

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT
ON THE INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF THE
MONTGOMERY EDUCATION AND PRE-RELEASE CENTER

Prepared and Submitted by CIIC Staff

June 26, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| INSPECTION PROFILE | 4 |
| Date of Inspection | 4 |
| Type of Inspection | 4 |
| CIIC Members and CIIC Staff Present | 4 |
| Institutional Staff Present | 4 |
| Areas and Activities Included in Inspection | 4 |
| BRIEF INSPECTION SUMMARY | 4 |
| INSTITUTION PROFILE | 5 |
| Inmate Programs | 6 |
| Table 1: Inmate Programs | 6 |
| Accreditation | 7 |
| Staff Data | 7 |
| Inmate Data | 7 |
| Table 2: Inmate Racial Breakdown | 7 |
| Fiscal Data | 8 |
| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | 8 |
| Attendance and General Meal Period | 8 |
| Attendance at Rehabilitative or Educational Program | 8 |
| INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE | 10 |
| RELIGIOUS SERVICES | 10 |
| INSPECTION | 10 |
| Entry | 10 |
| Pre-Inspection Meeting | 11 |
| Visitation | 11 |
| Food Service | 12 |
| Housing Units | 13 |
| Segregation Cell..... | 14 |
| Handicapped Cell..... | 14 |
| Safe Cell | 14 |
| Programs and Education | 15 |
| Academic, Vocational, and Re-Entry | 16 |
| Monthly Reported Educational Programming | 18 |
| Table 3: Academic Goals and Completion | 18 |
| Table 4: Career-Tech Goals and Completion | 18 |
| Community Service Programs..... | 19 |
| Medical Services | 20 |
| Monthly Reported Medical Services | 20 |
| Table 5: Monthly Medical Services for January through March 2008 | 21 |
| Mental Health Services | 21 |
| Exit Meeting | 21 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| CIIC DATABASE: CONTACTS AND CONCERNS | 22 |
| System-wide Distribution of Contacts and Concerns to CIIC | 22 |
| Table 6: Number of Contacts by Institution From January 1, 2007 through April 22, 2008 | 23 |
| Table 7: Number of Concerns by Institution From January 1, 2007 through April 22, 2008 | 24 |
| Monthly Reported Grievance Activity | 24 |
| Grievances and Concerns Regarding Prisons | 25 |
| Monthly Reported Racial Breakdown and Use of Force | 25 |
| INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES | 25 |
| British Adult Expectations | 26 |
| Notable Responses to Adult Expectations and Section-by-Section Summaries | 27 |
| Faith-Based Initiatives Recommendations | 29 |
| Notable Responses to Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Recommendations and Heading-Heading Summaries..... | 30 |
| Complete Questions and Responses to British Adult Expectations | 32 |
| Section 1 - Environment and Relationships | 32 |
| Residential Units | 32 |
| Clothing and Possessions | 34 |
| Hygiene | 35 |
| Staff – Prisoner Relationships..... | 35 |
| Section 2 - Duty of Care..... | 36 |
| Complaint/Grievance Procedure | 36 |
| Bullying and Violence Reduction | 40 |
| Self-Harm and Suicide | 43 |
| Section 3 - Activities | 46 |
| Learning and Skills and Work Activities | 46 |
| Library | 48 |
| Section 4 - Good Order | 49 |
| Security and Rules | 49 |
| Rules | 50 |
| Section 5 - Services | 50 |
| Food Services | 50 |
| Complete Questions and Responses to Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force Recommendations | 53 |
| Infrastructure | 53 |
| Alternatives to Incarceration | 55 |
| Institutional Programming | 57 |
| Reentry Programming | 59 |

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE
REPORT ON THE INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF
MONTGOMERY EDUCATION AND PRE-RELEASE CENTER**

INSPECTION PROFILE

Date of Inspection April 28, 2008

Type of Inspection Unannounced

CIIC Members and CIIC Staff Present

Representative John White, CIIC Chair
Carol Robison, CIIC Inspector

Institutional Staff Present

DCI/MEPRC Warden
Commissary Assistant Manager (serving as Acting Warden)
Deputy Warden of Special Services
Institutional Inspector
ACA Coordinator
Administrative Assistant
Correctional Officer (Union President)
Other Correctional Officers and Supervisors on Units
Registered Nurse

