the language that now requires the Committee to evaluate the inmate grievance procedure. In his testimony at the 1978 CIIC meeting, Committee Members were advised of the critical importance of having an effective inmate grievance procedure in the prison system, of the ability of an effective grievance procedure to prevent the enormous cost of prison litigation, and of the need for constant monitoring and evaluation to identify, and to bring about any needed improvements, due to changes which can occur over time. He spoke of the need to prioritize the Committee’s ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the grievance procedure at each institution.

Outside Review Committee

As a result of Taylor, the inmate grievance procedure at the Marion Correctional Institution was different than any of the other institutions, because it had an Outside Review Committee composed of private citizens selected by the Warden who volunteered to come to the institution to review inmate grievances. If an inmate was not satisfied with the Inspector’s decision on his grievance, he had the option to request a review by the Outside Review Committee. The Committee would meet with the inmate and also with the Inspector, review documents from the Inspector’s grievance investigation, then submit their recommendation with the inmate’s appeal to the Chief Inspector for decision. Based on inmate communication to the CIIC, without exception, the existence of the Outside Review Committee was viewed as an extremely positive aspect of the grievance procedure.

Every inspection of MCI in the Committee’s history, included inquiry to the administrative staff regarding how the Outside Review Committee was working. Without exception, every comment made by staff over the span of years in which the Outside Review Committee existed, relayed praise for the Outside Review Committee, and

relayed surprise that community members had offered such sensible, workable solutions to problems or conflicts relayed in grievances, solutions which prison staff had not considered. As a result of the consistently positive assessments regarding the Outside Review Committee by the MCI staff, as well as the absence of complaints about the grievance procedure from inmates at MCI, the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee recommended that an Outside Review Committee be established at every Ohio prison.

Objections to the recommendation were based on the claim that the community of Marion was reportedly so unique, that no other community could make an Outside Review Committee work in the way that it did at Marion Correctional Institution. Not only was the Outside Review Committee not expanded, but in 1991 after Taylor was settled, the **Outside Review Committee was totally disbanded**.

For many years, every Ohio prison has had a Citizens Advisory Committee appointed by the Warden. **It would have been, and still would be relatively easy to form an Outside Review Committee of volunteers from within the community to be called upon to visit the institution on occasion, to review and offer opinions regarding grievance decisions pending appeal to the Chief Inspector.** The ODRC is increasingly seeking community assistance and participation in the re-entry initiative. Providing the opportunity for citizens to serve in the Outside Review Committee role would not only enhance the effectiveness of the grievance procedure, but may well widen the network of potential partnerships for the expansion of the re-entry philosophy and initiative.

Interpreting Volume of Grievances

Marion Correctional Institution (MCI) experienced major positive changes in operations, conditions and programs due to Taylor, so that it was widely viewed as a model institution. Still, MCI had the largest volume of grievances filed, more than any other Ohio prison in those early years following the creation of the CIIC. Due to the large volume of grievances, it was the first, and at the time, the only Ohio prison to be granted an Assistant Inspector in addition to an Inspector, to investigate and resolve grievances. As demonstrated in the case of the MCI experience, a large volume of grievances, in and of itself, is not necessarily a negative indicator. It is not necessarily a red flag calling attention to a troubled institution. In fact, it can be, and in this instance is believed to have been, a positive factor, reflecting well on the grievance procedure at MCI. The volume of grievances is in fact, a measure of the extent to which inmates are using the grievance procedure. While a large volume of grievances at a particular prison can in fact be a telling sign of problems in need of attention, the MCI experience remains an excellent example in which that was not the case.

There is reason to believe that in the case of MCI, the large volume of grievances at the time reflected an environment in which inmates felt free to use the inmate grievance procedure without fear of reprisal. With the message to ODRC staff of the priority importance of the grievance procedure, coupled with close monitoring by the Court, there was a level of confidence that the “retaliation or the threat of retaliation for the use of the

inmate grievance procedure” which is “strictly prohibited” according to the Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure, in fact, would not be tolerated. From all indications and communication, there was a level of respect for the grievance procedure at MCI by line staff, administrative staff, and inmates alike that enhanced its effectiveness.

Another factor that is believed to have contributed to the large volume of grievances filed at MCI during the period in which it was viewed as a model for the rest, is that inmates likely had far more faith in the fairness of the procedure because of the existence and involvement of the Outside Review Committee. The volume of grievances filed at MCI at the time and for many subsequent years, is believed to be a reflection of the inmates’ willingness to use the grievance procedure because of faith and confidence in the procedure, a perception that it is safe to use, that is, will cause no harm in the form of retaliation, and belief that it is the most effective way to have a problem solved.

THE ACA STANDARD

According to the American Correctional Association’s (ACA) Standards for Adult Correctional Institution, the ACA Standard on grievance procedures, 44284 requires only that **“There is a written inmate grievance procedure that is made available to all inmates and that includes at least one level of appeal.”** The ODRC grievance procedure is in written form, in Administrative Rule 5120-9-31. There is also an Administrative Rule on the Office of the Inspector, Administrative Rule 5120-9-29, and on the Office of the Chief Inspector, Administrative Rule 5120-9-30. Through the opportunity to appeal an Inspector’s decision to the Chief Inspector, the grievance procedure fulfills the appeal requirement.

The Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure includes general language that seeks to ensure that it “is made available to all.” That is, AR 5120-9-31 states, **“Appropriate provisions shall be made to ensure access to the inmate grievance procedure by inmates not fluent in English, persons with disabilities, and those with low literacy levels.”** However, “appropriate provisions” are not defined. In the biennium, a significant number of inmates have communicated the concern that mentally ill inmates, the illiterate, and others with low education levels, reportedly do not receive the needed help for them to use the grievance procedure. In fact, many inmates without such handicaps have relayed frustration, difficulty, and confusion in using the grievance procedure.

Further, inmates have reported difficulties with access to the grievance procedure when necessary grievance forms have reportedly not been provided on request, or have been provided only after delays, thus making it difficult if not impossible to proceed with the next step of the grievance within the required timeline.

According to the ACA Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, “A grievance procedure is an administrative means for the **expression and resolution** of an inmate’s problems.” Clearly, the grievance procedure provides a valuable function by merely providing a means of expression of inmate problems. **However, if the grievance**

procedure does not also effectively function as a means to actually solve problems and address issues of concern, it is falling short of fulfilling its primary purpose.

A detailed section on the extent to which grievances were reported by Inspectors to be “Resolved” or “Not Resolved” is provided in this report. Due to its direct relevance to the above referenced ACA Standard, findings from the data review are briefly summarized below.

A review was made of monthly grievance reports submitted by each Inspector from October 2003 to November 2004. Of the 7,381 grievances filed, 1,602 grievances were reported by the Inspectors to be “Resolved.” Therefore, **21.7% of the grievances in the period system wide were “Resolved”**. The “Resolved” category includes grievances in which the problem was actually corrected, the problem was noted with correction pending, or the problem was noted and a report/recommendation was submitted to the Warden.

In contrast, a total of 5,779 grievances were reported by the Inspectors to be **“Not Resolved,” comprising 78.3% of the total grievances**. Excluding Dayton Correctional Institution and Oakwood Correctional Facility which had no unresolved grievances, “Not Resolved” grievances at the other institutions ranged from the **low of 55.5%** of the grievances filed at the Belmont Correctional Institution, to **97.2%** of the grievances filed at the Franklin Pre-Release Center. Unresolved grievances at the Noble Correctional Institution comprised **90.8%** of their grievances. Similarly, **90.5%** of the grievances from the Madison Correctional Institution were reported as “Not Resolved.” Unresolved grievances filed at the London Correctional Institution comprised **88.8%** of their grievances. Unresolved grievances at the Correctional Reception Center comprised **86.3%** of their grievances.

In addition to the two institutions in which over 90% of the grievances were “Not Resolved,” eight institutions in all reported unresolved grievances which comprise between 80% and 90% of their grievances. Another ten institutions reported unresolved grievances which comprise between 70% and 80% of their grievances.

ACA RECOMMENDATIONS

While the ACA Standard itself provides little basis for evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure, the ACA provides additional detail in its written recommendations pertaining to grievance procedures. According to the ACA, grievance procedures should provide:

- 1) Written responses to all grievances, including the **reasons for the decision;**
- 2) Response within a prescribed, reasonable **time limit**, with **special provisions for responding to emergencies;**
- 3) Supervisory review of grievances;
- 4) **Participation by staff and inmates in the procedure’s design and operation;**

- 5) Access by all inmates, with **guarantees against reprisals**;
- 6) Applicability over a broad range of issues; and
- 7) Means for resolving questions of jurisdiction.

Written Responses including Reasons

The ODRC grievance procedure clearly ensures that inmates are provided with written responses, though there is nothing in the Administrative Rule to require “reasons for the decision”. Administrative Rule 5120-9-31 states, “Informal complaint responses should **reflect an understanding of the inmate’s complaint, be responsive to the issue, cite any relevant departmental or institutional rules or policies, and specify the action taken, if any.**” Regarding the Inspector’s reply to a grievance, the AR states, “The written response shall summarize the inmate’s complaint, **describe what steps were taken to investigate the complaint and the inspector of institutional service’s findings and decision.**” In regard to the appeal decision, the AR only states, “The chief inspector or designee(s) shall provide a written response within thirty calendar days of receipt of the appeal.”

Response in Reasonable Time Limit

The ACA recommendation above applies to time limits on staff to respond to inmate grievances. Per the Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure, AR 5120-9-31:

Staff shall respond in writing within **seven calendar days** of receipt of the informal complaint. If the inmate has **not received a written response from the staff member within a reasonable time**, the inmate should immediately contact the inspector of institutional services either in writing or during regular open office hours. The inspector of institutional services shall take prompt action to ensure that a written response is provided to the informal complaint within **four calendar days**. If a response is **not provided by the end of the fourth day**, the informal complaint step is automatically waived...

The Inspector of institutional services shall provide a written response to the grievance **within fourteen calendar days** of receipt... The inspector of institutional services **may extend the time in which to respond, for good cause, with notice to the inmate.** The chief inspector or designee shall be notified of all extensions. **Any extension exceeding twenty-eight calendar days from the date the response was due, must be approved by the chief inspector or designee...**

The chief inspector or designee(s) shall provide a **written response within thirty calendar days of receipt of the appeal.** The chief inspector or designee(s) **may extend the time in which to respond for good cause, with notice to the inmate.**

As to whether the ODRC grievance procedure in practice complies with the ACA recommendation for responses in “a prescribed reasonable time limit,” the CIIC has received a pattern of complaints from inmates about non-response to informal complaints, extension after extension on grievance decisions, and reportedly the same on appeal decisions. Inquiries made regarding reports of extreme delays in responses have frequently resulted in verification of extensions and responses still pending.

Detailed information and tables are provided elsewhere in this report regarding extensions. Briefly, based on Inspectors’ monthly grievance reports from **July 2004 through November 2004, a total of 262 grievances involved extensions of 14 days to 28 days from the due date for response. The number of extensions comprised 10.3% of the 2,534 grievances filed in the period.** Extensions in the five month period ranged from no extensions at 13 institutions, to **51 extensions at the Ohio State Penitentiary, and 50 extensions at the Toledo Correctional Institution.**

ODRC Time Limits on Using the Grievance Procedure

Although it clearly is **not** among the ACA recommendations, the ODRC grievance procedure prescribes time limits for the inmates to file the informal complaint, grievance and grievance appeal. Grievances and appeals can and have been rejected for failing to meet the time limit. According to the Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure 5120-9-31, **“For good cause,” time limits may be waived.**

Detailed information and data are provided in the section on Resolved and Unresolved Grievances, which includes the number of grievances that were reported by Inspectors to be “Not Resolved.” The Inspectors’ monthly reports include the number of grievances within the “Not Resolved” category, which were rejected because they were “Not within the time limits.” **Of the 1,930 “Not Resolved” grievances filed from July 2004 to November 2004, there were 59 grievances that were unresolved because they were “Not within the time limits.”**

The time limit placed on inmates is an area of complaint about the grievance procedure, which merits serious consideration. Putting time limits on inmates to use the grievance procedure and each step of the grievance procedure, rejecting an informal complaint because it was not filed “within fourteen calendar days of the date of the event giving rise to the complaint,” rejecting a grievance because it was not filed within “fourteen calendar days from the date of the informal complaint response or waiver of the informal complaint step,” and rejecting an appeal because it was not filed “within fourteen calendar days of the date of the disposition of grievance,” may be an indication that some staff with the responsibility of participating in the grievance procedure have lost sight of its **fundamental purpose, which is believed to be solving problems and, resolving conflicts. None of that occurs, not even any fact-finding investigation, when grievances are dismissed outright due to a due date.** In addition to what is cited above and in the following on the issue, inmates complain of the double standard with respect to deadlines and due dates. That is, in practice, the **deadlines for staff responses to the informal complaint, grievance and appeal, are reportedly routinely violated, while**

the deadlines applied to inmates who wish to use the grievance procedure are reportedly strictly enforced.

Many inmates regard the grievance procedure as a last resort, some because they insist that they will be labeled a complainer or troublemaker, and believe retaliation will occur, so that problems will only increase if they use the grievance procedure. Whether it is true or not, the perception clearly exists. Many inmates therefore try to have a problem resolved by kite or in-person communication with multiple staff before even thinking about using the grievance procedure. They may ask an outside friend to call prison staff, Central Office staff, their local Legislator, or they may write to the Inspector General, and/or the CIIC. In many instances, even when the CIIC responds promptly to such communication, referring the person with the problem to use the grievance procedure, it is too late for them to do so.

Those who administer the grievance procedure tend to reinforce the perception that the grievance procedure should be a last resort, not a first response to a problem, in their practice of labeling certain inmates as “frequent filers”, which is considered to be a negative rather than a positive label among staff.

The time limit was not always part of the Ohio inmate grievance procedure. The addition of the time limits for filing grievances effectively discourages use of the grievance procedure, and contributes to its negative perception.

Special Provision for Responding to Emergencies

In regard to the recommended special provision for responding to emergency grievances, the AR states, “The filing of an informal complaint may be waived if it is determined by the inspector of institutional services that there is a substantial risk of physical injury to the grievant, the complaint is filed pursuant to rule 5120-9-03 or 5120-9-04 of the Administrative Code, paragraph (H) of this rule, or for other good cause.” AR 5120-9-03 pertains to inmate complaints of use of force incidents, which have not been reported by staff. AR 5120-9-04 pertains to inappropriate supervision, discrimination and racial issues. “Inappropriate supervision” is defined in the AR as:

Any continuous method of **annoying or needlessly harassing** an inmate or group of inmates, including, but not limited to, **abusive language, racial slurs, and the writing of inmate conduct reports strictly as a means of harassment.** A single incident may, due to its severity or egregiousness, be considered inappropriate supervision for purposes of this rule.

Based on the language in the AR on the grievance procedure, the special provision for emergencies is that the Inspector “may” waive the informal complaint requirement when it is determined that there is a **substantial risk of physical injury**, in complaints of **unreported use of force**, and in allegations meeting the definition of **inappropriate supervision**.

Supervisory Review of Grievances

In accord with the ACA recommendation, the ODRC grievance procedure includes supervisory review of grievances, in that an inmate may appeal the Inspector's decision to the Chief Inspector whose decision is final.

In addition to responding to appeals of an Inspector's grievance decision, according to the AR on the grievance procedure, grievances pertaining to a Warden or Inspector are to be filed directly with the Chief Inspector. In such instances, there is no opportunity to appeal the decision. According to the AR, "Such grievances **must show that the warden or inspector of institutional services was personally and knowingly involved in a violation of law, rule or policy, or personally and knowingly approved or condoned such a violation.**"

This aspect of the grievance procedure is regarded as both positive and negative. While the AR states that grievances regarding Wardens and Inspectors must be filed with the Chief Inspector, it requires the inmate to demonstrate in the grievance that the staff person "was personally and knowingly involved in a violation of law, rule or policy, or personally and knowingly approved or condoned such a violation." Anything short of that demonstration, based on the responses received by inmates, which have been forwarded by inmates to the CIIC for our information, appear to result in dismissal. **The standard that must be met for a grievance regarding an Inspector or Warden is likely to be extremely difficult for any inmate to meet. Yet, there are numerous other potential problems or concerns which should be grievable, even though they may pertain to an Inspector or Warden. It tends to discourage inmates from ever using the grievance procedure to notify the Chief Inspector about problems with Inspectors and Wardens, the two most important staff at the institution as it relates to the implementation of an effective grievance procedure.**

In the case of the above referenced complaints regarding the delay in responding to grievance appeals by the Chief Inspector's office, while inmates could write to the Chief Inspector to express the concerns, the Administrative rule **provides no supervisory review of complaints regarding the Chief Inspector's office.**

Participation of Staff and Inmates in the Design and Operation

Staff have definitely participated in the operation of the grievance procedure since the development of the Informal Complaint Resolution Form referred to as an "ICR". Prior to the creation of the form, an inmate merely had to contact the appropriate staff person by kite or in person to try to have a problem solved. If unsuccessful, the inmate could file a grievance with the Inspector.

According to the DRC staff person who reportedly designed the Informal Complaint Form and concept, it was developed to address the problem of staff not being thorough enough in their kite responses regarding problems. Further, it was reportedly designed to address the problem of staff non-response to kites. When an inmate complains that a staff

person failed to respond to his kite about a problem, if the staff person denies receiving the kite, there is no means for the inmate or Inspector to prove that the inmate sent the kite or to prove that the staff person received it.

Some staff have relayed that the same prison staff that do not respond to kites, do not respond to ICRs either. The Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure states the following regarding non-response to ICRs: **“Any pattern of non-compliance by staff shall be reported to the warden for appropriate action.”** Some prison staff and inmates have actually suggested that the ICRs should be eliminated. One of the positive aspects of ICRs is that it provides multiple copies of the Informal Complaint, one that is to be sent to the Inspector, one that can be retained by the inmate, and one that is to be sent to the Staff Supervisor to respond to the problem. However, **if the Staff Supervisor alleges non-receipt of any ICR, it still is not possible for an inmate to prove that it was sent to the Staff Supervisor or received by the Staff Supervisor.**

It is recommended that a method be devised to verify receipt of ICRs. For example, both copies of the ICR could be sent to the Inspector, who would contact the Staff Supervisor to pick up the ICR from the Inspector’s office, with documented signing to verify receipt.

This would provide an opportunity to eliminate a second reported frustration with ICRs. That is, **if an inmate mistakenly addresses the ICR to the incorrect Staff Supervisor, the Inspector or Inspector’s Secretary could easily and immediately redirect it to the appropriate Staff Supervisor.** As it is now, it is not uncommon for inmates to send to the CIIC office, ICRs which were reportedly submitted to the incorrect Staff Supervisor, who responded back to the inmate to send it to another Staff Supervisor. **Precious time has been lost by returning the referral back to the inmate who must then obtain another form, complete the form, then send it again and wait for it to be received, and then answered. Certainly the problem could be addressed if all Staff Supervisors who potentially may receive an ICR from time to time were advised to promptly forward the ICR to the appropriate Staff Supervisor if an ICR was mistakenly referred to them.**

Contrary to the ACA recommendation, there is no inmate participation in the design or operation of the inmate grievance procedure. The following excerpts from correspondence to the CIIC provide a summary of inmate input on the grievance procedure:

(Inmate) A reading of AR 5120-9-31 gives the general public and inmates a false impression that the grievance procedure provides a process whereby inmates may raise legitimate complaints and expect that the complaints will be fairly addressed by an impartial inspector...I have experienced many problems with the grievance process, which are systemic in nature...Staff members have been **trained to prevent inmates from prevailing on complaints, grievances and appeals.** I have come to recognize the complaint, grievance, appeal response methodology...as

nothing more than **denial, diversion** and deliberate indifference...Typically, supervisors responding to informal complaints simply **deny that their staff made any mistakes, and they decline to take any action to rectify the reported problems.** The local Inspector, following instructions issued by the Chief Inspector, typically makes a **cursory investigation for the sole purpose of packaging selective information to bolster the foregone conclusion that staff acted properly. No effort is made to locate and consider information which would prove the inmate's allegations.** On appeal, the Chief Inspector or Deputy CI will invariably **affirm the decision of the local Inspector.** As a result of this underhanded scheme to **defraud inmates of fair consideration of their complaints, problems are never acknowledged or addressed, and inmates continue to suffer unnecessarily.** Many of the continuing problems result in violations of inmates' rights...

(Inmate) The **ineffectiveness of the grievance procedure** played a significant part in condoning the deliberate indifference and inappropriate behavior of ODRC staff. Some specific tactics used by local administrators, Inspectors, and the Chief Inspector in their handling of all inmate grievances include:

1. **Failure to interview the inmate** complainant, while making every effort to interview staff
2. Official and automatic acceptance of every statement made by a staff member as truthful...
3. **Falsification of actual dates in responses, in order to counter claims of improper delays** at issue in the complaint.
4. Intentional **failure to address the specific issues raised in the complaints,** while improperly introducing extraneous arguments on issues which are not at issue in complaints.
5. **Unreasonable delays in answering complaints, grievances and appeals.**
6. Conflict of interest, since administrators and Inspectors paid by ODRC answer complaints against ODRC and ODRC staff.
7. Decisions giving 'lip service' only to problem resolution, while **nothing is actually done to correct the problems.**
8. When all else fails, the **inmate/complainant is blamed for the problem,** and misinformation is used to shield ODRC and staff from accepting responsibility for improper actions.

(Inmate) ...The problems are apparent to anyone who conducts a serious review. Any investigation of the procedure and report should not rely exclusively on the biased opinions of ODRC staff and Inspectors. CIIC staff should make time to **meet with inmates such as myself and many other inmates who have experienced serious problems with the grievance procedure in recent years. The inmate grievance procedure**

provides a terrible example to inmates who witness various staff twisting the truth and breaking rules without being held accountable for their actions. Without guidance from your Committee, the inmate grievance procedure will never attain the respect of inmates. Please take decisive action today, to restore integrity, accountability, and utility to the inmate grievance procedure.

(Inmate) My use of the inmate grievance procedure at this institution not only has been an **exercise in futility, but serious obstructions to the process occur.** As an inmate, I have **no direct access to the Inspector. My only form of communication with him is the kite system. The kite system here takes between one to seven weeks to work.** Every step of the grievance procedure must be done in a timely manner, usually 14 days. I was not allowed to walk to his office to get the **required forms that only he has. Instead, I received them a week later through the kite system.** When I then filed an Informal Complaint regarding this procedure to the Deputy Warden of Operations, I was again rebuffed. **The attitudes of both of these people have been arrogant and condescending.**

(Inmate) There are a **series of barriers in place that discourage and prevent prisoners from filing grievances.** Before a prisoner is given a grievance form, he must file an **informal complaint and send the pink copy to the Inspector. If an answer to the ICR is received, the prisoner must reiterate what the complaint is. All this is unnecessary. Once a pink copy of the ICR is sent to the Inspector, the Inspector has all the information needed.** By requiring the prisoner to keep supplying the same information over and over, the prisoner can be **kept from filing a formal grievance. This of course is the intended purpose. After all, most inmates are illiterate and semi-illiterate. Some prisoners are RTU patients and are incapable of overcoming all barriers to file a grievance. Informal Complaints are usually withheld from RTU patients. They simply can't get them. The reason informal complaints are kept from RTU patients is to prevent them from complaining about mistreatment. At a bare minimum, visits to the RTU by the Inspector and Assistant Inspector should be conducted on a weekly basis. Currently, they avoid the RTU like the plague. Most RTU patients have no idea what the Inspector and his Assistant look like.**

(Inmate) I am writing to send you a copy that I received from the Chief Inspector concerning the grievance I filed. Talk about a joke. That's exactly what it is. I had them dead to right and I still got denied. If I couldn't win my grievance, then there isn't the slightest chance of any inmate in the State of Ohio ever winning. The inmate grievance procedure might as well be abolished because it's a waste of time and money. It's as useless as a lawn mower in the South Pole. **I followed the grievance procedure, as I was advised to do, but what good did it do. I guess it's**

like the Deputy Warden of Operations told me, he said that the prison system is not designed for the inmate to come out ahead on anything, and when inmates file grievances, they are only asking for trouble. I fully believe that now, and they will never see another Informal Complaint come from me. I don't want to go through the harassment and retaliation that I had to endure.

(Inmate) I am fully aware that you and your office have no decision-making authority in this matter. However, this, my **first experience with the grievance procedure in my 24 plus years of incarceration, highlights significant deficiencies, problems and a general lack of accountability that needs to be addressed. From a procedural aspect, four months for a decision that resulted in absolutely no change in the DRC standard operating procedures and did not even acknowledge the clear violation for the DRC is unconscionable. At no point throughout the grievance process and subsequent appeal process did the staff even bother to interview me.** This, in spite of the Chief Inspector's office belatedly notifying me that additional time would be required "to affect a fair and impartial resolution." Had the Chief Inspector's office given serious consideration to and properly pursued my appeal, a simple change in operation procedure, having the Parole Board perform all **notifications as required by ORC 2967.12, could have been made and resolved this issue with finality.** Unfortunately, the status quo remains. **At no step in the process did the Inspector, nor Chief Inspector's office give any indication of the possibility of a problem nor express an interest in effecting a resolution. My experience is evidence of an administrative bureaucracy run amok with no accountability. Substantial changes need to be made. Accountability is paramount but sadly lacking**

(Inmate) I wanted you to see but one of thousands of examples why the ODRC grievance system is **inadequate, ineffective and negligent...** There appears to be nothing that the CIIC can do to correct this abhorrent hierarchy of unethical and unprofessional cover up artists. The grievance procedure serves **no purpose other than a temporary emotional catharsis for inmates to vent their anger and frustration with absolutely no hope of resolution outside of actual litigation in a court of law.**

(Inmate) **The grievance procedure has become ineffective and inadequate, but prisoners still must exhaust such before proceeding to court.** This I have done. However, there has been a long lasting consent decree in this matter, Taylor v. Perini. This has been grossly violated.

(Inmate) First I would like to suggest that ODRC employ the service of an **outside party** that does not have any involvement with ODRC.

Correctional Officers don't care about an inmate filing a grievance to which **many tell us to our face, "The Inspector won't do anything to us because the Inspector is Department staff." In order to establish an impartial system within the DRC, the fox guarding the chicken coop must be removed or this is simply a waste of taxpayers' dollars.**

(Inmate) The Chief Inspector's office is the source of the problem. She needs to **have her Inspectors uphold the A.R.s especially her Assistant Chief Inspectors.** CIIC needs to review ICRs, grievances and appeals and discipline and dismiss Inspectors who fall short of their obligations

(Inmate) My suggestions **are plainly stated in policy. If only these rules were enforced and disciplinary action taken seriously, then I truly believe that the inmate grievance procedure will improve itself.** This is not a very complex issue. However, certain employees disregard the A.R.s and DRC policies, and do as they please without limitation to abuse of authority or their position, which is strictly forbidden according to policy and ORC. However, the **issues involved within the grievance procedure can be corrected, and retaliation for use of the grievance procedure wouldn't be an issue if those condoning such acts wouldn't divulge confidential information, such as employees of a greater rank in charge of such information and records. Also, a timely response in accord with the AR and DRC policies without retaliation, shouldn't be out of the question.**

(Inmate) The problem is not how the **AR.s and DRC policies are compromised. They're just not being taken seriously by employees** because disciplinary action against staff is rare (if any) for violation of such rules when it's blatantly obvious that an employee violated such rules. The bottom line, if an inmate is found in the wrong and disciplined accordingly, why should an employee not be held accountable for their actions? What better way to correct someone's error in their thinking and actions than setting an example by supervisors. Rules are nothing but words on paper or etched in stone. When these same rules are enforced, they become alive with meaning, available to hold anyone accountable for their actions. If such rules are only semi-enforced, (one-sided), they become crooked lines unable to comprehend and be taken seriously.

Access By All Inmates With Guarantees Against Reprisals

According to the Administrative Rule on the inmate grievance procedure (AR 5120-9-31), The ODRC:

shall provide inmates with access to an inmate grievance procedure...

Inmates may utilize the inmate grievance procedure regardless of any disciplinary status, or other administrative or legislative decision to which the inmate may be subject. Appropriate provisions shall be made to ensure access to the inmate grievance procedure by inmates not fluent in English, persons with disabilities, and those with low literacy levels. Each institution shall maintain locked institutional mailboxes for inmates to mail kites, informal complaints, grievances and other institutional correspondence to staff...

Limited restrictions may be imposed, only with the approval of the chief inspector, based upon an inmate's abuse or misuse of the inmate grievance procedure. Such a restriction shall be for a stated period of time not to exceed ninety days and subject to extension by the chief inspector if the inmate has not substantially complied with the restriction requirements. Provisions shall be made to ensure that the inmate can pursue issues that could present a substantial risk of physical injury, such as medical concerns, through the inmate grievance procedure. Any inmate subject to a restriction shall be notified in writing. Such notice shall include a clear explanation of the nature of the restriction, and the length of time of the restriction, (conditional upon their compliance). The notice shall also include an explanation of how they may pursue issues that could present a substantial risk of harm while on restriction...

Retaliation or the threat of retaliation for the use of the inmate grievance procedure is strictly prohibited. Any alleged or threatened retaliation may be pursued through the inmate grievance procedure. Appropriate disciplinary action shall be taken against any employee found to be in violation of this section.

Based on the above excerpts from the Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure, there are specific provisions to ensure access to the grievance procedure by all inmates.

On the second aspect of the ACA recommendation, the provision of "guarantees against reprisals," the Administrative Rule specifically prohibits retaliation or the threat of retaliation, and allows inmates to use the grievance procedure to report any such retaliation or threat of retaliation. It further orders disciplinary action against those found to be in violation of the prohibition against retaliation or threat of retaliation. Therefore, the Administrative Rule falls short of providing "guarantees against reprisals." **In reality, it is not believed to be possible to "guarantee" that no reprisal will occur. The best that any grievance procedure can do, is to guarantee that a thorough investigation of any alleged threat of or actual reprisal, will be conducted, and when verified, corrective action will be taken, in accord with the AR.**

One of the problems reported to the CIIC on the issue, is that **retaliation is often reported to be in the form of a conduct report**, either written by the staff person named in the inmate's grievance, or reportedly by the staff person's co-worker. To find an

inmate guilty of a conduct report, all that is needed is “some evidence.” **A staff person’s written statement on the conduct report, alleging an inmate’s words or actions, has repeatedly been cited as meeting the requirement of “some evidence.”** In grievance decisions on allegations of such retaliation, which inmates have sent to the CIIC, Inspectors have cited the fact that the **inmate received an RIB conviction for the alleged rule violation, and cited the RIB conviction as evidence that the grievance has “no merit.”**

Another concern is that an inmate who has in fact experienced retaliation for good faith use of the grievance procedure may be understandably **reluctant to use the grievance procedure again to report it. Those who do, may find, as Inspectors have relayed to CIIC over the period of many years, that retaliation is extremely difficult to prove.** Areas of alleged retaliation are reportedly in areas in which staff have the authority to exercise discretion. Without evidence that a staff person violated the prohibition against retaliation or threat of retaliation, no disciplinary or other corrective action can or will be taken.

The Staff/Inmate Relations section of each institution’s Inspector of Institutional Services Monthly Report has subsections of Retaliation for Filing Grievance and Retaliation for Voicing Complaints, within the subsection of Force/Supervision. The **Retaliation for Filing Grievance subsection contained 42 grievances for the time period of October 2003 to November 2004.** The **Madison** Correctional Institution and **Noble** Correctional Institution each had **five** grievances for retaliation for filing grievance. **The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility** had **four** grievances. The **Lebanon** Correctional Institution had three grievances. The Allen Correctional Institution, Lima Correctional Institution, Lorain Correctional Institution, Mansfield Correctional Institution, Ohio State Penitentiary, Ross Correctional Institutional, Richland Correctional Institution, and Toledo Correctional Institution each had **two** grievances.

The **Retaliation for Voicing Complaints** subsection contained **44 grievances** for the time period of October 2003 to November 2004. The **Chillicothe** Correctional Institution, **Toledo** Correctional Institution, and **Warren** Correctional Institution each had **four** grievances. The **North Central** Correctional Institution and **North Coast** Correctional Treatment Facility each had **three** grievances. The question of whether retaliation or the perception of retaliation for filing grievances and voicing complaints exists appears to be generated from this data.

Applicability Over a Broad Range of Issues

According to the AR on the inmate grievance procedure, “This procedure is designed to address inmate **complaints related to any aspect of institutional life that directly and personally affects the grievance.** This may include complaints **regarding policies, procedures, conditions of confinement, or the actions of institutional staff.**” Therefore, the inmate grievance procedure does in fact fulfill the ACA recommendation regarding applicability over a broad range of issues.

The AR specifies what is not grievable as follows:

The inmate grievance procedure will not serve as an additional or substitute appeal process for **hearing officer decisions, rules infraction board decisions or those issues or actions which already include an appeal mechanism beyond the institutional level or where a final decision has been rendered by central office staff.** Other matters that are not grievable include complaints **unrelated to institutional life**, such as legislative actions, policies and decisions of the **adult parole authority**, judicial proceedings and sentencing or complaints whose subject matter is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the courts or other agencies. Complaints which present allegations which fall, in part, within the scope of paragraph (A) of this rule and in part within this paragraph will be **considered to the extent they are not excluded under this paragraph.**

Means for Resolving Questions of Jurisdiction

The above referenced quote from the Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure clarifies that if part of the grievance is grievable, and part is not grievable, the allegations which are grievable will be “considered.” If an inmate disagrees with the rejection of his grievance due to a determination that it is not grievable, he may appeal the decision as a means to resolve the issue.

The concern that has been relayed to the CIIC on the subject is that some Inspectors are reportedly too quick to reject a grievance as not grievable, merely because a portion of the problem or incident involved a matter that is not grievable, such as a conduct report and RIB decision.

THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACCORDING TO AR 5120-9-31

Although the most recent revision to the Administrative Rule was effective August 1, 2004, the last major revision to the Administrative Rule was effective January 1, 2002, following the submission of a report by Attorney Vincent Nathan, an outside expert, who was contracted by the Department to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the inmate grievance procedure. Although the above subsections included quotes from portions of the Administrative Rule, the following description of the grievance procedure is provided in Administrative Rule 5120-9-31:

The inmate grievance procedure shall be comprised of three consecutive steps fully described below. Whenever feasible, inmate complaints should be resolved at the lowest step possible. **There is a specific form designated by the Chief Inspector to use for each step. Only forms designated by the Chief Inspector may be used in this process. Such forms shall be reasonably available to inmates** regardless of their disciplinary status or classification. **Inmates shall not be required to**

advise a staff member, other than the inspector of institutional services, of the reason the form is being requested.

The filing of an informal complaint – step one:

Within fourteen calendar days of the date of the event giving rise to the complaint, the inmate shall file an informal complaint to the direct supervisor of the staff member, or department most directly responsible for the particular subject matter of the complaint. Staff shall respond in writing within **seven calendar days** of receipt of the informal complaint. If the inmate has not received a written response from the staff member within a reasonable time, the inmate should immediately **contact the inspector** of institutional services either in writing or during regular open office hours. The inspector of institutional services **shall take prompt action to ensure that a written response is provided to the informal complaint within four calendar days. If a response is not provided by the end of the fourth day, the informal complaint step is automatically waived.**

Informal complaint responses should **reflect an understanding of the inmate's complaint, be responsive to the issue, cite any relevant departmental or institutional rules or policies and specify the action taken, if any.** The inspector of institutional services shall monitor staff compliance with the informal complaint process. Any **pattern of non-compliance by staff shall be reported to the warden for appropriate action.**

The filing of an **informal complaint may be waived** if it is determined by the inspector of institutional services that there is a **substantial risk of physical injury** to the grievant, the complaint is filed pursuant to rule 5120-9-03 (Inmate complaints of **use of force when no force report has been made.**) or 5120-9-04 (**Appropriate supervision, discrimination, and racial issues**) of the Administrative Code, paragraph (H) [**Retaliation or the threat of retaliation for the use of the inmate grievance procedure.**] of this rule, or for **other good cause.**

The filing of the notification of grievance – step two:

If the inmate is dissatisfied with the informal complaint response, or the informal complaint process has been waived, the inmate **may obtain a notification of grievance form from the inspector of institutional services.** All inmate grievances must be filed by the inmate no later than **fourteen calendar days from the date of the informal complaint response or waiver of the informal complaint step.** The inspector of institutional services **may also waive the timeframe for the filing of the notification of grievance, for good cause.**

The inspector of institutional services shall provide a written response to the grievance **within fourteen calendar days of receipt**. The written response shall **summarize the inmate's complaint, describe what steps were taken to investigate the complaint and the inspector of institutional services' findings and decision**.

The inspector of institutional services **may extend the time in which to respond, for good cause, with notice to the inmate**. The Chief Inspector or designee shall be notified of all extensions. **Any extension exceeding twenty-eight calendar days from the date the response was due must be approved by the Chief Inspector or designee**. Expedited responses shall be made to those grievances that, as determined by the inspector of institutional services, present a substantial risk of physical injury to the grievant or for good cause.

The filing of an appeal of the disposition of grievance – step three:

If the inmate is dissatisfied with the disposition of grievance, the inmate may **request an appeal form from the inspector** of institutional services. The appeal must then be filed to the office of the Chief Inspector within **fourteen calendar days of the date of the disposition of grievance**. **For good cause the Chief Inspector or designee(s) may waive such time limits**. The Chief Inspector or designee(s) shall provide a written response within **thirty calendar days** of receipt of the appeal. The Chief Inspector or designee(s) **may extend the time in which to respond for good cause, with notice to the inmate**. The decision of the Chief Inspector or designee is final.

Grievance appeals **concerning medical diagnosis or a specific course of treatment shall be copied to the office of correctional health care, reviewed by a health care professional, and a joint response provided from the office of the Chief Inspector and the office of correctional health care**.