Areas and Activities Included in Inspection

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Entrance Meeting | Medical Services | Exterior Grounds |
| Housing Units | School Classrooms | HVAC Classroom |
| Segregation Cell | Program Centers | |
| Safe Cell | Food Service | |
| Sinclair Community College | Instructional Classroom | |

BRIEF INSPECTION SUMMARY

On April 29, 2008, the CIIC Director provided a brief summary of the inspection to the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Assistant Director. Excerpts of that summary are provided below:

The unannounced inspections of Dayton Correctional Institution and the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center went very well. Staff members were very helpful in enabling us to cover nearly all areas of both institutions in one day. We sensed an overlay of concern, almost sadness, from some staff regarding their job security and that of their co-workers. We were pleased to learn that DRC has developed a special suicide prevention program for DRC

employees, which may be especially helpful to those who experience the grief of job loss.

It is also our understanding that there are three phases of implementation of the DRC staff reduction stemming from the budget reduction, and that DRC is in or near completion of phase one. It is also our understanding that institutions housing inmates at classification level three or above will be returning to the treatment, custody, social services model that existed prior to unit management.

Additional information on the above referenced phases and on changes in unit management affecting high security prisons was subsequently provided to the CIIC Director through the DRC Assistant Director. Further information on the subject is summarized in the separate inspection report on the Dayton Correctional Institution. The Dayton Correctional Institution report also includes information obtained from DCI staff regarding the special suicide prevention program for DRC.

INSTITUTION PROFILE

The following information was gathered from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction website, or taken from the materials prepared in August 2007 for the American Correctional Association (ACA) auditors, provided to CIIC staff on site during the inspection on April 28, 2008.

The campus is relatively new, having opened in May 1994 on 15 acres within the city limits of Dayton, Ohio. Recent upgrades in the institution include the installation of a new spider security system, which is being installed over time. It was reported at the inspection that nearly 25% of the institution is currently equipped with the spider system.

The institution was designed for an intended capacity of 352 inmates. The inmate population as of August 6, 2007 was 341. Inmate ages range from 18 years old to 60 years old, and the average length of stay is 1.7 years.

As found on the DRC website, the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center maintains a *mission* to create a safe, secure, and humane environment at all times for the purpose of providing offenders with the opportunities for treatment, educational programs, and other services that will enhance their reintegration into society as productive, law abiding citizens.

Staff relayed that inmates at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center tend not to affiliate with security threat groups or STGs. Any instances of STG affiliation have been minor and uncommon, according to staff at the institutional inspection.

Inmate Programs

As relayed by staff, all inmates are interviewed relevant to their desire to learn prior to being accepted at the institution. The interview process is conducted similar to the process of an inmate interviewing for employment or acceptance to an institution of higher education. In addition, the institution houses only inmates with classifications of 1 and 1A. Inmates generally remain in the confines of the institution for less than or equal to one year on average. The admission process includes a mental health screen, such that no inmates with diagnosed serious mental illness or who require psychotropic medications are admitted. If an inmate does not successfully gain admission to MEPRC, he is transferred to Dayton Correctional Institution or to another institution at the inmate’s classification level. Reportedly, once admitted, inmates must be engaged in service programming, educational or rehabilitative programming, or an institutional job for at least 6.5 hours per day in order to receive state pay.

The institution is distinguished among the adult institutions in Ohio for its emphasis on educational programming and its admission by interview. The institution’s website provides the following list of inmate programs, shown in the succeeding table.

| Table 1: Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center Inmate Programs | |
|---|--|
| Community Service | Train dogs for Pilot Dog Program. Trash pick-up for the Ohio Department of Transportation. Montgomery County Parks litter pick-up. Handle mailings for the Greater Dayton Humane Society. Train dogs for the Greater Dayton Humane Society. Button assembly for various organizations. Work with Montgomery County Children’s Services. City of Dayton recycling program. |
| Vocational | Building maintenance. Work and family living skills. Landscape and horticulture. Baking. |
| Academic | GED. Adult Basic Education. Peer Tutoring. Pre-Release. Fast Track GED. Sinclair Community College, college credit classes. Vocational class: hazardous waster removal, asbestos abatement, construction surveying basics, entrepreneurship. |
| Religious Services | Complete listing of available religious programming available. |