Appropriate remedies for valid grievances shall be provided. **Potential remedies** may include, but are not limited to: **changes to institutional policies or procedures, the implementation of new policies or procedures, and/or corrective action specific to the inmate's complaint**. (For example, a correction to the inmate's account, locating lost property, etc.)

If the resolution of a grievance or portion thereof, is **not within the scope of authority of the inspector** of institutional services, the inspector of institutional services shall submit **the findings and recommendations concerning the grievance to the warden for the warden's approval**,

modification or disapproval. The warden shall respond to the inspector of institutional services within fourteen calendar days. The inspector of institutional services shall provide to the office of Chief Inspector the report to the warden that includes the warden's decision.

Grievances against the warden or inspector of institutional services must be filed directly to the office of the Chief Inspector **within thirty calendar days of the event giving rise to the complaint.** Such grievances **must show that the warden or inspector of institutional services was personally and knowingly involved in a violation of law, rule or policy, or personally and knowingly approved or condoned such a violation.** The Chief Inspector or designee(s) shall respond within **thirty calendar days** of receipt of the grievance. The Chief Inspector or designee(s) **may extend the time in which to respond for good cause, with notice to the inmate.** The decision of the Chief Inspector or designee is final.

As referenced previously, according to the Administrative Rule on the grievance procedure, matters that cannot be grieved include the following:

- 1) Hearing officer decisions
- 2) Rule infraction board decisions
- 3) Those issues or actions which already include an appeal mechanism beyond the institutional level or where a final decision has been rendered by central office staff, and
- 4) Complaints unrelated to institutional life, such as legislative actions, policies and decisions of the Adult Parole Authority, judicial proceedings and sentencing or complaints whose subject matter is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the courts or other agencies.

According to the AR, inmates may use the grievance procedure regardless of any disciplinary status, or other administrative or legislative decision to which the inmate may be subject. As referenced above, "Appropriate provisions shall be made to ensure access to the inmate grievance procedure by inmates not fluent in English, persons with disabilities, and those with low literacy levels."

Limited restrictions may be imposed, only with the approval of the Chief Inspector, based upon an inmate's abuse or misuse of the inmate grievance procedure. Provisions must be made to ensure that the inmate can pursue issues that could present a substantial risk of physical injury, such as medical concerns, through the inmate grievance procedure.

Retaliation or the threat of retaliation for the use of the inmate grievance procedure is strictly prohibited. Any alleged or threatened retaliation may be pursued through the inmate grievance procedure. The filing of an informal complaint may be waived by the Inspector if the grievance pertains to a reprisal or threat of reprisal. According to the AR,

appropriate disciplinary action must be taken against any employee found to be in violation.

CIIC GRIEVANCE DATA:

Grievance Concerns:

The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee started tracking contacts and concerns in its database on January 6, 2004. The **Inmate Grievance Concern section, which contains subsections of Inspector, Chief Inspector, Informal Complaint, and Other, presently contains 400 logged entries, which average out to 33 inmate grievance concerns being received per month by CIIC.** The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had the most reported concerns with a total of 66. The Ohio State Penitentiary had 30 reported concerns. The Mansfield Correctional Institution, Trumbull Correctional Institution, and Madison Correctional Institution each had 22 reported concerns. The Pickaway Correctional Institution and Marion Correctional Institution each had 21 reported concerns. **The inmate grievance concerns are 8% of all logged concerns in the database.**

Retaliation for Filing Grievances:

The Staff/Inmate Relations section of the CIIC database has a subsection of Retaliation for Filing Grievance, within the subsection of Force/Supervision. **The Retaliation for Filing Grievance subsection contains 66 logged concerns, which average out to 5.5 retaliation for filing grievance concerns being received per month by CIIC.** The Lake Erie Correctional Institution had the most reported concerns with a total of eight. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Trumbull Correctional Institution each had seven reported concerns. The Madison Correctional Institution, Marion Correctional Institution, and North Central Correctional Institution each had four reported concerns. The retaliation for filing grievances concerns is 1.3% of all logged concerns in the database. **The combined total for inmate grievance concerns and retaliation for filing grievance concerns is 466, which is 9.3% of all logged concerns, and an average of 38.8 concerns received per month by CIIC.**

REPORTED AREAS OF CONCERN AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The CIIC has received reports of concern regarding the inmate grievance procedure from various sources, such as inmates, inmates' family and friends, concerned citizens, ODRC staff, inmate advocacy groups and elected officials. The following information details the reported concerns.

CONCERN: RETALIATION AND FEAR OF RETALIATION BY INSTITUTIONAL STAFF IF AN INMATE USES THE INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Inmates continue to state that they have been subjected to retaliation by institution staff for using the inmate grievance procedure, or that they will face retaliation by institution

staff if they use the inmate grievance procedure. Many of the concerns regarding this area that were expressed by National Institute of Corrections Consultant and Attorney, Vincent Nathan, in his Evaluation of the Inmate Grievance System Report, dated February 13, 2001, appear to still exist.

In Nathan's report, he noted that **87.2% of the inmates commenting on the statement, "I believe staff will retaliate or get back at me if I use the inmate grievance process," agreed with the statement.** He further reported that **91.9% of the inmates commenting on the statement, who had used the inmate grievance procedure, agreed with the statement.** Data discussed in the Grievance Data, Tables, and Analysis Section of this report that was obtained from the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Inspector of Institutional Services Monthly Reports and the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee's Database provide evidence to support this concern.

RECOMMENDATION): Vincent Nathan's Recommendation 4 in his Evaluation of the Inmate Grievance System Report has the same importance as it had in 2001. It states:

The DRC should begin to **impose the most serious disciplinary consequences for acts of retaliation by staff against inmates as a result of the latter's use of any aspect of the grievance process.**

As part of its effort to address this problem, DRC officials should ensure that **training** components at the training academy, new staff orientation at each facility, and annual in-service training emphasize strongly the **utility of the grievance system, the DRC's commitment to that system, and the consequences that will flow from acts of retaliation.** Institutional inspectors should be personally responsible for orienting new staff and providing the in-service training segment on the grievance system, and this subject should be a component of all in-service training curricula.

Wardens should hold supervisors responsible for providing adequate supervision to line staff regarding the DRC's non-retaliation policy, and institutional inspectors should investigate allegations of retaliation with special care and vigor.

It is not only necessary to address the concerns regarding real and/or perceived retaliation for good faith use of the grievance procedure by implementing each portion of the above recommendation, but it is also **imperative that the above information regarding the Department's commitment and activities regarding retaliation, be shared with all inmates in their orientation at the reception centers to instill in all inmates that the inmate grievance procedure is an objective procedure, which prohibits and will aggressively investigate any retaliatory actions.** One of the best ways to send a strong message that retaliation in fact will not be tolerated, is by **thorough investigations of alleged reprisals or threats of reprisals, and by taking corrective action specified in AR 5120-9-31, one case at a time.**

CONCERN: DIFFICULTIES OF INMATES WHO ARE MENTALLY ILL, HAVE LOW LITERACY LEVELS, OR HAVE OTHER DISABILITIES, IN USING THE INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE.

The above referenced inmates need assistance in the use of the inmate grievance procedure. Inmates report that Inspectors either do not provide assistance, or do not provide sufficient assistance. Although the Administrative Rule at one time stated that the Inspector “shall” provide such assistance to those who need it, that specific language is no longer in the AR on the grievance procedure or in the AR describing the duties of the Inspector.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION(s): The Department should **work to ensure that the inmate grievance procedure is not, and is not seen as, an adversarial procedure, with the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction versus the inmates.** Rather, the grievance procedure should be, and should be regarded as, **an objective problem-solving mechanism** which is good for the ODRC, resulting in improvements in operations, conditions and programs, and which is equally good for the inmate population who will face problems in the best of institutions. Institutional Inspectors need to be, and need to be perceived as, objective and non-adversarial.

The Institutional Inspectors’ workload at each institution should be evaluated to ensure that they have sufficient time to assist inmates who require assistance in using the inmate grievance procedure, and to “facilitate all aspects of the inmate grievance procedure.” In some cases, the Inspector should not wait for the inmate to try to file a grievance or to kite the Inspector for help. Inspectors should make regular rounds in areas where their assistance is likely to be needed, including, but not limited to Residential Treatment Units for the mentally ill.

In cases when an inmate’s grievance is difficult to read or to understand, the Inspector should interview the inmate for clarification.

The grievance procedure should be reevaluated to ensure that the forms and processes are in the most simplified state to guarantee ease of use by all parties.

CONCERN: UNTIMELINESS IN RECEIVING GRIEVANCE FORMS FROM STAFF AND IN RESPONSES BY STAFF TO INFORMAL COMPLAINTS, NOTIFICATION OF GRIEVANCES, AND APPEALS OF THE DISPOSITION OF GRIEVANCE.

Inmates have reported that they have had **delays of a week or longer in receiving a notification of grievance form or form to appeal** to the Chief Inspector from Institutional Inspectors, which has reduced their time to file the forms within the 14 day deadline. These reports include inmates in general population and segregation. Inmates have reported **delays in receiving responses to their Informal Complaint Resolution form.**

Inmates have reported **delays in receiving responses from the Chief Inspector's Office** after they have filed their appeal to the Chief Inspector. At least eight recent inquiries verified that **inmates have been waiting from four months to as long as ten months to receive responses to their appeals**. Inmates have also reported that delays in responses to their appeals have resulted in their appeal being a moot point by the time they received a response. Inmates have also provided responses to appeals, in which their response had absolutely **no relevance to their problem, but appeared to be directed to the wrong inmate**.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION(s): **The workload of the Institutional Inspectors at each institution should be evaluated to ensure that they have the ability to provide grievance forms in a timely manner, to monitor and act on delayed responses to the informal complaint resolution forms, and to respond to notification of grievance forms in a timely manner.**

The Chief Inspector may need to evaluate the way that informal complaint resolution forms and the notification of grievance forms are responded to by staff. **If the quality of responses can be improved, then the domino effect of informal complaints resulting in notification of grievances and notification of grievances resulting in appeals of the disposition of grievance can be reduced.**

The Department should consider some “outside the box” solutions such as the **Outside Review Committee**, which was mandated by the U.S. District Court in the *Taylor v. Perini* case. The outside review committee, which consisted of members from different disciplines in the community, was established to review and assess inmate grievances before they were appealed to the Chief Inspector's Office. **The establishment of the outside review committee could assist the Chief Inspector's Office by providing an assessment and recommendation, in addition to the institutional inspector's input, prior to deciding the grievance appeal. This process would give greater credibility to the inmate grievance procedure. This process is somewhat comparable to the assistance the Office of Correctional Healthcare gives to the Office of the Chief Inspector for grievance appeals concerning medical diagnosis or a specific course of treatment.**

The workload at the Chief Inspector's Office also needs to be evaluated to determine if additional staff is required to monitor the grievance procedure and provide quality and timely grievance appeal decisions.

Just as ODRC considers the Inspector's position at the institutions as an “essential” position, which can and should be filled, the provision of an adequate number of Assistant Chief Inspectors should be regarded with the same essential status. There should be enough staff to comply with the appeal response time requirements in the AR on the inmate grievance procedure, without extensions caused solely by staff shortages and/or large workload.

There should also be enough staff to comply with AR 5120-9-30 which provides a two-page list of additional duties of the Office of the Chief Inspector.

CONCERN: THE MAJORITY OF GRIEVANCE DISPOSITIONS RESULT IN A “NOT RESOLVED” DISPOSITION.

Data shows that **78.3% (5,779 grievances) of the grievances processed during the time period of October 2003 to November 2004 resulted in a “not resolved” disposition.** Data also shows that **76.2% (1,930 grievances) of the grievances processed during the time period of July 2004 to November 2004 resulted in a “not resolved” disposition.** Of the 1,930 grievances noted, 1,217 (63%) listed their reason for a “not resolved” disposition as either 1) insufficient evidence to support claim or 2) staff action was a valid exercise of discretion. Many inmates have reported that the grievance procedure does not work simply because of the results or lack thereof.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION(s): The Chief Inspector should ensure that the Institutional Inspectors and Assistant Chief Inspectors are **resolving grievances** whenever warranted. **The grievance procedure should in part be evaluated by the results.** The **percentage of grievances that are “Not Resolved” should be major cause for concern.** **Only through a drastic increase in the number of grievance decisions in which problems are in fact resolved,** will inmates gradually develop a more positive view of the grievance procedure. If more grievances were truly solved by the Inspectors, there would be less of a burden on the Office of the Chief Inspector in the number of grievance appeals.

GRIEVANCE DATA, TABLES AND ANALYSIS:

ODRC Grievance Data:

GRIEVANCES FILED:

The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee receives ODRC’s inmate grievance data through the receipt of each institution’s Inspector of Institutional Services Monthly Report and the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report.

The number of reported inmate grievances during the time period of October 2003 to November 2004 is 7,381. The average number of inmate grievances per month during the period is 527. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had the highest number of inmate grievances with a total of 722, which is an average of 52 inmate grievances per month. The total number of grievances for the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility represents 9.8% of the grievances filed for all the institutions. The Mansfield Correctional Institution reported 537 inmate grievances. The Ohio State Penitentiary reported 488 inmate grievances. The Lebanon Correctional Institution reported 398 inmate grievances. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported 384 inmate grievances.

The Dayton Correctional Institution had the lowest number of inmate grievances with a total of 8, which is an average of 0.6 inmate grievances per month. The Northeast Pre-Release Center reported 12 inmate grievances. The Oakwood Correctional Facility reported 14 inmate grievances. The Hocking Correctional Facility reported 16 inmate grievances. The Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center reported 20 grievances.

Institutions receiving an inordinate number of inmate grievances generate speculation whether the grievance procedure is freely and properly being used to resolve institution issues or if there are problems concerning their daily operations. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Mansfield Correctional Institution are institutions that will require continued diligent review by the CIIC.

Institutions receiving an extremely low number of inmate grievances generate speculation whether the institutions' operations are functioning extremely well, the informal complaint step of the grievance procedure is addressing all issues, or there is a deterrence to the use of the grievance procedure. The Hocking Correctional Facility has a unique dynamic, based on the age and health of its inmates that results with issues and problems reportedly being resolved at an informal level.

There are a total of 31 complaint categories under which a grievance can be filed. Health Care was the leading complaint category, with a total of 1,235 grievances. The total represents 17% of all grievances filed. Force/Supervision was second with 1,224 grievances, which represents 16.8% of all grievances filed. Personal Property was third with 1,146 grievances, which represents 15.7% of all grievances filed. Staff Accountability was fourth with 567 grievances, which represents 7.8% of all grievances filed. Safety/Sanitation was fifth with 427 grievances, which represents 5.9% of all grievances filed.

It is interesting to note the low number of grievances filed in the following areas: Dental Care – 104 grievances, which ranks 14th in number; Psychological/Psychiatric Services – 55 grievances, which ranks 23rd in number; Recovery Services – 26, which ranks 28th in number; and Telephone – 10, which ranks 31st in number. Based on inquiries received and perceived concerns, these figures seem to be extremely low without clear reasons. The number of grievances for Psychological/ Psychiatric Services raises the question if complaints are being resolved at the informal complaint stage of the grievance procedure or if inmates who are mentally ill are having difficulties filing grievances.

**TABLE 81. NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES FILED FROM OCTOBER 2003
THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION**

Total Grievances Filed (Listed by Institution)		
Institution (ranked highest to lowest)	Grievances Filed	Percent (of System-Wide 7,381 Total Grievances Filed)
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	722	9.8%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	537	7.3
Ohio State Penitentiary	488	6.6
Lebanon Correctional Institution	398	5.4
Toledo Correctional Institution	384	5.2
North Central Correctional Institution	370	5.0
Madison Correctional Institution	359	4.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	344	4.7
Ohio Reformatory for Women	327	4.4
Warren Correctional Institution	315	4.3
Allen Correctional Institution	310	4.2
Grafton Correctional Institution	309	4.2
Noble Correctional Institution	294	4.0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	274	3.7
Marion Correctional Institution	247	3.3
Richland Correctional Institution	241	3.3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	198	2.7
London Correctional Institution	188	2.5
Franklin Pre-Release Center	181	2.5
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	161	2.2
Ross Correctional Institution	144	2.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	128	1.7
Lorain Correctional Institution	106	1.4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	99	1.3
Corrections Medical Center	55	.7
Correctional Reception Center	51	.7
North Coast Correctional Training Facility	45	.6
Lima Correctional Institution	36	.5
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	20	.3
Hocking Correctional Facility	16	.2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	14	.2
Northeast Pre-Release Center	12	.2
Dayton Correctional Institution	8	.1
TOTAL Grievances Filed System-Wide	7,381	100%

NUMBER AND SUBJECT OF GRIEVANCES FILED AT EACH INSTITUTION

The following tables list the number and types of complaints grieved by inmates at each institution during the time period of October 2003 through November 2004.

TABLE 82. Allen Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Personal Property	3	2	5	1	0	1	0	7	8	5	6	2	5	5	50
Force/ Supervision	3	7	7	3	1	3	0	4	1	2	4	4	1	1	41
Health Care	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	4	4	8	5	2	2	38
Staff Accountability	0	3	3	4	2	5	0	4	1	3	8	2	1	1	37
Food Service	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	8	2	3	3	3	1	0	22
Safety and Sanitation	0	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	4	1	0	19
Mail/ Package	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	4	2	1	1	1	15
Discrimination	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	1	0	9
Housing Assignment	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	1	0	8
Visiting	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	7
Library	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	7
Commissary	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	7
Facilities Maintenance	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	6
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	6
Inmate Account	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	5
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Non-Grievable Matters	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
Recreation	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Recovery Services	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Job Assignments	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Special Management Housing	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Psychological/ Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	10	21	21	16	7	20	2	32	17	20	38	20	13	11	248
RESOLVED	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	5	11	6	12	10	6	1	62
TOTAL	11	22	25	17	9	21	3	37	28	26	50	30	19	12	310

Grievances were not filed in the following categories: Educational/Vocational Training, Telephone, Religious Services, and Security Classification.

TABLE 83. Belmont Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Personal Property	0	0	1	4	1	2	4	0	2	5	4	4	2	6	35
Health Care	6	2	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	25
Force/Supervision	0	2	6	4	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	18
Safety and Sanitation	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	14
Mail/Package	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Visiting	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Housing Assignment	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Inmate Account	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Staff Accountability	3	3	3	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	15
Job Assignment	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Non-Grievable Matters	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Commissary	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNRESOLVED	10	5	18	12	1	3	6	0	3	2	2	1	1	7	71
RESOLVED	1	3	6	6	0	4	2	0	2	5	7	4	1	16	57
TOTAL	11	8	24	18	1	7	8	0	5	7	9	5	2	23	128

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Food Service, Protective Control, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Library, Recreation, Legal Services, Dental Care, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Education/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Religious Services, Telephone, Records, Discrimination.

TABLE 84. Chillicothe Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	6	6	11	2	4	3	2	6	7	5	1	5	13	8	82
Force/ Supervision	1	7	4	5	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	4	2	38
Personal Property	0	2	6	3	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	8	2	4	37
Staff Accountability	1	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	3	26
Non Grievable Matters	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	1	18
Mail/ Package	2	2	1	4	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	17
Safety and Sanitation	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	14
Housing Assignment	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	1	1	14
Inmate Account	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	14
Food Service	0	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	12
Commissary	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
Job Assignments	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	10
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Laundry/ Quartermaster	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Recreation	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	6
Dental Care	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6
Psychological/ Psychiatric	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
Visiting	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Special Management Housing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Religious Services	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Library	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
UNRESOLVED	25	24	33	21	15	13	9	21	24	11	17	26	27	26	286
RESOLVED	4	3	3	7	5	4	4	4	4	6	3	3	3	5	58
TOTAL	29	27	36	28	20	17	13	25	28	17	20	29	30	25	344

Grievances were not filed in the following categories, Recovery Services, Telephone, Protective Control, and Security Classification.

TABLE 85. Correctional Reception Center

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/Supervision	2	3	4	5	5	4	1	0	1	1	3	1	4	0	34
Health Care	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Staff Accountability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Mail/Package	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Recreation	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Account	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Personal Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	2	4	5	5	6	4	3	0	0	4	4	1	4	2	44
RESOLVED	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	7
TOTAL	2	5	5	5	7	4	3	0	2	4	6	1	5	2	51

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Non-Grievable Matters, Food Service, Special Management Housing, Facilities Maintenance, Safety and Sanitation, Commissary, Protective Control, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Library, Legal Services, Dental Care, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Laundry/Quartermaster, Visiting, Education/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Job Assignments, Recovery Services, Religious Services, Telephone, Records.

TABLE 86. Corrections Medical Center

Complaints Grievied	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	1	4	2	1	1	0	3	0	2	3	3	3	1	1	25
Force/Supervision	3	0	2	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	15
Non-Grievable Matters	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Job Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Personal Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	4
Religious Services	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Account	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Safety and Sanitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	4	4	4	5	2	2	3	1	2	1	4	4	0	0	36
RESOLVED	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	2	0	6	1	1	19
TOTAL	4	5	5	6	3	2	5	2	4	3	4	10	1	1	55

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Staff Accountability, Mail/Package, Special Management Housing, Facilities Maintenance, Commissary, Protective Control, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Library, Legal Services, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Laundry/Quartermaster, Visiting, Education/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Telephone, Records, Discrimination, Housing Assignment.

TABLE 87. Dayton Correctional Institution

Complaints Grievied	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force /Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Personal Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RESOLVED	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	8
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	8

Categories where grievances were not filed: Health Care, Psychological/Psychiatric, Safety and Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Laundry/Quartermaster, Commissary, Inmate Account, Educational/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Job Assignments, Library, Recovery Services, Recreation, Religious Services, Mail/Package, Visiting, Telephone, Records, Legal Services, Discrimination, Staff Accountability, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Housing Assignment, Special Management Housing, Protective Control, and Non-Grievable Matters.

TABLE 88. Franklin Pre Release Center

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Safety and Sanitation	0	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Force /Supervision	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5
Health Care	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Religious Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Mail/ Package	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Visiting	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Staff Accountability	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Personal Property	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Accounts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Non Grievable Matters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNRESOLVED	5	164	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	176
RESOLVED	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
TOTAL	5	164	2	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	181

Grievances were not filed in the following categories: Dental Care, Psychological/Psychiatric Services, Facilities Maintenance, Food Service, Commissary, Educational/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Job Assignments, Library, Recovery Services, Recreation, Telephone, Records, Legal Services, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Housing Assignment, Special Management Housing, and Protective Control.

TABLE 89. Grafton Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	15	7	4	9	7	6	5	8	5	3	3	7	3	2	84
Staff Accountability	2	5	0	4	5	7	3	3	2	0	0	6	2	1	40
Personal Property	3	0	3	2	3	3	4	2	2	10	2	5	1	0	40
Force/Supervision	2	2	3	3	5	3	1	4	5	2	2	1	0	5	38
Safety and Sanitation	1	3	4	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	3	0	0	1	18
Dental Care	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	14
Mail/Package	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	12
Housing Assignment	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	11
Visiting	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	8
Job Assignments	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	8
Inmate Account	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Non Grievable Matters	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	5
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4
Laundry/Quartermaster	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Security Classification	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Educational/Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Commissary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	25	16	15	15	27	16	11	20	13	8	12	17	8	11	214
RESOLVED	8	3	5	7	5	11	7	11	9	9	6	7	5	2	95
TOTAL	33	19	20	22	32	27	18	31	22	17	18	24	13	13	309

Grievances were not reported in the following areas: Institution Assignment, Protective Control, Special Management Housing, Library, Recovery Services, Telephone, and Religious Services.

TABLE 90. Hocking Correctional Facility

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	7
Personal Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Dental Care	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Commissary	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Force/ Supervision	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Non Grievable Matters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNRESOLVED	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	13
RESOLVED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
TOTAL	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	1	16

Grievances were not filed in the following categories: Psychological/Psychiatric, Safety and Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Laundry/Quartermaster, Inmate Account, Educational/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Job Assignments, Library, Recovery Services, Recreation, Religious Services, Mail/Package, Telephone, Legal Services, Discrimination, Staff Accountability, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Housing Assignment, Special Management Housing, and Protective Control.

TABLE 91. Lake Erie Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	4	2	5	2	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	28
Force/Supervision	2	1	0	2	1	2	1	2	6	0	2	0	0	0	19
Personal Property	0	2	1	3	1	2	3	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	17
Food Service	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	12
Staff Accountability	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	10
Non-Grievable Matters	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	8
Legal Services	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Housing Assignment	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	6
Mail/package	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Job Assignment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Records	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Education/Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	5
Safety and Sanitation	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Inmate Account	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Discrimination	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Facilities Maintenance	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Library	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Recovery Services	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Religious Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Telephone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	10	11	10	9	12	8	7	12	16	8	11	7	6	4	131
RESOLVED	2	1	2	7	5	0	2	3	1	0	3	3	0	1	30
TOTAL	12	12	12	16	17	8	9	15	17	8	14	10	6	5	161

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Commissary, Protective Control, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Recreation, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Inmate Groups.

TABLE 92. Lebanon Correctional Institution

Complaints Grievied	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/ Supervision	6	7	14	8	6	4	4	4	4	8	5	8	11	7	96
Health Care	4	6	9	4	10	4	4	0	4	4	7	4	6	1	67
Personal Property	7	1	4	5	3	2	2	4	3	5	2	6	3	5	52
Staff Accountability	0	2	0	1	1	2	4	0	3	2	2	5	3	0	25
Mail/ Package	2	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	0	3	0	2	1	0	22
Non-Grievable Matters	1	0	2	2	3	6	2	1	1	0	3	2	0	0	23
Safety and Sanitation	0	1	3	1	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	14
Food Service	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	6	4	13
Visiting	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	10
Religious Services	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	9
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	8
Dental Care	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	8
Housing Assignment	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
Inmate Accounts	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Job Assignments	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	6
Psychological/ Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	6
Institution Assignment	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Education/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
Commissary	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Records	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
UNRESOLVED	15	21	33	21	28	23	22	15	19	24	25	26	29	18	319
RESOLVED	8	6	7	3	7	7	5	1	6	5	4	8	7	5	79
TOTAL	23	27	40	24	35	30	27	16	25	29	29	34	36	23	398

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Recreation, Telephone, Legal Services, Special Management Housing, Recovery Services, Security Classification, and Protective Control.

TABLE 93. Lima Correctional Institution*

Complaints Grievied	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/ Supervision	1	0	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Staff Accountability	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Health Care	0	3	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Mail/Packages	0	3	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Food Services	0	0	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Personal Property	0	0	3	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Dental Care	0	2	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Safety/ Sanitation	0	0	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	0	2	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Inmate Accounts	1	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Library	0	1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Recreation	0	1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Housing Assignment	0	0	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	0	0	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Job Assignments	0	0	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
UNRESOLVED	4	5	10	7											26
RESOLVED	0	6	2	2											10
TOTAL	4	11	12	9											36

* LCI did not house prisoners after January 2004. Grievances were not filed in the following categories: Facilities Maintenance, Commissary, Educational/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Religious Services, Visiting, Telephone, Records, Legal Services, Discrimination, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Special Management Housing, Protective Control, and Non Grievable Matters.

TABLE 94. London Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	3	6	0	3	3	2	4	0	11	4	3	3	1	1	44
Personal Property	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	6	1	0	25
Force/Supervision	1	1	2	1	0	3	2	0	3	3	2	2	1	2	23
Non-Grievable Matter	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	16
Food Service	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	11
Staff Accountability	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	11
Housing Assignment	0	2	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10
Safety and Sanitation	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	9
Inmate Account	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	8
Mail/Package	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	7
Institution Assignment	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Job Assignments	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Commissary	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Religious Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Education/Vocational Training	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	16	12	5	6	8	9	18	2	24	19	9	19	10	10	167
RESOLVED	2	2	0	2	1	3	1	0	3	2	1	3	0	1	21
TOTAL	18	14	5	8	9	12	19	2	27	21	10	22	10	11	188

Complaints that were not reported during the period include: Protective Control, Security Classification, Legal Services, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Laundry/Quartermaster, Inmate Groups, Telephone, Records.

TABLE 95. Lorain Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/Supervision	6	6	1	0	6	2	4	4	2	4	1	1	0	0	37
Personal Property	0	0	2	1	4	0	1	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	17
Health Care	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	12
Staff Accountability	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	10
Inmate Account	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	6
Non-Grievable Matters	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Job Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
Dental Care	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Mail/Package	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Religious Services	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discrimination	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	6	11	5	1	5	2	1	4	6	6	5	4	4	2	62
RESOLVED	5	2	1	0	11	3	4	4	0	3	1	6	3	1	44
TOTAL	11	13	6	1	16	5	5	8	6	9	6	10	7	3	106

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Facilities Maintenance, Safety and Sanitation, Commissary, Protective Control, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Library, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Education/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Telephone, Records.

TABLE 96. Madison Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	12	12	6	4	8	9	4	12	13	4	2	1	5	3	95
Force/ Supervision	4	7	2	4	0	2	2	6	9	4	6	8	5	3	62
Personal Property	1	2	3	1	0	2	1	1	6	4	5	6	9	3	44
Staff Accountability	5	0	0	4	1	3	4	0	3	1	1	1	5	6	34
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	5	1	1	24
Non-Grievable Matters	0	0	3	4	2	3	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	22
Safety and Sanitation	0	0	3	1	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	13
Food Service	2	2	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Inmate Account	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	10
Housing Assignment	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	7
Job Assignments	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6
Visiting	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Mail/ Package	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Education/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Religious Services	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Institution Assignment	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Library	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Commissary	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
UNRESOLVED	20	22	23	19	14	22	20	25	39	22	23	23	35	18	325
RESOLVED	6	1	2	4	3	4	1	1	0	0	3	3	2	4	34
TOTAL	26	23	25	23	17	26	21	26	39	22	26	26	37	22	359

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Psychological/Psychiatric, Laundry/Quartermaster, Telephone, Legal Services, and Protective Control.

TABLE 97. Mansfield Correctional Institution

Complaints Grievied	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Staff Accountability	4	3	8	8	4	9	12	6	5	11	7	4	3	6	90
Health Care	5	10	5	7	3	10	11	2	6	7	4	4	5	8	87
Personal Property	4	11	6	6	2	7	7	1	10	14	8	2	2	6	86
Force/ Supervision	2	3	4	3	3	10	1	1	0	7	1	2	3	2	43
Mail/ Package	2	0	7	3	1	0	2	3	4	6	1	3	2	4	38
Inmate Accounts	3	2	5	4	2	4	2	0	1	3	2	1	1	1	31
Non-Grievable Issues	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	2	1	25
Food Service	0	0	2	1	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	2	0	4	24
Housing Assignment	0	2	3	4	2	4	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	21
Visiting	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	3	2	0	0	13
Facilities Maintenance	0	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Job Assignments	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8
Dental Care	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	6
Religious Services	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	6
Special Management Housing	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Recreation	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	6
Safety and Sanitation	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4
Commissary	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Discrimination	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Records	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Security Classification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
URESOLVED	20	29	35	40	23	58	34	19	21	45	30	30	16	23	423
RESOLVED	5	10	8	4	5	8	7	4	15	17	7	4	9	11	114
TOTAL	25	39	43	44	28	66	41	23	36	62	37	347	25	34	537

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Library, Telephone, and Staff Accountability..

TABLE 98. Marion Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	1	6	0	0	4	0	0	3	7	0	1	7	3	8	40
Personal Property	2	1	0	2	1	0	4	1	9	6	0	3	6	4	39
Mail/ Package	2	2	2	3	4	4	3	2	3	2	2	1	0	3	33
Staff Accountability	3	5	1	2	0	1	1	3	2	2	3	4	1	2	30
Force Supervision	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	19
Inmate Account	2	0	0	4	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	14
Non Grievable	3	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	12
Education/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	10
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	7
Food Services	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	6
Records	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	5
Job Assignment	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Commissary	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4
Religious Services	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Recovery Services	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Housing Assignment	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Discrimination	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Security Classification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Safety/ Sanitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Telephone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	14	16	5	16	10	5	6	11	18	10	12	20	7	11	161
RESOLVED	2	4	2	5	9	3	5	4	15	5	3	6	11	12	86
TOTAL	16	20	7	21	19	8	11	15	33	15	15	26	18	23	247

Grievances were not reported in the following areas: Psychological/Psychiatric, Inmate Groups, Recreation, Legal Services, and Special Management Housing.

TABLE 99. Montgomery Education Pre Release Center

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/ Supervision	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7
Health Care	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Staff Accountability	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Personal Property	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Mail/ Package	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Educational/Vocational Training	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Food Service	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	0	2	3	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	14
RESOLVED	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6
TOTAL	0	2	3	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	20

Grievances were not reported in the following areas: Dental Care, Psychological/Psychiatric, Safety/Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Laundry/Quartermaster, Commissary, Inmate Account, Inmate Groups, Library, Recovery Services, Recreation, Religious Services, Visiting, Telephone, Records, Legal Services, Discrimination, Job Assignments, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Housing Assignment, Special Management Housing, Protective Control, Non Grievable Matters.

TABLE 100. Noble Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/ Supervision	5	11	3	8	6	5	2	5	7	5	9	3	2	4	75
Personal Property	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	6	3	15	8	5	2	48
Staff Accountability	0	1	4	6	7	2	2	6	4	5	2	1	3	2	46
Health Care	5	4	2	5	1	1	0	1	8	1	1	1	2	1	33
Safety/ Sanitation	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	2	4	1	16
Discrimination	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	4	1	0	0	0	11
Non Grievable Matters	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	12
Mail/Package	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	7
Dental Care	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
Visiting	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	5
Job Assignment	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Recreation	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Records	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Library	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Food Service	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Legal Services	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Inmate Accounts	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Recovery Services	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Education/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	16	27	18	23	18	8	12	20	30	20	23	23	17	12	267
RESOLVED	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	5	4	8	1	0	0	27
TOTAL	18	27	19	24	20	10	13	20	35	24	31	24	17	12	294

Grievances were not filed in the following categories: Facilities Maintenance, Commissary, Religious Services, Telephone, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Special Management Housing, and Protective Control.

TABLE 101. North Central Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Personal Property	5	2	3	3	3	3	0	2	3	4	8	18	13	8	75
Safety/ Sanitation	0	0	0	39	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	73
Health Care	6	3	2	5	2	2	7	3	2	4	2	3	7	10	58
Force / Supervision	5	5	4	1	4	1	0	5	1	0	4	2	1	0	33
Staff Accountability	1	1	3	1	3	0	1	0	3	4	2	2	2	2	25
Non Grievable Matters	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	1	3	18
Food Service	2	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	16
Mail/Package	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	1	12
Inmate Accounts	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	8
Dental Care	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	8
Commissary	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	6
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Job Assignment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Recreation	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Legal Services	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Education/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Records	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Institution Assignment	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Psychological/ Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Security Classification	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	20	17	16	50	39	8	7	9	17	16	24	26	23	26	298
RESOLVED	8	4	2	6	9	3	5	5	0	10	3	4	6	7	72
TOTAL	28	21	18	56	48	11	12	14	17	26	27	30	29	33	370

Grievances were not reported in the following areas: Facilities Maintenance, Religious Services and Telephone.

TABLE 102. North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	10
Staff Accountability	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	8
Force/ Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	6
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Personal Property	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Mail /Package	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Records	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Laundry/ Quartermaster	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Accounts	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Safety/Sanitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Visiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Food Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNRESOLVED	2	1	1	0	0	4	3	3	8	4	3	0	3	3	35
RESOLVED	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	10
TOTAL	3	1	2	0	0	5	4	3	12	4	3	0	3	5	45

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Facilities Maintenance, Psychological/Psychiatric, Commissary, Educational/Vocational Services, Inmate Groups, Job Assignment, Recreation, Religious Services, Telephone, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Housing Assignment, Protective Control, and Non Grievable Matters.

TABLE 103. Northeast Pre Release Center

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Inmate Accounts	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Mail/ Package	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Force Supervision	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Staff Accountability	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Education/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	7
RESOLVED	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	5
TOTAL	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	12

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Dental Care, Safety and Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Food Service, Laundry/Quartermaster, Commissary, Personal Property, Inmate Groups, Job Assignments, Library, Recovery Services, Recreation, Religious Services, Visiting, Telephone, Records, Legal Services, Discrimination, Security Classification, Institution Assignment, Special Management Housing, Protective Control, and Non Grievable Matters.

TABLE 104. Oakwood Correctional Facility

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Security Classification	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Staff Accountability	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Library	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Psychological/Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Inmate Accounts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Personal Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Job Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Force Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Special Management Housing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RESOLVED	0	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	14
TOTAL	0	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	14

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Dental Care, Safety and Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Food Service, Laundry/Quartermaster, Commissary, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Recreation, Religious Services, Mail/Package, Visiting, Telephone, Records, Legal Services, Discrimination, Institution Assignment, Housing Assignment, Protective Control, Non-Grievable Matters.

TABLE 105. Ohio Reformatory for Women

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	2	3	8	2	8	12	2	4	3	5	3	4	5	4	65
Staff Accountability	1	4	1	5	5	6	9	3	4	4	5	3	1	0	51
Personal Property	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	6	2	12	3	2	31
Force Supervision	3	6	1	2	3	2	0	4	2	2	2	1	2	1	31
Housing Assignment	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	17	5	0	1	0	1	31
Safety/ Sanitation	1	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	16
Laundry/Quartermaster	4	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	14
Mail/Packages	2	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	14
Discrimination	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	11
Non Grievable Matters	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	10
Food Services	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	8
Job Assignment	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Dental Care	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Inmate Groups	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Visiting	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Religious Services	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Inmate Accounts	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Library	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Psychological/Psychiatry	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Institution Assignment	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Recreation	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Commissary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Telephone	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Special Management Housing	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Security Classification	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
URESOLVED	11	20	20	18	23	20	12	10	32	26	11	22	8	13	246
RESOLVED	9	4	4	2	4	6	7	6	7	9	6	4	7	6	81
TOTAL	20	24	24	20	27	26	19	16	39	35	17	26	15	19	327

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Recovery Services, Legal Services, and Protective Control.