The website presents three programs as unique: The ***Career Tech Administrative Office Technology*** program, ***Advanced Job Training***, and ***Responsible Family Life Skills*** program. The *career tech* program is designed to develop employability skills, enhance proficiency in academics as well as abilities essential for reentry and initial employment in business. Students are trained in keyboarding, Windows, Word, Excel, Access, PowerPoint and Desktop Publisher. *Advanced job training* provides post-secondary employment skills instruction to inmates in the fields of drafting and design, personal

computers for business, and hazardous waste operations. Last, the *family life skills* program is a three-phase, 45-hour, all-inclusive parenting program. Phase I centers around individual responsibility, communication sharing and interaction, giving back to the community, the impact of crime, the culture of community justice and morality, the cycle of poverty, child support, and paternity. Phase II represents the core of the program and concentrates on the history of family, child development, substance abuse, discipline, violence prevention, effective communication, and grief and separation issues. Phase III offers a student manual that includes realistic scenarios of struggles they may encounter when released.

Accreditation

The Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center has earned a score of 100% for American Correctional Association accreditation and also reached 100% compliance of both Mandatory and Non-mandatory standards for two consecutive years.

Staff Data

As shown on the institution's website, as of May 8, 2008, there were 154 total staff employed at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center, with 74 or 48 percent of the total staff being security staff.

The total number of staff employed at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center will be reduced in the future due to budget reductions and the subsequent removal of Unit staff. With possible increases in inmate population, the result will likely produce a higher ratio of inmates to staff, overall. The following tables show the distribution of male and female staff in custody and non-custody positions.

Inmate Data

According to information located on the website, there were 348 inmates living at Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center as of May 8, 2008. The racial distribution of inmates was 194 or 55.7 percent *black*, 153 or 44.0 percent *white*, zero percent *Hispanic*, and 1 or less than 1 percent *other*. The following table displays the recent racial breakdown of inmates as of May 8, 2008 at MEPRC.

| Race | Number | Percent |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| African American | 194 | 55.7 % |
| Caucasian | 153 | 44.0 % |
| Other | 1 | < 1 % |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0 % |
| | | |
| TOTAL | 348 | 100% |

Fiscal Data

According to information on the DRC website, the General Revenue Fund (GRF) Budget for Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center is \$9,816,084, subject to monthly review and adjustment. The daily cost per inmate is \$85.82.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Attendance at General Meal Period

Per statute, CIIC inspections require attendance at a general meal period of the institution's general population. The mid-day meal was completed at the time of the inspection; however, information regarding kitchen operations was obtained from one of the two Food Coordinators who are assigned to each of the three daily meals. Inspection details of the dining hall and kitchen are provided under a subsequent heading in this report.

Attendance at Rehabilitative or Educational Program

During the inspection, CIIC stepped into one of the *academic* classrooms with a mathematics lesson in progress, a *vocational* classroom where students were engaged in learning the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) trades, and two *community service program* rooms. In one of the programs, *Crayons to Computers*, inmates were engaged in the construction of instructional materials and activities for pre-schoolers. In the second program room, inmates were engaged in the construction of quilts for the homeless and canvas carry-bags for use by children in specific programs in local schools. The carry-bags were large enough to hold a few workbooks and pencils.

Typically, the MEPRC inmates provide the labor required such that an educational project may be completed for the benefit of children in the less-well funded school districts in Ohio. Coordination between program administrator(s) within the institution and representatives from the school districts allows for materials and specific instructions to be supplied to the inmates so that labor of a fulfillment nature, is supplied by the inmates, while the materials are supplied through the school or charitable organization. The projects are, therefore, completed by the inmates at no cost to the institution or from state funds.

Likewise, inmates performing tasks toward completion of projects under a non-profit or charitable organization were providing the labor so that there was no cost to the institution or to the state in the fulfillment of the project.