TABLE 106. Ohio State Penitentiary

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Personal Property	5	2	2	7	20	6	3	10	16	5	23	13	9	9	130
Force/ Supervision	3	6	6	6	14	6	4	6	7	5	20	7	5	12	107
Food Services	2	5	7	2	9	2	2	5	1	1	1	2	1	6	46
Health Care	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	1	0	7	3	7	3	3	42
Recreation	1	0	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	4	0	12	0	7	33
Staff Accountability	2	1	1	0	3	1	2	0	1	3	8	1	2	0	25
Non-Grievable Matters	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	13
Mail/ Package	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	11
Religious Services	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	10
Commissary	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	1	9
Inmate Accounts	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	2	1	0	9
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	2	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8
Telephone	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	5
Discrimination	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Records	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Safety/ Sanitation	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Security Classification	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Visitation	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	13	21	19	16	54	20	7	19	19	18	50	35	16	32	339
RESOLVED	4	5	6	14	15	5	9	11	9	13	17	16	10	12	149
TOTAL	20	26	25	30	69	25	16	30	28	31	67	51	26	44	488

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Psychological/Psychiatric, Dental Care, Inmate Account, Inmate Groups, Job Assignment, Recovery Services, Institution Assignment, and Protective Control.

TABLE 107. Pickaway Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/Supervision	8	1	5	10	5	14	2	7	4	-	4	-	-	-	60
Health Care	2	7	4	10	6	5	2	3	4	-	1	-	-	-	44
Personal Property	0	1	0	3	2	3	3	4	5	-	1	-	-	-	22
Discrimination	4	0	1	1	3	3	2	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	19
Non Grievable Matters	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	1	-	0	-	-	-	11
Safety/Sanitation	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	6
Food Service	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	-	-	-	4
Laundry/Quartermaster	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	3
Job Assignment	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	3
Housing Assignment	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	3
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	-	0	-	-	-	3
Mail/Package	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	2
Inmate Account	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	2
Religious Services	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-	1	-	-	-	2
Records	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	2
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	2
Commissary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	-	0	-	-	-	2
Institution Assignment	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	1
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	1
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	1
Staff Accountability	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	1
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	0	-	-	-	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	0	-	-	-	1
UNRESOLVED	16	12	12	22	17	24	14	19	14	-	3	-	-	-	153
RESOLVED	3	1	3	8	4	8	2	3	5	-	8	-	-	-	45
TOTAL	19	13	15	30	21	32	16	21	19	-	11	-	-	-	198

PCI did not provide reports for the months of July, September, October, and November 2004.

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Psychological/Psychiatric, Facilities/Maintenance, Recreation, Visitation, Telephone, Security Classification, and Protective Control.

TABLE 108. Richland Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	2	8	6	3	2	5	4	1	6	4	6	4	2	5	58
Personal Property	4	4	3	6	7	1	0	4	2	0	8	0	5	4	48
Force/ Supervision	3	1	4	0	1	3	3	4	3	1	2	3	4	7	39
Staff Accountability	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	20
Non Grievable Matters	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	13
Mail/Package	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	12
Inmate Account	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	11
Dental Care	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	7
Safety and Sanitation	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Commissary	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	5
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Job Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Visitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Education/Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNRESOLVED	14	21	12	6	7	9	6	9	12	11	22	15	12	20	176
RESOLVED	2	3	6	6	5	6	3	4	4	0	6	5	6	9	65
TOTAL	16	24	18	12	12	15	9	13	16	11	29	20	18	29	241

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Psychological/Psychiatric, Facilities Maintenance, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Recreation, Religious Services, Telephone, Legal Services, Security Classification, and Institution Assignment .

TABLE 109. Ross Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/Supervision	1	3	5	0	3	1	1	2	5	4	3	5	1	3	37
Health Care	3	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	5	24
Personal Property	1	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	3	4	20
Staff Accountability	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	11
Laundry/Quartermaster	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	9
Food Service	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	6
Institution Assignment	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Housing Assignment	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Library	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Mail/Package	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Inmate Account	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Job Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
Visiting	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Non-Grievable Matters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Special Management housing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Education/Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	8	9	8	5	7	5	4	3	7	8	12	8	6	11	101
RESOLVED	6	1	4	3	1	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	3	6	43
TOTAL	14	10	12	8	8	8	6	5	11	12	14	10	9	17	144

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Safety and Sanitation, Commissary, Protective Control, Security Classification, Legal Services, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Recovery Services, Religious Services, Telephone.

TABLE 110. Southeastern Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/Supervision	3	4	2	5	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	0	28
Personal Property	1	1	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	3	5	5	1	25
Health Care	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	11
Staff Accountability	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	6
Safety and Sanitation	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Inmate Account	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	5
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Non-Grievable Matters	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Mail/Package	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Visiting	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Food Service	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Recreation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Education/Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	7	9	7	5	3	6	5	2	2	4	5	4	7	2	68
RESOLVED	2	1	2	6	3	1	0	2	0	1	3	6	2	2	31
TOTAL	9	10	9	11	6	7	5	4	2	5	8	10	9	4	99

Complaints that were not reported for the period include: Special Management Housing, Facilities Maintenance, Commissary, Security Classification, Library, Legal Services, Psychological/Psychiatric (Mental Health Services), Laundry/Quartermaster, Job Assignment, Religious Services, Telephone, Housing Assignment, Force/Supervision

TABLE 111. Southern Ohio Correctional Facility

Complaints Grievied	Oct 03	Nov	Dec	Jan 04	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force/Supervision	10	11	4	17	10	18	6	9	6	14	12	12	9	13	151
Personal Property	6	1	8	7	8	13	8	10	11	10	16	12	9	10	129
Health Care	7	9	6	7	7	13	6	13	9	10	6	9	13	4	117
Mail/Package	4	3	5	1	2	4	1	4	6	8	2	2	2	3	47
Special Management	2	3	5	1	3	6	4	0	2	1	0	1	3	4	35
Housing															
Food Service	2	4	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	25
Inmate Account	2	1	3	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	0	2	3	21
Housing Assignment	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	0	1	1	1	18
Non-Grievable Matters	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	1	2	1	17
Staff Accountability	2	2	0	0	2	2	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	17
Legal Services	1	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	15
Discrimination	2	4	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	15
Job Assignment	0	2	0	4	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	14
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	13
Psychological/Psychiatric	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	13
Security Classification	1	0	0	0	14	2	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	10
Religious Services	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	9
Recreation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	1	0	8
Commissary	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	7
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	7
Visiting	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	6
Dental Care	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	6
Educational Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
Facilities Maintenance	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Safety and Sanitation	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Telephone	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
UNRESOLVED	40	39	34	38	43	65	31	50	42	48	42	46	43	41	602
RESOLVED	8	6	4	11	5	13	1	12	9	10	7	14	7	4	120
TOTAL	48	45	38	49	48	78	41	62	51	58	49	60	50	45	722

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Inmate Groups, Library, Records, and Protective Control.

TABLE 112. Toledo Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Force Supervision	16	21	9	2	5	7	0	3	8	0	1	0	1	5	78
Personal Property	2	3	0	2	3	5	0	3	27	4	6	0	2	6	63
Non Grievable Matters	2	13	0	0	0	4	1	3	3	6	1	0	0	2	35
Staff Accountability	3	8	0	2	3	8	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	2	33
Health Care	2	1	0	1	4	2	0	4	3	1	4	0	0	8	30
Food Services	7	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	18
Mail/ Packages	2	5	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	16
Inmate Accounts	2	2	0	1	1	3	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	15
Special management Housing	1	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	14
Protective Control	1	2	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Library	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	8
Recreation	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	8
Psychological/ Psychiatric	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Security Classification	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Commissary	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Visiting	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5
Job Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
Legal Services	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Facilities Maintenance	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Safety and Sanitation	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Dental Care	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Institution Assignment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Religious Services	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	39	58	6	10	14	41	2	23	44	18	16	0	4	28	303
RESOLVED	7	15	3	4	8	16	3	4	11	3	2	0	0	5	81
TOTAL	46	73	9	14	22	57	5	27	55	21	18	0	4	33	384

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Inmate Groups, and Telephone.

TABLE 113. Trumbull Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Health Care	6	0	3	2	3	1	3	8	6	3	3	4	1	2	45
Force/Supervision	1	6	4	2	4	6	2	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	39
Personal Property	0	0	1	2	3	9	3	3	5	4	3	2	1	2	38
Staff Accountability	3	1	3	3	1	5	2	5	3	4	0	4	1	1	36
Safety and Sanitation	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	3	0	1	0	1	3	0	16
Non-Grievable Matters	1	0	2	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	14
Library	1	4	0	1	0	1	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	14
Inmate Account	0	1	3	1	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	12
Mail/Package	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	1	8
Dental Care	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	7
Recreation	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
Laundry/Quartermaster	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
Food Services	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	5
Job Assignment	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Visiting	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Psychological/Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Legal Service	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Special Management Housing	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Housing Assignment	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Commissary	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Records	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Discrimination	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Educational/ Vocational Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Inmate Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Religious Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNRESOLVED	16	10	21	12	14	14	13	27	15	19	11	14	12	10	208
RESOLVED	9	7	2	5	3	4	7	2	3	9	3	3	6	3	66
TOTAL	25	17	23	17	17	18	20	29	18	28	14	17	18	13	274

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Facilities Maintenance, Telephone, Security Classification, and Protective Control.

TABLE 114. Warren Correctional Institution

Complaints Grieved	Oct 2003	Nov	Dec	Jan 2004	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Total
Personal Property	2	1	3	3	2	4	1	4	5	4	4	6	10	7	56
Health Care	3	3	5	1	2	6	3	6	1	1	2	2	3	4	42
Staff Accountability	3	3	3	0	2	3	4	5	3	3	4	1	1	2	37
Force/Supervision	2	2	1	2	2	6	3	2	1	2	3	1	5	3	35
Mail/ Packages	1	1	5	1	1	1	0	2	1	3	0	1	3	0	20
Non Grievable Matters	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	4	1	7	3	0	1	20
Special Management Housing	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	6	2	1	1	18
Inmate Account	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	15
Housing Assignment	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	13
Food Service	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	9
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Facility Maintenance	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Psychological/ Psychiatric	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Religious Services	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Inmate Groups	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Institution Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Recreation	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Commissary	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Job Assignments	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Records	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Visiting	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Recovery Services	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Laundry/ Quartermaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Discrimination	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Protective Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
UNRESOLVED	12	16	15	7	20	37	16	23	15	15	24	18	23	19	260
RESOLVED	1	2	5	3	2	4	4	5	6	4	7	7	7	1	55
TOTAL	13	18	20	10	22	41	20	28	21	19	31	25	30	20	315

Grievances were not filed in the following areas: Dental Care, Safety/Sanitation, Educational/Vocational Training, Telephone, and Security Classification.

GRIEVANCES FILED BY SUBJECT:

The following table provides data on the number of grievances filed from October 2003 to November 2004 by subject. Health care is the largest category of complaint, totaling 1,235 grievances, comprising 17% of all grievances filed in the period. The second largest category of complaint is Force/Supervision, with a total of 1,224 such grievances, comprising 16.8% of all grievances. The third largest group of complaint is Personal Property, with 1,146 grievances, comprising 15.7%.

In addition to the above referenced table on Grievances Filed by Subject, separate tables are provided on each category of complaint, presented in the order of largest category to smallest category. The number of grievances filed at each institution in that category is also provided.

**TABLE 115. SUBJECT OF GRIEVANCES FILED FROM
OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004**

TOTAL GRIEVANCES FILED (Listed by Type of Grievance)		
Grievance Complaint	Number of Grievances Filed	Percent of Total Grievances Filed
Health Care	1,235	17.0%
Force/Supervision	1,224	16.8
Personal Property	1,146	15.7
Staff Accountability	567	7.8
Safety/Sanitation	427	5.9
Mail/Package	327	4.5
Non-Grievable Matters	312	4.3
Food Service	268	3.7
Inmate Account	220	3.0
Housing Assignment	181	2.5
Discrimination	130	1.8
Job Assignments	112	1.5
Laundry/Quartermaster	111	1.5
Dental Care	104	1.4
Visiting	98	1.3
Special Management Housing	97	1.3
Recreation	92	1.3
Commissary	74	1.0
Religious Services	62	.9
Educational/Vocational Training	62	.9
Facilities Maintenance	61	.8
Library	60	.8
Psychological/Psychiatric Services	55	.8
Legal Services	55	.8
Records	47	.6
Institution Assignment	47	.6
Security Classification	30	.4
Recovery Services	26	.4
Inmate Group	26	.4
Protective Control	17	.2
Telephone	10	.1
TOTAL	7,381	100%

The following tables list the number of grievances filed by inmates for each specific grievance complaint during the time period of October 2003 to November 2004 by institution.

HEALTH CARE GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's HEALTH CARE Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide HEALTH CARE Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	117	16.2%	9.5%
Madison Correctional Institution	95	26.5	7.7
Mansfield Correctional Institution	87	16.2	7.0
Grafton Correctional Institution	84	27.2	6.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	82	23.8	6.6
Lebanon Correctional Institution	67	16.8	5.4
Ohio Reformatory for Women	65	19.9	5.3
North Central Correctional Institution	58	15.7	4.7
Richland Correctional Institution	58	24.1	4.7
Trumbull Correctional Institution	45	16.4	3.7
London Correctional Institution	44	23.4	3.6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	44	22.2	3.6
Ohio State Penitentiary	42	8.6	3.4
Warren Correctional Facility	42	13.3	3.4
Marion Correctional Institution	40	16.2	3.2
Allen Correctional Institution	38	12.3	3.1
Noble Correctional Institution	33	11.2	2.7
Toledo Correctional Institution	30	7.8	2.4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	28	17.4	2.3
Belmont Correctional Institution	25	19.5	2.0
Corrections Medical Center	25	45.5	2.0
Ross Correctional Institution	24	16.7	2.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	12	11.3	1.0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	11	11.1	.9
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	10	22.2	.8
Hocking Correctional Facility	7	43.8	.6
Correctional Reception Center	5	9.8	.4
Lima Correctional Institution	4	11.1	.3
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	4	20.0	.3
Franklin Pre-Release Center	3	1.7	.2
Northeast Pre-Release Center	3	25.0	.2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	3	21.4	.2
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	1,235	NA	100%

The subsections within Health Care include access/delay in receiving medical care, improper/inadequate medical care, delay/denial of medication, medical records, eye glasses, forced medical testing, medical transfer, prosthetic device, medical co-pay, medical restriction, medical aide/ device, other. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of grievances regarding Health Care, followed by the Madison Correctional Institution, Mansfield Correctional Institution, Grafton Correctional Institution, and Chillicothe Correctional Institution.

FORCE/SUPERVISION GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's FORCE /SUPERVISION Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide FORCE /SUPERVISION Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	151	20.9%	12.3%
Ohio State Penitentiary	107	21.9	8.7
Lebanon Correctional Institution	96	24.1	7.8
Toledo Correctional Institution	78	20.3	6.4
Noble Correctional Institution	75	25.5	6.1
Madison Correctional Institution	62	17.3	5.1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	60	30.3	4.9
Mansfield Correctional Institution	43	8.0	3.5
Allen Correctional Institution	41	13.2	3.3
Richland Correctional Institution	39	16.2	3.2
Trumbull Correctional Institution	39	14.2	3.2
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	38	11.0	3.1
Grafton Correctional Institution	38	12.3	3.1
Lorain Correctional Institution	37	34.9	3.0
Ross Correctional Institution	37	25.7	3.0
Warren Correctional Institution	35	11.1	2.9
Correctional Reception Center	34	66.7	2.8
North Central Correctional Institution	33	8.9	2.7
Ohio Reformatory for Women	31	9.5	2.5
Southeastern Correctional Institution	28	28.3	2.3
London Correctional Institution	23	12.2	1.9
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	19	11.8	1.5
Marion Correctional Institution	19	7.7	1.5
Belmont Correctional Institution	18	14.1	1.5
Corrections Medical Center	15	27.3	1.2
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	7	35.0	.5
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	6	13.3	.5
Franklin Pre -Release Center	5	2.8	.4
Lima Correctional Institution	5	13.9	.4
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	1.0	.2
Dayton Correctional Institution	2	25	.2
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	6.3	.1
Northeast Pre-Release Center	1	8.3	.1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	.1
TOTAL	1,224	NA	100%

The subsections within Force/Supervision include use of force with no report, abusive language, racial or ethnic slurs, conduct report for no reason, intimidation/threats, retaliation for filing grievance, retaliation for filing lawsuit, retaliation for voicing complaints, privacy violations, harassment, other. As shown above, the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of grievances in the Force/Supervision category, comprising nearly 21% of the SOCF grievances and comprising 12.3% of system wide grievances regarding Force/Supervision.

PERSONAL PROPERTY GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's PERSONAL PROPERTY Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide PERSONAL PROPERTY Grievances Filed
Ohio State Penitentiary	130	26.6%	11.3%
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	129	17.9	11.3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	86	16.0	7.5
North Central Correctional Institution	75	20.3	6.5
Toledo Correctional Institution	63	16.4	5.5
Warren Correctional Institution	56	17.8	4.9
Lebanon Correctional Institution	52	13.1	4.5
Allen Correctional Institution	50	16.1	4.4
Noble Correctional Institution	48	16.3	4.2
Richland Correctional Institution	48	19.9	4.2
Madison Correctional Institution	44	12.3	3.8
Grafton Correctional Institution	40	12.9	3.5
Marion Correctional Institution	39	15.8	3.4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	38	13.9	3.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	37	10.8	3.2
Belmont Correctional Institution	35	27.3	3.1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	31	9.5	2.7
London Correctional Institution	25	13.3	2.2
Southeastern Correctional Institution	25	25.3	2.2
Pickaway Correctional Institution	22	11.1	1.9
Ross Correctional Institution	20	13.9	1.8
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	17	10.6	1.5
Lorain Correctional Institution	17	9.0	1.5
Corrections Medical Center	4	7.3	.4
Lima Correctional Institution	3	11.1	.3
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	3	6.7	.3
Dayton Correctional Institution	2	25.0	.2
Hocking Correctional Facility	2	12.5	.2
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	2	10.0	.2
Correctional Reception Center	1	2.0	.1
Franklin Pre -Release Center	1	.6	.1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	.1
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,146	N/A	100%

The subsections within Personal Property include lost, damaged, confiscated by staff; stolen or damaged by inmate; denied permission to receive/possess; and other.

The Ohio State Penitentiary and Southern Ohio Correctional Facility have the largest number of personal property grievances in the prison system, with 130 and 129 respectively, together comprising 22.6% of all property grievances system wide.

STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY Grievances Filed
Ohio Reformatory for Women	51	15.6%	8.9%
Noble Correctional Institution	46	15.6	8.1
Grafton Correctional Institution	40	12.9	7.1
Allen Correctional Institution	37	11.9	6.5
Warren Correctional Institution	37	11.7	6.5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	36	13.1	6.3
Madison Correctional Institution	34	9.5	6.0
Toledo Correctional Institution	33	8.6	5.8
Marion Correctional Institution	30	12.1	5.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	26	7.6	4.6
Lebanon Correctional Institution	25	6.3	4.4
North Central Correctional Institution	25	6.8	4.4
Ohio State Penitentiary	25	5.1	4.4
Richland Correctional Institution	20	8.3	3.5
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	17	2.4	3.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	15	11.7	2.6
London Correctional Institution	11	5.9	1.9
Ross Correctional Institution	11	7.6	1.9
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	10	6.2	1.8
Lorain Correctional Institution	10	9.4	1.8
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	8	17.8	1.4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	6	9.1	1.1
Lima Correctional Institution	5	13.9	.9
Corrections Reception Center	3	5.9	.5
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	2	10	.4
Franklin Pre Release Center	1	.6	.2
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	8.3	.2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	.2
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	.2
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	567	NA	100%

The subsections within Staff Accountability include access to staff, failure to perform job duties, failure to respond to communication, failure to follow policies, and other.

The Ohio Reformatory for Women has the largest number of grievances regarding Staff Accountability, with 51, comprising 8.9 percent of all system wide grievances in the category. Noble and Grafton Correctional Institutions have the second and third largest number of grievances in the category, with 46 and 40 respectively.

SAFETY AND SANITATION GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's SAFETY SANITATION Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide SAFETY SANITATION Grievances Filed
Franklin Pre Release Center	162	89.5%	37.9%
North Central Correctional Institution	73	19.7	17.1
Allen Correctional Institution	19	6.1	4.4
Grafton Correctional Institution	18	5.8	4.2
Noble Correctional Institution	16	5.4	3.7
Ohio Reformatory for Women	16	4.9	3.7
Trumbull Correctional Institution	16	5.8	3.7
Lebanon Correctional Institution	15	3.8	3.5
Belmont Correctional Institution	14	10.9	3.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	14	4.1	3.3
Madison Correctional Institution	13	3.6	3.0
London Correctional Institution	9	4.8	2.1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	6	3.0	1.4
Richland Correctional Institution	6	2.5	1.4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	5	5.0	1.2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4	2.5	.9
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	.7	.9
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	.9
Southern Ohio Correctional Institution	4	.6	.9
Toledo Correctional Institution	4	1.0	.9
Lima Correctional Institution	2	5.6	.5
Corrections Medical Center	1	1.8	.2
Marion Correctional Institution	1	.4	.2
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	.2
Corrections Reception Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	427	NA	100%

The subsections within Safety and Sanitation include fire safety measures, dirty living quarters/work areas, cleaning supplies, vermin, unsafe living areas, smoking/no-smoking, unsafe work practices, handicapped facilities, overcrowding, air/water quality, and other. The Franklin Pre-Release Center had the most grievances filed due to a large number of grievances pertaining to a smoking incident that occurred. North Central had the second largest number of grievances in the category, with 73, comprising nearly 20 percent of the grievances filed at NCCI.

MAIL/PACKAGE GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's MAIL/PACKAGE Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide MAIL/PACKAGE Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	47	6.5%	14.4%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	38	7.1	11.6
Marion Correctional Institution	33	13.4	10.1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	22	5.5	6.7
Warren Correctional Institution	20	6.3	6.1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	17	4.9	5.2
Toledo Correctional Institution	16	4.2	4.9
Allen Correctional Institution	15	4.8	4.6
Ohio Reformatory for Women	14	4.3	4.3
Grafton Correctional Institution	12	3.9	3.7
North Central Correctional Institution	12	3.2	3.7
Richland Correctional Institution	12	5.0	3.7
Ohio State Penitentiary	11	2.3	3.4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	8	2.9	2.4
London Correctional Institution	7	3.7	2.1
Noble Correctional Institution	7	2.4	2.1
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	6	3.7	1.8
Lima Correctional Institution	4	11.1	1.2
Madison Correctional Institution	4	1.1	1.2
Belmont Correctional Institution	4	3.1	1.2
Ross Correctional Institution	3	2.1	.9
Corrections Reception Center	2	3.9	.6
Lorain Correctional Institution	2	1.9	.6
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	2	10	.6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	2	4.4	.6
Northeast Pre Release Center	2	16.7	.6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	.5	.6
Southeastern Correctional Institution	2	1.0	.6
Franklin Pre Release Center	1	.6	.3
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	327	NA	100%

The subsections within Mail / Package include delay/failure in delivery, delay/failure in sending, publication screening, handling of legal mail, handling of packages, damaged or missing, denial, postage charges, and other.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of grievances in the Mail/Package category, with 47, comprising 14.4% of the grievances in the category system wide, followed by Mansfield and Marion Correctional Institutions with 38 and 33 grievances in the category, respectively.

GRIEVANCES ON NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's NON GRIEVABLE MATTERS Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide NON GRIEVABLE MATTERS Grievances Filed
Toledo Correctional Institution	35	9.1%	11.2%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	25	4.7	8.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	23	5.8	7.4
Madison Correctional Institution	22	6.1	7.1
Warren Correctional Institution	20	6.3	6.4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	18	5.2	5.8
North Central Correctional Institution	18	4.9	5.8
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	17	2.4	5.4
London Correctional Institution	16	8.5	5.1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	14	5.1	4.5
Ohio State Penitentiary	13	2.7	4.2
Richland Correctional Institution	13	5.4	4.2
Marion Correctional Institution	12	4.9	3.8
Noble Correctional Institution	12	4.1	3.8
Pickaway Correctional Institution	11	5.6	3.5
Ohio Reformatory for Women	10	3.1	3.2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	8	5.0	2.6
Grafton Correctional Institution	5	1.6	1.6
Lorain Correctional Institution	5	4.7	1.6
Allen Correctional Institution	4	1.3	1.3
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3	3.0	1.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	2	1.6	.6
Corrections Medical Center	2	3.6	.6
Ross Correctional Institution	2	1.4	.6
Franklin Pre Release Center	1	.6	.3
Hocking Correctional Institution	1	6.3	.3
Corrections Reception Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	0	0	0
North Central Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
TOTAL	312	NA	100%

The subsections within Non-Grievable Matters include RIB / hearing officer, APA, court, legislative action, separate appeal process.

FOOD SERVICE GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's FOOD SERVICE Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide FOOD SERVICE Grievances Filed
Ohio State Penitentiary	46	9.4%	17.2%
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	25	3.7	9.3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	24	4.5	9.0
Allen Correctional Institution	22	7.1	8.2
Toledo Correctional Institution	18	4.7	6.7
North Central Correctional Institution	16	4.3	6.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	13	3.3	4.9
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	12	3.5	4.5
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	12	7.5	4.5
London Correctional Institution	11	5.9	4.1
Madison Correctional Institution	10	2.8	3.7
Warren Correctional Institution	9	2.9	3.4
Ohio Reformatory for Women	8	2.5	3.0
Marion Correctional Institution	6	2.4	2.2
Ross Correctional Institution	6	4.2	2.2
Trumbull Correctional Institution	6	2.2	2.2
Pickaway Correctional Institution	4	2.0	1.5
Richland Correctional Institution	4	1.7	1.5
Lima Correctional Institution	3	8.3	1.1
Lorain Correctional Institution	3	2.8	1.1
Noble Correctional Institution	3	1.0	1.1
Grafton Correctional Institution	2	.6	.7
Corrections Medical Center	1	1.8	.4
Dayton Correctional Institution	1	1.3	.4
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	6.3	.4
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	1	5.0	.4
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	.4
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	.4
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Corrections Reception Center	0	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
TOTAL	268	NA	100%

The subsections within Food Service include food temperature, food not properly prepared, poor quality, deviation from menu, inadequate substitute, foreign object in food, food portions, medical diet, religious diet, unsanitary cooking conditions, denial, and other. The Ohio State Penitentiary has the largest number of grievances in the Food Service category, with 46, comprising 17.2% of all system wide grievances in the category. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Mansfield Correctional Institution, and Allen Correctional Institution had from 22 to 25 grievances regarding Food Service.

INMATE ACCOUNT GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 124. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: Inmate Account (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's INMATE ACCOUNT Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide INMATE ACCOUNT Grievances Filed
Mansfield Correctional Institution	31	5.8%	14.1%
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	21	2.9	9.5
Toledo Correctional Institution	15	3.9	6.8
Warren Correctional Institution	15	4.8	6.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	14	4.1	6.4
Marion Correctional Institution	14	5.7	6.4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	12	4.4	5.5
Richland Correctional Institution	11	4.6	5.0
Madison Correctional Institution	10	2.8	4.5
Ohio State Penitentiary	9	1.8	4.1
London Correctional Institution	8	4.3	3.6
North Central Correctional Institution	8	2.2	3.6
Grafton Correctional Institution	6	1.9	2.7
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6	1.5	2.7
Lorain Correctional Institution	6	5.7	2.7
Allen Correctional Institution	5	1.6	2.3
Southeastern Correctional Institution	5	5.1	2.3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4	2.5	1.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	2.3	1.4
Ohio Reformatory for Women	3	.9	1.4
Ross Correctional Institution	3	2.1	1.4
Noble Correctional Institution	2	.7	.9
Northeast Pre Release Center	2	16.7	.9
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	1.0	.9
Corrections Reception Center	1	2.0	.5
Corrections Medical Center	1	1.8	.5
Lima Correctional Institution	1	2.8	.5
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	.5
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	.5
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	0	0	0
TOTAL	220	NA	100%

The subsections within Inmate Account include funds lost / not posted, funds improperly refused, account balance, state pay, court ordered collection (AR 5120-5-03), and other.

The Mansfield Correctional Institution had the largest number of grievances pertaining to Inmate Accounts, with 31, comprising 14.1% of all grievances system wide in the category, followed by the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 21, comprising 9.5% of all grievances system wide in the category.

HOUSING ASSIGNMENT GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's HOUSING ASSIGNMENT Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide HOUSING ASSIGNMENT Grievances Filed
Ohio Reformatory for Women	31	9.5%	17.1%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	21	3.9	11.6
Southern Ohio Correctional Institution	18	2.5	9.9
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	14	4.1	7.7
Warren Correctional Institution	13	4.1	7.2
Grafton Correctional Institution	11	3.6	6.1
London Correctional Institution	10	5.5	5.5
Allen Correctional Institution	9	2.9	5.0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	7	1.8	3.9
Madison Correctional Institution	7	1.9	3.9
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	6	3.7	3.3
Richland Correctional Institution	5	2.1	2.8
North Central Correctional Institution	4	1.1	2.2
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	2.2
Ross Correctional Institution	4	2.8	2.2
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	2.3	1.7
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3	1.5	1.7
Marion Correctional Institution	2	.8	1.1
Noble Correctional Institution	2	.7	1.1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	2	.7	1.1
Corrections Reception Center	1	2	.6
Lima Correctional Institution	1	2.8	.6
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	.6
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	8.3	.6
Toledo Correctional Institution	1	.3	.6
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	181	NA	100%

The subsections for Housing Assignment include unit assignment, cell / bed assignment, racial bunching, and other.

The Ohio Reformatory for Women had the largest number of grievances regarding Housing Assignment, with 31, which comprised 9.5% of the grievances filed at ORW, and represented 17.1 percent of system wide grievances regarding Housing Assignment. Mansfield Correctional Institution had 21 grievances in the category, comprising 11.6% of system wide grievances regarding Housing Assignment.

DISCRIMINATION GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's DISCRIMINATION Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide DISCRIMINATION Grievances Filed
Madison Correctional Institution	24	6.7%	18.5%
Pickaway Correctional Institution	19	9.6	14.6
Southern Ohio Correctional Institution	15	2.1	11.5
Noble Correctional Institution	11	3.7	8.5
Ohio Reformatory for Women	11	3.4	8.5
Allen Correctional Institution	9	2.9	6.9
Lebanon Correctional Institution	4	1.0	3.1
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	.2	3.1
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	3.1
Corrections Reception Center	3	5.9	2.3
Grafton Correctional Institution	3	1.0	2.3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3	1.9	2.3
Ross Correctional Institution	3	2.1	2.3
Southeastern Correctional Institution	3	3.0	2.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	.6	1.5
London Correctional Institution	2	1.1	1.5
Richland Correctional Institution	2	1.1	1.5
Franklin Pre Release Center	1	.6	.8
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	.8
Marion Correctional Institution	1	.4	.8
North Central Correctional Institution	1	.2	.8
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	.8
Toledo Correctional Institution	1	.3	.8
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	.4	.8
Warren Correctional Institution	1	.3	.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
TOTAL	130	NA	100%

The subsections for Discrimination (race, creed, color, national origin, or sexual preference) include programs, jobs, benefits, disciplinary action, transfer, and other.

There were 130 grievances filed regarding Discrimination, with the largest volume filed at the Madison Correctional Institution, with 24 such grievances, comprising 18.5% of system wide grievances regarding Discrimination. The Pickaway Correctional Institution had the second largest number of grievances in the category with 19, comprising 9.6% of the grievances at PCI, and 14.6% of system wide grievances regarding Discrimination.

JOB ASSIGNMENT GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's JOB ASSIGNMENTS Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide JOB ASSIGNMENTS Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	14	1.9%	12.5%
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	10	2.9	8.9
Grafton Correctional Institution	8	2.6	7.1
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8	1.5	7.1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	8	2.4	7.1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6	1.5	5.4
Madison Correctional Institution	6	1.7	5.4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5	3.1	4.5
Noble Correctional Institution	5	1.7	4.5
Toledo Correctional Institution	5	1.3	4.5
London Correctional Institution	4	2.1	3.8
Marion Correctional Institution	4	1.6	3.8
Ross Correctional Institution	4	2.8	3.8
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4	1.5	3.8
Lorain Correctional Institution	3	2.8	2.7
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3	1.5	2.7
Warren Correctional Institution	3	1.0	2.7
Allen Correctional Institution	2	.6	1.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	2	1.6	1.8
Corrections Medical Center	2	3.6	1.8
North Central Correctional Institution	2	.5	1.8
Richland Correctional Institution	2	.8	1.8
Lima Correctional Institution	1	2.8	.9
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	.9
Correctional Reception Center	0	.0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	.0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	.0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	.0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	.0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	.0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	.0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	.0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	.0	0
TOTAL	112	NA	100%

The subsections for Job Assignments include job assignment, job removal, preferential treatment, racial balance, evaluations, and other.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Chillicothe Correctional Institution have the largest number of grievances regarding Job Assignments, with 14 and 10 respectively. Their 24 grievances in the category comprise 21.4% of system wide grievances regarding Job Assignments.

LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 128. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: Laundry/Quartermaster (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER Grievances Filed
Ohio Reformatory for Women	14	4.3	12.6
Southern Ohio Correctional Institution	13	1.8	11.7
Ross Correctional Institution	9	6.3	8.1
Allen Correctional Institution	8	2.6	7.2
Lebanon Correctional Institution	8	2.0	7.2
Ohio State Penitentiary	8	1.6	7.2
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	7	2.0	6.3
North Central Correctional Institution	6	1.6	5.4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5	3.1	4.5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	5	1.8	4.5
Grafton Correctional Institution	4	1.3	3.6
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	.7	3.6
Noble Correctional Institution	3	1	2.7
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3	1.5	2.7
Lima Correctional Institution	2	5.5	1.8
Lorain Correctional Institution	2	1.9	1.8
Richland Correctional Institution	2	.8	1.8
Toledo Correctional Institution	2	.5	1.8
Warren Correctional Institution	2	.6	1.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	1	.8	.9
Franklin Pre -Release Center	1	.6	.9
Marion Correctional Institution	1	.4	.9
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	.9
Corrections Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	111	NA	100%

The subsections for Laundry / Quartermaster (State clothing / bedding) include clothing lost / not returned, clothing damaged, improperly charged for damaged clothing, received soiled / damaged linen, denied exchange, does not fit, refusal to alter / repair clothing, denied item, and other. The Ohio Reformatory for Women and Southern Ohio Correctional Facility have the largest number of grievances in the Laundry/Quartermaster category with 14 and 13 respectively. Together, they account for 24.3% of all grievances in the category.

DENTAL CARE GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's DENTAL CARE Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide DENTAL CARE Grievances Filed
Grafton Correctional Institution	14	4.5%	13.5%
Lebanon Correctional Institution	8	2.0	7.7
North Central Correctional Institution	8	2.2	7.7
Marion Correctional Institution	7	2.8	6.7
Richland Correctional Institution	7	2.9	6.7
Trumbull Correctional Institution	7	2.6	6.7
Allen Correctional Institution	6	1.9	5.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	6	1.7	5.8
Mansfield Correctional Institution	6	1.1	5.8
Noble Correctional Institution	6	2.0	5.8
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	6	.8	5.8
Ohio Reformatory for Women	4	1.2	3.8
Toledo Correctional Institution	4	1.0	3.8
Corrections Medical Center	2	3.6	1.9
Lima Correctional Institution	2	5.6	1.9
Lorain Correctional Institution	2	1.9	1.9
Dayton Correctional Institution	1	1.3	1.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	6.3	1.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1	.6	1.0
London Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.0
Madison Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	1.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.0
Ross Correctional Institution	1	.7	1.0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	1.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	104	NA	100%

The subsections for Dental Care include access / delay in receiving dental care, improper / inadequate dental care, delay / denial of dentures, dental co-pay, and other.

Grafton Correctional Institution has the largest number of grievances regarding Dental Care, with 14 grievances, comprising 13.5% of system wide grievances regarding Dental Care. Lebanon Correctional Institution and North Central Correctional Institution both had eight grievances each in the category, and Marion, Richland and Trumbull Correctional Institutions each had seven grievances regarding Dental Care.

VISITING GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 130. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: VISITING (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's VISITING Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide VISITING Grievances Filed
Mansfield Correctional Institution	13	2.4%	13.3%
Lebanon Correctional Institution	10	2.5	10.2
Grafton Correctional Institution	8	2.6	8.2
Allen Correctional Institution	7	2.3	7.1
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	6	.8	6.1
Madison Correctional Institution	5	1.4	5.1
Noble Correctional Institution	5	1.7	5.1
North Central Correctional Institution	5	1.4	5.1
Toledo Correctional Institution	5	1.3	5.1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	4	1.2	4.1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4	1.5	4.1
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	2.3	3.1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	3	.9	3.1
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3	1.9	3.1
Marion Correctional Institution	3	1.2	3.1
Ohio State Penitentiary	2	.4	2.0
Ross Correctional Institution	2	1.4	2.0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	2	2.0	2.0
Warren Correctional Institution	2	.6	2.0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	1	.6	1.0
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	6.3	1.0
London Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	1.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	1.0
Richland Correctional Institution	1	.4	1.0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	98	NA	100%

The subsections for Visiting include visitor not approved / removed from list, visitor denied access, visit cut short, hours, rules, special visit, and other.

The Mansfield and Lebanon Correctional Institutions have the largest number of grievances in the Visiting category, with 13 and 10, respectively. Together, their visiting grievances account for 23.5% of all grievances regarding Visiting system wide.