Every inmate interviewed by the CIIC inspector regarding their work and tasks verbally remarked that they felt very positive about the role they were playing and that their work was about giving something back to the community. Every inmate emphasized that they recognized that they had a personal need to give back to the community and were

enjoying the opportunity to participate in an activity of generosity. A few inmates relayed as well that they hoped that they were also developing a few skills that might transfer into marketable skills toward future employment.

While no actual class session was in progress at the time the CIIC reached the Auto CADD (automated computer aided design and drafting) classroom, which is taught by college-level professors/instructors who commute from Sinclair Community College, the classroom setting was observed. The classroom is equipped with individual computer stations and all of the standard college textbooks, software, college-level instruction, assignments, and tests for the full sequence of core courses required to develop CADD skills at a sufficient level to make inmates employable in this field.

The content of the CADD course is complete, not lacking in any core topic to the study. Students learn three-dimensional imaging, for example, just as would be learned by students taking the course on the Sinclair campus. While students are not told the specific nature of some of their design assignments, the students do complete assignments for government and other various projects. The course is comprised of three quarters per academic year, with approximately ten weeks in each quarter. Students who complete the course received full credit on their institutional transcripts while incarcerated and have the option to pay a monetary fee after release to receive full college credit from Sinclair Community College as well.

It was relayed to the CIIC inspector that one inmate completed all of the available CADD courses and took the steps to convert his certificate of completion from MEPRC into paid college credits from Sinclair Community College. At the time this inmate was released, he was able to acquire a \$25 per hour position with a graphic design firm and was becoming established in a successful new life in society. His success has served as motivation to the continuation of this level of educational programming being made available to inmates.

Inmates readily seek admission to the Sinclair Community College CADD program and usually there is a waiting list. However, nearly all inmates desiring to take the course do gain admission. Inmate applicants are screened carefully prior to admission. They must have no Rules Infraction Board convictions within a year, must hold a minimum grade level, and must have completed the GED or equivalent prior to admission to the CADD program. Staff relayed that once admitted and taking the CADD course, inmates do not want to leave it.

The elimination of PELL grants and other sources of educational funding applicable to inmates has created an increasingly greater challenge to providing educational opportunities for inmates. Additional details of educational and rehabilitative programming, as gathered during the inspection, are provided under a subsequent heading, *Programs and Education*, in this report.

INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

As reported by the Institutional Inspector during the inspection, inmates are encouraged to come directly to the Inspector to talk about their concerns and problems prior to filing an Informal Complaint. When a discussion of the issue fails to produce a satisfactory result, the Inspector advises the inmate to acquire an Informal complaint form from staff on his unit or from the Inspector if needed. Grievance procedure instructions were posted on the dayroom bulletin boards of each unit.

The Institutional Inspector reported at the inspection that during 2007, he recorded 41 Informal Complaints and nine Notifications of Grievances. Among the grievances, two were deemed medical in nature. Monthly data submitted to CIIC from MEPRC is representative of eight select months of 2007 and the first quarter 2008. This data also shows a low volume of grievances and is referenced in Monthly Reported Grievance Activity, under the heading, **CIIC Database: Contacts and Concerns**.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES

Religious services are provided by an institutional chaplain, who serves all faiths under a contract with the institution. A separate Imam, also under contract, makes calls on Muslim inmates once per week to serve their religious needs.

INSPECTION

Entry

The entry processing at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center was quick, yet efficient, with required badge checks, metal detection, and sign-in. Walking through the main entrance building with administrative offices, the institution opened to multiple buildings positioned around an oval with crossing sidewalks. Some of the buildings were connected by exterior covered walkways. The grounds within the campus and surrounding the oval were very well maintained and landscaped with quality and care. Natural materials, including timbers, rocks, and perennials were used in the landscaping design. A small terraced section of the grounds and a wooden footbridge looked professionally designed and was built among the landscaping features. One specific inmate was introduced as having acquired excellent landscaping credentials in designing and managing the landscaping efforts for the campus. On the campus, inmates were observed as they walked to buildings or exercised dogs as part of the canine program. Inmates appeared to be at ease and comfortable in the presence of administrative staff and the CIIC.