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	35	4.8%	36.1%
Warren Correctional Institution	18	5.7	18.6
Toledo Correctional Institution	14	3.6	14.4
Mansfield Correctional Institution	5	.9	5.2
North Central Correctional Institution	4	1.1	4.1
Madison Correctional Institution	3	.8	3.1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	.6	2.1
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	1.2	2.1
Richland Correctional Institution	2	.8	2.1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	2	.7	2.1
Allen Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.0
Belmont Correctional Institution	1	.8	1.0
London Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.0
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	1.0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	1.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	1.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	.3	1.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	1	.2	1.0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.0
Ross Correctional Institution	1	.7	1.0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	97	NA	100%

The subsections for Special Management Housing include placement, release, privileges, and other.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Warren Correctional Institution and Toledo Correctional Institution have the largest number of grievances in the Special Management Housing category, with 35, 18 and 14 respectively. The three facilities account for a total of 69% of all grievances in the category system wide.

RECREATION GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 132. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: RECREATION (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's RECREATION Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide RECREATION Grievances Filed
Ohio State Penitentiary	33	6.8%	35.9%
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	8	1.1	8.7
Toledo Correctional Institution	8	2.1	8.7
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	6	1.7	6.5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	6	1.1	6.5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	6	2.2	6.5
Noble Correctional Institution	4	1.4	4.3
Warren Correctional Institution	4	1.3	4.3
Allen Correctional Institution	3	1.0	3.3
Madison Correctional Institution	2	.6	2.2
North Central Correctional Institution	2	.5	2.2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2	.6	2.2
Ross Correctional Institution	2	1.4	2.2
Correctional Reception Center	1	2.0	1.1
Corrections Medical Center	1	1.8	1.1
Lima Correctional Institution	1	2.8	1.1
London Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.1
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	1.1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	1.1
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	92	NA	100%

The subsections for Recreation include recreation facilities / equipment, selection of activities, recreation hours, and other.

The Ohio State Penitentiary had the largest number of grievances regarding recreation, comprising 35.9% of all recreation grievances system wide.

COMMISSARY GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 133. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: COMMISSARY (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's COMMISSARY Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide COMMISSARY Grievances Filed
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	10	2.9%	13.5%
Ohio State Penitentiary	9	1.8	12.2
Allen Correctional Institution	7	2.3	9.5
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	7	1.0	9.5
North Central Correctional Institution	6	1.6	8.1
Richland Correctional Institution	5	2.1	6.8
Toledo Correctional Institution	5	1.3	6.8
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	.7	5.4
Marion Correctional Institution	4	1.6	5.4
Warren Correctional Institution	3	1.0	4.1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2	.5	2.7
London Correctional Institution	2	1.1	2.7
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2	.6	2.7
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	.1	2.7
Trumbull Correctional Institution	2	.7	2.7
Belmont Correctional Institution	1	.9	1.4
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.4
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	6.3	1.4
Madison Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.4
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	74	NA	100%

The subsections for Commissary include charged for item not received, denied commissary privileges, inadequate selection, insufficient quantities, pricing, poor quality, exchange / refund, warranty, and other.

The Chillicothe Correctional Institution and Ohio State Penitentiary have the largest number of grievances regarding Commissary, with 10 and 9 respectively.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's RELIGIOUS SERVICES Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide RELIGIOUS SERVICES Grievances Filed
Ohio State Penitentiary	10	2.1%	16.1%
Lebanon Correctional Institution	9	2.3	14.5
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	9	1.3	14.5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	6	1.1	9.7
Warren Correctional Institution	4	1.3	6.5
Franklin Pre -Release Center	3	1.7	4.8
Madison Correctional Institution	3	.8	4.8
Marion Correctional Institution	3	1.2	4.8
Ohio Reformatory for Women	3	.9	4.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	.6	3.2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	1.2	3.2
London Correctional Institution	2	1.1	3.2
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	1.0	3.2
Corrections Medical Center	1	1.8	1.6
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	1.6
Toledo Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.6
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	.4	1.6
Allen Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	62	NA	100%

The subsections for Religious Services include prevented from worship, religious materials, services for particular faith, and other.

The Ohio State Penitentiary had the largest number of grievances filed regarding Religious Services, with 10, though Lebanon Correctional Institution and Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had nine grievances each in the category. The grievances at the three institutions comprise 45.2% of all grievances regarding Religious Services.

**EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL TRAINING GRIEVANCES
BY INSTITUTION**

TABLE 135. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: EDUCATION/VOCATIONAL TRAINING (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's EDUCATION/ VOCATIONAL TRAINING Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide EDUCATION/ VOCATIONAL TRAINING Grievances Filed
Marion Correctional Institution	10	4.1%	16.1%
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5	3.1	8.1
Mansfield Correctional Institution	5	.9	8.1
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	5	.7	8.1
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	4	1.2	6.5
Lebanon Correctional Institution	4	1.0	6.5
Madison Correctional Institution	4	1.1	6.5
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	6.5
Pickaway Correctional Institution	3	1.5	4.8
Grafton Correctional Institution	2	.7	3.2
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	2	10.0	3.2
North Central Correctional Institution	2	.5	3.2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2	.6	3.2
Toledo Correctional Institution	2	.5	3.2
London Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.6
Noble Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.6
Northeast Pre-Release Center	1	8.3	1.6
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	1.6
Richland Correctional Institution	1	.4	1.6
Ross Correctional Institution	1	.7	1.6
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	1.6
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	.4	1.6
Allen Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	62	NA	100%

The subsections for Education/Vocational Training include education programs, vocational programs, and other.

The Marion Correctional Institution has the largest number of grievances in the category of Education/Vocational Training, with 10 grievances, comprising 16.1% of all grievances in the category system wide.

FACILITIES MAINTENANCE GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's FACILITIES MAINTENANCE Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide FACILITIES MAINTENANCE Grievances Filed
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	8	2.3%	13.1%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8	1.5	13.1
Ohio State Penitentiary	8	1.6	13.1
Allen Correctional Institution	6	1.9	9.8
Warren Correctional Institution	6	1.9	9.8
Marion Correctional Institution	4	1.6	6.6
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	4	.6	6.6
Toledo Correctional Institution	4	1.0	6.6
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3	1.9	4.9
Lebanon Correctional Institution	3	.8	4.9
London Correctional Institution	2	1.1	3.3
Belmont Correctional Institution	1	.8	1.6
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.6
Madison Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.6
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	.3	1.6
Ross Correctional Institution	1	.7	1.6
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	61	NA	100%

The subsections for Facilities Maintenance include toilets, sewers, showers or sinks, water temperature, building temperature, lighting, ventilation, ceilings, painting / repair, windows, privacy screens, and other.

The Chillicothe and Mansfield Correctional Institutions, and the Ohio State Penitentiary have the largest number of grievances regarding Facilities Maintenance, with eight grievances each, together accounting for 29.3% of all grievances in the category system wide.

LIBRARY GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 137. INSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES: LIBRARY (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's LIBRARY Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide LIBRARY Grievances Filed
Trumbull Correctional Institution	14	5.1%	23.3%
Toledo Correctional Institution	8	2.1	13.3
Allen Correctional Institution	7	2.3	11.7
Noble Correctional Institution	4	1.4	6.7
Ross Correctional Institution	4	2.8	6.7
Lebanon Correctional Institution	3	.8	5.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	3	.9	5.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	1.2	3.3
London Correctional Institution	2	1.5	3.3
Marion Correctional Institution	2	.8	3.3
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2	.3	3.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.7
Lima Correctional Institution	1	2.8	1.7
Madison Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.7
North Central Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.7
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	1.7
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	1.7
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	1.7
Richland Correctional Institution	1	.4	1.7
Warren Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.7
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	60	NA	100%

The subsections for Library include library materials, library hours, and other.

The Trumbull Correctional Institution has the largest number of grievances regarding the Library, with 14, accounting for 23.3% of all grievances system wide in the category. The Toledo and Allen Correctional Institutions rank second and third, with eight grievances and seven grievances, respectively. Grievances from the three prisons account for 48.3% of all grievances in the category system wide.

PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHIATRIC GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 138. Institutional Grievances: PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHIATRIC (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's PSYCHOLOGICAL /PSYCHIATRIC Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide PSYCHOLOGICAL /PSYCHIATRIC Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	13	1.8%	23.6%
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6	1.5	10.9
Toledo Correctional Institution	6	1.6	10.9
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	5	1.5	9.1
Warren Correctional Institution	5	1.6	9.1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4	1.5	7.3
Grafton Correctional Institution	3	1.0	5.5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	3	.6	5.5
Ohio Reformatory for Women	3	.9	5.5
Noble Correctional Institution	2	.7	3.6
Allen Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.8
Lima Correctional Institution	1	2.8	1.8
North Central Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.8
Northeast Pre-Release Center	1	8.3	1.8
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	7.1	1.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	55	N/A	100%

The subsections for Psychological / Psychiatric include denial / inadequate treatment, forced treatment, RTU assignment, psychiatric medication, psych co-pay, mental health files, and other.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of grievances in the Psychological/Psychiatric category, with 13 or 23.6% of all grievances system wide regarding Mental Health. Lebanon and Toledo Correctional Institutions rank second with six grievances each in the category. Chillicothe and Warren Correctional Institutions rank third with five grievances each regarding Mental Health.

LEGAL SERVICES GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's LEGAL SERVICES Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide LEGAL SERVICES Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	15	2.1%	27.3%
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	8	5.0	14.5
Warren Correctional Institution	6	1.9	10.9
Toledo Correctional Institution	5	1.3	9.1
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	7.3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	3	.6	5.5
Noble Correctional Institution	3	1.0	5.5
North Central Correctional Institution	2	.5	3.6
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	1.0	3.6
Trumbull Correctional Institution	2	.7	3.6
Allen Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.8
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	.3	1.8
Lorain Correctional Institution	1	.9	1.8
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	1	2.2	1.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	55	N/A	100%

The subsections for Legal Services include law library hours, legal reference materials, legal assistance, typewriters, legal kit, copy service, notary service, legal service in special management, access to legal property, and other.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of grievances regarding Legal Services, with 15 grievances in the category, accounting for 27.3% of all grievances in the prison system pertaining to Legal Services. Lake Erie and Warren Correctional Institution rank second and third with eight grievances and six grievances, respectively.

RECORDS GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 140. Institutional Grievances: RECORDS (10/03 – 11/04)

Institution	Number of Institution's RECORDS Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide RECORDS Grievances Filed
Allen Correctional Institution	5	1.6%	10.6%
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	5	3.1	10.6
Marion Correctional Institution	5	2.0	10.6
Noble Correctional Institution	4	1.4	8.5
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	8.5
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2	.5	4.3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2	.4	4.3
North Central Correctional Institution	2	.5	4.3
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	2	4.4	4.3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2	1.0	4.3
Richland Correctional Institution	2	.8	4.3
Trumbull Correctional Institution	2	.7	4.3
Warren Correctional Institution	2	.6	4.3
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	.3	2.1
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	.3	2.1
Hocking Correctional Facility	1	6.3	2.1
Madison Correctional Institution	1	.3	2.1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	.3	2.1
Ross Correctional Institution	1	.7	2.1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	2.1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1	.3	2.1
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0	0
TOTAL	47	N/A	100%

The subsections for Records include good time credit, jail time credit, inaccurate calculation, release of information, earned credit, and other.

Allen, Lake Erie and Marion Correctional Institutions have the largest number of grievances pertaining to Records, with five grievances each in the category. The Noble Correctional Institution and the Ohio State Penitentiary rank second, with four grievances each regarding Records.

INSTITUTION ASSIGNMENT GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's INSTITUTION ASSIGNMENT Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide INSTITUTION ASSIGNMENT Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	7	1.0%	14.9%
Lebanon Correctional Institution	6	1.5	12.8
London Correctional Institution	4	2.1	8.5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	4	.7	8.5
Ross Correctional Institution	4	2.8	8.5
Warren Correctional Facility	4	1.3	8.5
Allen Correctional Institution	3	1.0	6.4
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	.6	4.3
Madison Correctional Institution	2	.6	4.3
Marion Correctional Institution	2	.8	4.3
North Central Correctional Institution	2	.5	4.3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2	.6	4.3
Toledo Correctional Institution	2	.5	4.3
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	2.1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	2.1
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	.4	2.1
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	47	N/A	100%

The subsections for Institution Assignment include transfer or denial, and other.

The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Lebanon Correctional Institution have the largest number of grievances regarding Institution Assignment, with seven and six respectively. The two institutions account for 27.6% of all grievances pertaining to Institution Assignment.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Grievances Filed
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	10	1.4%	33.3%
Toledo Correctional Institution	6	1.6	20.0
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	.8	13.3
Grafton Correctional Institution	3	1.0	10.0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2	.4	6.7
Oakwood Correctional Facility	2	14.3	6.7
Marion Correctional Institution	1	.4	3.3
North Central Correctional Institution	1	.3	3.3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	.3	3.3
Allen Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	30	N/A	100%

The subsections for Security Classification include instrument overdue, instrument incorrect, instrument overridden, procedural issues, other. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility has the largest number of grievances in the Security Classification category, with 10, accounting for 33.3% of the system wide grievances on the subject. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked second, with six grievances regarding Security Classification.

RECOVERY SERVICES GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

TABLE 143. Institutional Grievances: RECOVERY SERVICES (10/03 – 11/04)			
Institution	Number of Institution's RECOVERY SERVICES Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide RECOVERY SERVICES Grievances Filed
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	4	8.9%	15.4%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	3	.6	11.5
Allen Correctional Institution	2	.6	7.7
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	1.2	7.7
Madison Correctional Institution	2	.6	7.7
Marion Correctional Institution	2	.8	7.7
Noble Correctional Institution	2	.7	7.7
Toledo Correctional Institution	2	.5	7.7
Warren Correctional Institution	2	.6	7.7
London Correctional Institution	1	.5	3.8
North Central Correctional Institution	1	.3	3.8
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	3.8
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	3.8
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	.4	3.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0	0
TOTAL	26	N/A	100%

The subsections for Recovery Services include recovery services programs, earned credit, and other.

Compared to the other categories of grievances, there are few grievances system wide regarding Recovery Services, a total of 26. There are 19 prisons with no grievances in the category. Those with grievances regarding Recovery Services range from one each at Trumbull, Southeastern, Pickaway, North Central and London Correctional Institutions, to the four at the North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility. NCCTF grievances in the category account for 15.4% of the system wide grievances regarding Recovery Services.

INMATE GROUPS GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's INMATE GROUP Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide INMATE GROUP Grievances Filed
Grafton Correctional Institution	4	1.3%	15.4%
Ohio Reformatory for Women	4	1.2	15.4
Warren Correctional Institution	4	1.3	15.4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	3	.8	11.5
Madison Correctional Institution	2	.6	7.7
Allen Correctional Institution	1	3.2	3.8
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	2.9	3.8
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	.2	3.8
Noble Correctional Institution	1	.3	3.8
North Coast Correctional Institution	1	.3	3.8
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1	.5	3.8
Ross Correctional Institution	1	.7	3.8
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	3.8
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1	.4	3.8
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Marion Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	26	N/A	100%

The subsections for Inmate Groups include denial of permission to start, staff interference, and other.

Compared to the other categories, there are few grievances system wide pertaining to Inmate Groups, with only 26 in all. There are 19 prisons with no grievances in the category. Grievances regarding Inmate Groups range from one each at Trumbull, Southeastern, Ross, Pickaway, Noble, Mansfield, Chillicothe and Allen Correctional Institutions, to four each at the Ohio Reformatory for Women, Grafton Correctional Institution, and Warren Correctional Institution.

PROTECTIVE CONTROL GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Institution's PROTECTIVE CONTROL Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide PROTECTIVE CONTROL Grievances Filed
Toledo Correctional Institution	10	2.6%	58.9%
Allen Correctional Institution	1	.3	5.9
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	.2	5.9
Marion Correctional Institution	1	.4	5.9
North Central Correctional Institution	1	.3	5.9
Richland Correctional Institution	1	.4	5.9
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1.0	5.9
Warren Correctional Facility	1	.3	5.9
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	17	N/A	100%

The subsections for Protective Control include placement, release, privileges, and other. Protective Control Units exist at Warren Correctional Institution, Marion Correctional Institution, and Toledo Correctional Institution. The largest number of grievances regarding Protective Control is at the Toledo Correctional Institution, with 10 grievances, accounting for nearly 60% of all grievances in the category system wide. Warren and Marion Correctional Institutions only had one grievance each regarding Protective Control. Of the institutions without any PC unit, only five institutions had grievances filed in the category as follows: Allen, Mansfield, North Central, Richland, and Southeastern Correctional Institutions. **The small number of PC grievances system wide is regarded as a positive indicator that personal safety issues are being addressed. However, the CIIC received 90 logged concerns system wide regarding Protective Control and personal safety concerns.** Based on the inspection at TOCI and its PC unit, the inmate issues pertained to the range separations maintained which resulted in limited out of cell time. However, there were no expressed concerns regarding the lack of safety and security in the unit, which is again a positive indicator. **The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had no grievances regarding PC, yet the CIIC received 38 logged concerns from SOCF regarding PC.** SOCF had the largest number of reported concerns to the CIIC regarding PC and relayed personal safety concerns.

TELEPHONE GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTIONTABLE 146. **Institutional Grievances: TELEPHONE** (10/03 – 11/04)

Institution	Number of Institution's TELEPHONE Grievances Filed	Percent of Institution's Total Grievances Filed	Percent of System-Wide TELEPHONE Grievances Filed
Ohio State Penitentiary	5	2.1%	50.0%
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2	.3	20.0
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1	.6	10.0
Marion Correctional Institution	1	.4	10.0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	.3	10.0
Allen Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Correctional Reception Center	0	0	0
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Franklin Pre -Release Center	0	0	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Lebanon Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lima Correctional Institution	0	0	0
London Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Madison Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Noble Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Pickaway Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Ross Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Toledo Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Warren Correctional Institution	0	0	0
TOTAL	10	N/A	100%

The subsections for Telephone include inadequate access, denial of phone privilege, and other.

There were only 10 grievances filed system wide in the Telephone category, and only five prisons had any grievances on the subject. The Ohio State Penitentiary had the largest number of grievances, with five, followed by two at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, and one each at the Lake Erie and Marion Correctional Institutions, and the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

RESOLVED AND UNRESOLVED GRIEVANCES:

There were **7,381 grievances** filed from October 2003 to November 2004 that resulted in resolved and not resolved dispositions. As shown in Table 147, a **total of 1,602 grievances resulted in resolved dispositions, which is 21.7%** of the 7,381 total. **The Ohio State Penitentiary was ranked first in total number of resolved dispositions, with a total of 149, which is 9.3% of all the resolved dispositions. The Ohio State Penitentiary's resolved dispositions represent 30.5% of the grievances filed at the institution.** The Dayton Correctional Institution had resolved dispositions for 100% of its filed grievances, though there were only eight grievances filed in the period. The Belmont Correctional Institution was second with resolved dispositions for 44.5% of its filed grievances.

As shown in Table 148, a total of **5,779 grievances resulted in unresolved dispositions, which is 78.3% of the 7,381 total.** The **Southern Ohio Correctional Facility ranked first in total number of unresolved dispositions, with a total of 602, which is 10.4% of all the unresolved dispositions. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility's unresolved dispositions represent 83.4% of the grievances filed at the institution. The Franklin Pre-Release Center had unresolved dispositions for 97.2% of its filed grievances. The Noble Correctional Institution had unresolved dispositions for 90.8% of its filed grievances, and the Madison Correctional Institution had unresolved dispositions for 90.5% of its filed grievances.** The Dayton Correctional Institution and Oakwood Correctional Facility did not report any unresolved dispositions, which is 0% of their filed grievances. The Belmont Correctional Institution was next lowest with unresolved dispositions for 55.5 of its filed grievances.