The outside grounds, as well as the interior spaces of the institution, had the look and presence of a small, appealing college campus rather than a large correctional institution. The architecture of the red brick and poured concrete buildings and attention to detail presented a pleasant environment, unlike a traditional prison. The majority of colors used to paint even concrete walls were 'warm' rather than taken from a 'cool' palette. Steel

window frames were painted white. The incorporation of the many large window-walls in the units' common room and elsewhere, as appropriate, opens the space and allows for much natural light and sunshine to filter into the buildings. Throughout the institution, both interior and exterior spaces were very clean and there were no odors detected at any time. Spaces appeared uncluttered and also free of any evidence of moisture-related issues such as mold. On the day of the inspection, the internal temperature within the buildings was comfortable.

Pre-Inspection Meeting

A pre-inspection meeting was effectively completed at the beginning of the inspection of the nearly-adjacent Dayton Correctional Institution. The CIIC Director and one CIIC Inspector stayed at Dayton Correctional Institution to complete the inspection at that facility.

The Warden and the Institutional Inspector accompanied the CIIC Member and one CIIC Inspector, comprising the inspection team of Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. During the initial period of conversation relevant to the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center, it was reinforced that the facility was intentionally built to look like a college campus, and that the focus of every activity and program is to immerse each inmate as much as possible into educational programming and the acquisition of marketable skills so as to send them away with definable possibilities for lucrative employment. Also mentioned during pre-inspection conversation was the consolidation steps that are being taken to merge some inmate services in order to save costs for both Dayton Correctional Institution and the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. The consolidation is happening primarily at the administrative level, however certain services like medical services will continue to be shared to eliminate duplication of costs.

Visitation

The visitation room is quite large, open, and again, well-lit with much natural light from a wall of windows. Visitation periods are staffed by a bid-posted Correctional Officer, who remains at a desk observing the visitation room at all times, while a yard Officer and a second Officer serve as floaters during visitation times.

In one corner of the visitation room, a children's area is designated by a brightly painted blue and yellow, child-sized fence. The area is furnished with tables and chairs, bookshelves and books, as well as other children's activities and games. This area is also furnished for use in the Ohio Reads program, in which inmates read quality children's books to children during visitation periods.

The visitation room has vending machines along one wall, separate restrooms for male and female visitors, and adequate tables and chairs for up to 14 inmates and their family members to visit at one time during each visitation period.

Food Service

The dining hall was clean, large, open, and bright, with a great deal of natural light from a wall of windows. Tables and benches were traditional and arranged in rows, constructed of steel and bolted to the floor. Food service was positioned along the wall opposite the windows, with the kitchen immediately behind the food service stations. Inmate workers were actively engaged in cleaning the dining hall and food service line during the inspection. Approximately 80-90 inmates are seated for each meal at one time, which includes approximately two residential pods at a time. Inmates are given approximately 20 minutes to consume their meal.

The kitchen was large, uncluttered, and observably clean. All inmate workers wore kitchen whites and hairnets or caps so that no hair was exposed. Staff wore kitchen apparel as well, including hairnets, aprons, or 'lab' coats. Separate, locked rooms or oversized closets were in operation for shelved food storage, kitchen supplies, cleaning tools, and refrigerated and frozen foods.

In addition, a closet for kitchen tools and implements held tools that must be signed in and out for use. The closet for storage of select kitchen tools, including class A knives, was designed using a chit shadow system, a log book, and a requirement for staff to 'sign in' and 'sign out' any tool from that supply source to be used. Multiple signatures are required as part of the security system for managing the class A tools. Documentation and signatures appeared to be complete regarding the daily tool count and tracking of all tools kept using the chit system. It was explained that when class A knives are in use, for example, the knives are bolted to the tables at which they are used, further reducing the risk of the tool being removed from the kitchen.

The kitchen is semi-divided for food preparation and meal-clean up functions, maintaining two separate sets of three-compartment steel sinks and preparation areas at a distance and opposite from each other. One set of sinks is used for food preparation, and the other is used for dishwashing functions. Dish rinse water is kept at 180 degrees. During the inspection, there was some hot water spray on the kitchen floor, which was being cleaned up by inmates as part of the kitchen cleaning process.