The ODRC Inspector of Institutional Services Monthly Reports provide three types of "resolved" dispositions and list 10 possible reasons why a grievance was "unresolved." The following are the three types of **resolved** dispositions:

- 3) Problem **corrected**
- 4) Problem noted, **correction pending**
- 5) Problem noted, report/ **recommendation to the Warden.**

The following are the possible reasons why a grievance results in an **unresolved** disposition:

- 1) Contrary to Ohio Revised Code
- 2) Contrary to administrative rule
- 3) Contrary to department policy
- 4) Contrary to institution policy
- 5) Staff action was a **valid exercise of discretion**
- 6) **Insufficient evidence** to support claim
- 7) **False claim**
- 8) **Failure to use informal complaint procedure**
- 9) Not within the scope of the grievance procedure
- 10) **Not within the time limits.**

A greater understanding of the grievance procedure and its effectiveness can be gained by careful review of the reasons for grievance resolutions.

The following tables display statewide statistical data as provided to the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee from each of Ohio's adult correctional institutions, with the exception of Pickaway Correctional Institution, which did not supply the monthly reports for four of the five months in the period reviewed. Therefore, statistics are based on 32 of the 33 adult correctional institutions, with Pickaway Correctional Institution being the exclusion. For the purpose of analysis, a five-month time period from July 2004 through November 2004 was considered, which represents several of the most recent months of grievance activity in the institutions.

As shown in Table 149, of **all the resolved grievances, in 302 or 50% of the resolved dispositions, the problem was corrected. In 217 or 35.9% of the resolved dispositions, the problem was noted and a correction was pending. In 85 or 14.1% of the resolved grievances, the problem was noted and a report or recommendation was made to the Warden.**

Table 149 also provides a statistical breakdown based on the race of the inmates who filed the grievances in the period. Of the **604 total grievances that were resolved, 282 or 46.7% were grievances of white inmates, 313 or 51.8% were grievances filed by black inmates, and nine or 1.5% were grievances filed by inmates classified as "other."**

Regarding the number of grievances that were resolved by virtue of the problem being "corrected" compared to the total number of resolved grievances by race, the data shows that white inmates received resolved dispositions based on "problem corrected" in 141 or 50% of the white inmates' resolved grievances. Black inmates received resolved dispositions based on "problem corrected" in 156 or 49.8% of the black inmates' resolved grievances.

Table 150 provides information on unresolved grievance dispositions from July 2004 through November 2004, based on the monthly reports of ODRC Inspectors. Data revealed that **866 or 44.8% of the unresolved grievances were due to "insufficient evidence to support the claim"**, and in 351 or 18.2% of the unresolved grievances, it was determined that **"staff action was a valid exercise of discretion"**.

Table 150 also provides the racial breakdown of inmates whose grievance was not resolved. Of the **1,930 unresolved grievances** from July through November 2004 period, White inmates received unresolved dispositions in 846 or 43.8% of all the unresolved grievances. Black inmates received unresolved dispositions in 1,058 or 54.8% of all of the unresolved grievances, and other races received unresolved dispositions in 26 or 1.4% of the total unresolved grievances. These percentages are comparable to the percentages based on race for resolved grievances.

For the five-month period, the distribution of reasons for “Not Resolved” dispositions was not consistently the same among the institutions. Certain institutions showed a proportionately high use of specific reasons why a grievance was rejected or “Not Resolved,” as follows.

- **Chillicothe Correctional Institution (CCI) accounted for 37 or 52.9% of the 70 not resolved grievances due to “false claim.”**
- **Lebanon Correctional Institution (LeCI) accounted for 20 or 31.3% of the 64 not resolved grievances due to “Inmate failure to use informal complaint procedure.”**
- **Mansfield Correctional Institution (ManCI) accounted for 55 or 29.1% of the 189 not resolved grievances that were deemed to be “contrary to Administrative Rule.”**
- **Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (SOCF) accounted for 157 or 18.1% of the 866 not resolved grievances due to “Insufficient evidence to support claim.”**
- **Ohio State Penitentiary (OSP) accounted for 61 or 17.4% of the 351 not resolved grievances because the “staff action was a valid exercise of discretion.”**
- **Warren Correctional Institution (WCI) accounted for 17 or 16.3% of the 104 not resolved grievances that were “not within the scope of the grievance procedure.”**
- **Chillicothe Correctional Institution (CCI) accounted for 9 or 15.3% of the 59 not resolved grievances that were “not within the time limits.”**

Table 151 provides grievance information from July 2004 through November 2004 for all institutions, except for the Pickaway Correctional Institution. Resolved Grievances, Not Resolved Grievances, Grievances Withdrawn at Inmate’s Request, Grievances with Extensions of 14 to 28 days, and the Ratio of Total Grievances to the inmate Population.

The ratio of total grievances to the total population, as shown in the last column in Table 151, is an indicator of the extent to which the inmates within the institutions actually use the Inmate Grievance Procedure. Noteworthy among the data for the July through November 2004 period is the relatively large average percentage of inmates, compared to the statewide average, that used the inmate grievance procedure at certain institutions. **At the Ohio State Penitentiary (OSP), for example, 219 grievances were filed among the 439 inmates, which represent an average use of the grievance procedure by 49.9% of the inmates. Likewise, at Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (SOCF), 262 grievances were filed among the 965 inmates, which represent an average use of the grievance procedure by 27.2% of the inmates.**

The **Ohio State Penitentiary had 51 grievances that received extensions**, which is 23.3% of the institution's total grievances. The **Toledo Correctional Institution had 50 grievances that received extensions**, which is 65.8% of the institution's total grievances. The **Grafton Correctional Institution had 36 grievances that received extensions**, which is 42.4% of the institution's total grievances. The **Chillicothe Correctional Institution had 31 grievances that received extensions**, which is 25.6% of the institution's total grievances. The Belmont Correctional Institution, Corrections Medical Center, Correctional Reception Center, Dayton Correctional Institution, Franklin Pre-Release Center, Hocking Correctional Facility, Lake Erie Correctional Institution, London Correctional Institution, Madison Correctional Institution, North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility, Northeast Pre-Release Center, Oakwood Correctional Facility, and Richland Correctional Institution **did not have any grievances that received extensions**.

**TABLE 147. RESOLVED GRIEVANCES FROM OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004
BY INSTITUTION WITH PERCENTAGE OF RESOLVED GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION
AND SYSTEM WIDE**

Total Grievances RESOLVED			
Institution (Ranked highest to lowest)	Institution's Grievances RESOLVED	Resolved Grievances as a Percent of Institution's Grievances Filed	Institution's Percent of System- Wide Total 1,602 Grievances RESOLVED
Ohio State Penitentiary	149	30.5%	9.3%
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	120	16.6	7.5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	114	21.1	7.1
Grafton Correctional Institution	95	30.7	5.9
Marion Correctional Institution	86	34.8	5.4
Ohio Reformatory for Women	81	24.8	5.1
Toledo Correctional Institution	81	21.1	5.1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	79	19.8	4.9
North Central Correctional Institution	72	19.5	4.5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	66	24.1	4.1
Richland Correctional Institution	65	27.0	4.1
Allen Correctional Institution	62	20.0	3.9
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	58	16.9	3.6
Belmont Correctional Institution	57	44.5	3.6
Warren Correctional Institution	55	17.5	3.4
Pickaway Correctional Institution	45	22.7	2.8
Lorain Correctional Institution	44	41.5	2.7
Ross Correctional Institution	43	29.9	2.7
Madison Correctional Institution	34	9.5	2.1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	31	31.3	1.9
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	30	18.6	1.9
Noble Correctional Institution	27	9.2	1.7
London Correctional Institution	21	11.2	1.3
Corrections Medical Center	19	34.5	1.2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	14	100	.9
Lima Correctional Institution	10	27.8	.6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	10	22.2	.6
Dayton Correctional Institution	8	100	.5
Correctional Reception Center	7	13.7	.4
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	6	30	.4
Franklin Pre-Release Center	5	2.8	.3
Northeast Pre-Release Center	5	41.7	.3
Hocking Correctional Facility	3	18.8	.2
TOTAL Grievances RESOLVED	1,602	*	100.0%
<i>*Resolved grievances accounted for 21.7 % of the system-wide total of 7,381 grievances filed from all institutions.</i>			

TABLE 148. UNRESOLVED GRIEVANCES FROM OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION WITH PERCENTAGE OF UNRESOLVED GRIEVANCES BY INSTITUTION AND SYSTEM WIDE

Total Grievances NOT RESOLVED			
Institution (Ranked highest to lowest)	Institution's Grievances NOT RESOLVED	Not resolved Grievances as a Percent of Institution's Grievances Filed	Institution's Percent of System-Wide Total 5,779 Grievances NOT RESOLVED
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	602	83.4%	10.4%
Mansfield Correctional Institution	423	78.8	7.3
Ohio State Penitentiary	339	69.5	6.0
Madison Correctional Institution	325	90.5	5.6
Lebanon Correctional Institution	319	80.2	5.5
Toledo Correctional Institution	303	78.9	5.2
North Central Correctional Institution	298	80.5	5.2
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	286	83.1	5.0
Noble Correctional Institution	267	90.8	4.6
Warren Correctional Institution	260	82.5	4.5
Allen Correctional Institution	248	80.0	4.3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	246	75.2	4.3
Grafton Correctional Institution	214	69.3	3.7
Trumbull Correctional Institution	208	75.9	3.6
Richland Correctional Institution	176	73.0	3.0
Franklin Pre-Release Center	176	97.2	3.0
London Correctional Institution	167	88.8	3.0
Marion Correctional Institution	161	65.2	2.8
Pickaway Correctional Institution	153	77.3	2.6
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	131	81.4	2.3
Ross Correctional Institution	101	70.1	1.7
Belmont Correctional Institution	71	55.5	1.2
Southeastern Correctional Institution	68	68.7	1.2
Lorain Correctional Institution	62	58.5	1.1
Correctional Reception Center	44	86.3	.8
Corrections Medical Center	36	65.5	.6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	35	77.8	.6
Lima Correctional Institution	26	72.2	.4
Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Center	14	70.0	.2
Hocking Correctional Facility	13	81.3	.2
Northeast Pre-Release Center	7	58.3	.1
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	.0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	.0
TOTAL Grievances UNRESOLVED	5,779	*	100.0%
<i>*Unresolved grievances accounted for 78.3% of the system-wide total of 7,381 grievances filed from all institutions.</i>			

**TABLE 149. RESOLVED GRIEVANCE DISPOSITIONS BY TYPE
FROM JULY 2004 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004
WITH RACIAL BREAKDOWN OF GRIEVANT**

Grievance Dispositions – Resolved				
<u>Reasons for Resolved Disposition</u>	White	Black	Other	Total
1. Problem Corrected	141	156	5	302
2. Problem noted, correction pending	97	116	4	217
3. Problem noted, report/recommendation to the Warden	44	41	0	85
Total Resolved Grievances	282	313	9	604

**TABLE 150. REASONS FOR “NOT RESOLVED” GRIEVANCES
FROM JULY 2004 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004
WITH RACIAL BREAKDOWN OF GRIEVANT**

Grievance Dispositions – Not Resolved				
Reason for Not Resolved Disposition	White	Black	Other	Total
1. Insufficient evidence to support claim	325	526	15	866
2. Staff action was a valid exercise of discretion	181	168	2	351
3. Contrary to Administrative Rule	89	99	1	189
4. Contrary to DRC Dept. Policy	99	74	2	175
5. Not within scope of grievance procedure	49	55	0	104
6. False claim	31	39	0	70
7. Inmate failure to use informal complaint procedure	21	43	0	64
8. Not within the time limits	23	30	6	59
9. Contrary to Institutional Policy	24	18	0	42
10. Contrary to Ohio Revised Code	4	6	0	10
Total Not Resolved Grievances	846	1,058	26	1,930

TABLE 151. RATIO OF GRIEVANCES FILED TO INMATE POPULATION FROM JULY 2004 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004 BY INSTITUTION, WITH NUMBER RESOLVED, NOT RESOLVED, WITHDRAWN AND EXTENSIONS

<u>Institution</u>	Resolved	Not resolved	Total (Resolved + Not resolved)	Grievances Withdrawn (by inmate)	Grievances with Extensions (14-28 days)	Ratio of Grievances (Resolved + Not resolved) to Approximate Population by Percent
ALLEN CI	35	103	138	0	1	1274/138 = 10.8%
BELMONT CI	33	13	46	0	0	2129/46 = 2.2%
CHILLICOTHE CI	20	101	121	0	31	2660/121 = 4.5%
CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL C	10	9	19	1	0	109/19 = 17.4%
CORRECTIONAL RECEPTION C	3	15	18	0	0	1810/18 = 1.0%
DAYTON CI	5	0	5	0	0	413/5 = 1.2%
FRANKLIN PRE - RELEASE C	1	1	2	0	0	479/2 = 0.4%
GRAFTON CI	29	56	85	1	36	1407/85 = 6.0%
HOCKING COR F	3	5	8	0	0	471/8 = 1.7%
LAKE ERIE CI	7	36	43	0	0	1369/43 = 3.1%
LEBANON CI	28	122	150	4	1	1911/150 = 7.8%
LIMA CI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
LONDON CI	7	67	74	0	0	2021/74 = 3.7%
LORAIN CI	14	21	35	0	5	1420/35 = 2.5%
MADISON CI	12	121	133	0	0	1914/133 = 6.9%
MANSFIELD CI	48	144	192	0	3	2399/192 = 8.0%
MARION CI	37	60	97	1	25	1804/97 = 5.4%
MONTGOMERY EDUCATION PRE-RELEASE C	2	3	5	0	2	327/5 = 1.5%
NOBLE CI	13	95	108	0	1	2127/108 = 5.1%
NORTH CENTRAL CI	30	114	144	0	2	2242/144 = 6.4%
NORTH COAST CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT F	2	13	15	0	0	529/15 = 2.8%
NORTHEAST PRE-RELEASE C	3	1	4	0	0	596/4 = 0.7%
OAKWOOD CORR F	5	0	5	0	0	125/5 = 4.0%
OHIO REFORM FOR WOMEN	31	80	111	1	4	2053/111 = 5.4%
OHIO STATE P	68	151	219	2	51	439/219 = 49.9%
PICKAWAY CI- <i>no data submitted</i>						2095=unknown %
RICHLAND CI	26	80	106	1	0	2324/106 = 4.6%
ROSS CI	17	45	62	3	15	2261/62 = 2.7%
SOUTHEASTERN CI	14	22	36	0	8	1607/36 = 2.2%
SOUTHERN OHIO CORR F	43	220	263	1	1	965/262 = 27.2%
TOLEDO CI	10	66	76	0	50	793/76 = 9.6%
TRUMBULL CI	25	66	91	1	12	1039/90 = 8.7%
WARREN CI	23	100	123	6	14	1047/123 = 11.7%
Statewide Totals	604 or 23.8% of all grievances	1930 or 76.2% of all grievances	2534	22	262	44,159/2,532 = 5.7% statewide average IGP participation

CONCLUSION:

The inmate grievance procedure is an essential process for the ODRC Institutions. An effective inmate grievance procedure results in the reduction of inmate tension, the prevention and reduction of litigation against ODRC, and the availability of an information gathering and management tool. The reduction of inmate tension in the institutions can create a more positive institution atmosphere, increase the safety of staff and inmates, increase the security of the institution, and reduce inmate misconduct and disturbances. The potential information gathering from the grievance procedure can result in immediate identification of issues and swift correction of problems within the institutions, which can assist the Wardens and other staff in the operation of the institutions in a more effective, safe, and secure manner, for the betterment of all. The prevention and reduction of litigation against ODRC could result in a major cost savings for the Department and could prevent possible court mandates.

The written inmate grievance procedure as outlined in Administrative Rule 5120-9-31, complies with the standard of the American Correctional Association and many of the recommendations by Vincent Nathan in his Evaluation of the Inmate Grievance System Report. **The areas of concern do not pertain to the written administrative rule, but to the extent to which the provisions of the administrative rule are carried out in practice.** Based on concerns that have been expressed and data that has been gathered, **the inmate grievance procedure is operating below the level of optimum effectiveness. There is also the general perception by inmates that the grievance procedure has extremely limited effectiveness. There is reason to believe that in general, inmates lack faith in the procedure.** It has been shown that perception often is or becomes reality.

In 1975, a Special Master appointed by the U.S. District in the case of Taylor vs. Perini stated in his first report “that there was **no effective grievance procedure maintained to process complaints related to racial discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or insult**”. **Over the years, complaints regarding harassment and retaliation have been reported by Inspectors to be the most difficult, if not “impossible to prove.” Many would insist that the grievance procedure remains ineffective** in resolving these extremely difficult, yet potentially serious problems. **Inappropriate supervision can be a preceding factor in assaults on staff and in use of force incidents. It has also been a factor in at least two suicides known to have occurred in CIIC’s history.**

There is a definite need to reduce the adversarial nature and perception of the procedure in an effort to increase the procedure’s effectiveness. A need for continued evaluation and improvement of the procedure is imperative based on its fundamental importance.

In the process of reviewing all available information on the inmate grievance procedure, the following issues have been identified. The cost of litigation and inmate tension can be reduced by an improved and effective inmate grievance procedure. Health care and force/supervision are the leading grievance complaints.

The ODRC staff responses to informal complaints, grievances, and appeals need to be made in a timely manner, in strict compliance with the deadlines mandated in the Administrative Rule. That is, per the AR, the Inspector “shall provide a written response to the grievance within 14 calendar days of receipt,” and the Chief Inspector “shall respond within 30 calendar days of receipt of the grievance.” Extensions are permitted “for good cause,” according to the AR. According to inmates, extensions are not restricted to those “for good cause,” and extremely long delays in responses have been reported and verified.

Discrepancies exist between what is written in the Inmate Grievance Procedure’s Administrative Rule, and compliance in practice. The Department needs to ensure all inmates’ access to the grievance procedure, especially for inmates who are mentally ill, disabled, and/or have low literacy levels. DRC staff responses to informal complaints, grievances, and appeals need marked improvement. The ODRC Chief Inspector’s Office should increase its monitoring of the quality of Institutional Inspectors’ responses to notifications of grievances.

The Department should acknowledge that retaliation and fear of retaliation for use of the inmate grievance procedure by inmates exists, and that merely referring inmates to file another grievance to report reprisals which are reportedly extremely difficult to prove, is not enough to ensure that retaliation is not tolerated.

Many inmates have little or no faith in the inmate grievance procedure. It is not widely viewed as an effective way to have a problem solved. A disturbing 78.3% of all grievances filed result in a “Not Resolved” dispositions. The adversarial nature of the inmate grievance procedure should be eliminated. The procedure needs to be, and needs to be viewed as a truly unbiased, objective, problem-solving method.

A determination needs to be made on staff needs and job duties of Inspectors and Chief Inspector to ensure their ability to improve the quality and timeliness of responses to grievances and appeals.