Other documentation kept in food services includes food receipt and use dates. Dry goods and food shipments are received twice a month at the institution. Every item in the shipment is marked with a receipt date and use-by date. Attention to detail was observed. For example, it was observed that bread (rolls) planned for consumption at a later meal was being stored on trays in a tall kitchen rack that was completely covered in clear plastic wrap so as to prevent any contamination of the bread. Compared to storage of this type observed in other institutions, this bread cart was very well covered and the bread completely encased.

Reportedly, the Ohio Department of Health has complimented the kitchen staff at Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center on the quality of its operations and cleanliness, reportedly giving it their highest evaluations. As a safety measure and in

compliance with DRC policy, the kitchen keeps a tray in cold storage for every meal that is served within the institution for a period of three days as a resource for investigation if any food-related ailment were to break out among any person who has eaten in the cafeteria. At the end of the three-day period, the meal is discarded.

Housing Units

There are four housing units on the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center campus: Bravo, Charlie, Delta, and Echo. The four housing units are divided into two “pods” each. Each pod contains single cells, double cells, a segregation cell, staff offices, storage rooms, a laundry room, library, and a classroom. The maximum inmate capacity on each single-cell unit is 46 inmates. General population inmates in single-room (cells) are grouped on two wings off the dayroom, each wing housing 22 inmates in 11 cells. This arrangement allows for two additional inmates in segregation. In the units where there are four inmates per living space, the general population inmates are housed in ten cell-like spaces of four inmates each. Ten ‘cells’ are located on an upper range and ten are located on a lower range. There is one additional cell at the mid-range, which also houses four inmates. Again, the segregation cell will hold two additional inmates as needed.

The architecture of the units includes the large two-story common room (day room) with bolted tables and chairs, televisions, and books. In addition, there were various recreational items in most of the dayrooms, such as ping-pong tables, and a pool table in one unit. Each dayroom was equipped with a microwave oven and a bank of four telephones. Each dayroom has at least two very large bulletin boards upon which are posted a variety of notices and required postings. Among the postings was the CIIC memorandum providing information on contacting the CIIC office.

Around the perimeter of the day room are various rooms used for specified purposes. One of the peripheral rooms is used as a private meeting room for staff – inmate conferences. There is a centrally located officer desk, an officer workroom, and other rooms that are dedicated to completing tasks associated with community service projects or educational programming. In one of the units, one separate room was known as the RIB Court because it is the central location for holding Rules Infraction Board hearings. The room has been outfitted with a tall wooden judge’s bench such that the inmate must stand before it to have his conduct report heard.

Inmate pods lie along a hallway that extends from the dayroom. Inmate rooms or cells within each pod are designed as either a double or single. In both cases, the architecture creates the image of a space resembling a ‘suite’ that is shared, yet affording privacy.

Inmate quarters in the single-cells are built so that two inmates share space, yet each inmate has his own private bedroom with bed, desk, bookshelves, and wall-mounted television. The bedrooms are located toward the back of the pod, and divided by a full concrete dividing wall with each having its own entrance without a door. Each inmate has his own private bathroom in the front, one on either side of the front door to the

room/cell. Living in the single-cells is an earned privilege for remaining free of any conduct reports for 60 days.

The four-man cells/rooms are designed somewhat similar to the single rooms, except that two men share each of the two bedrooms and all four must share the bathroom facilities in the front two quadrants of the space.

Housing units were very clean and well-maintained, well-lighted, quiet, odorless, well-ventilated, comfortably heated and cooled, and in good repair both in general population and in all special management and segregation cells.

Segregation Cell

A segregation cell is located within each residential unit. The cell is used for segregating an inmate who has been placed under investigation or has violated a rule(s). Each segregation cell is designed to accommodate two inmates if necessary. The cell has two beds (an upper and a lower bunk), two writing stations, a shower, sink and toilet within the cell, and an exterior window.

Handicapped Cell

There are reportedly cells to accommodate eight wheelchair-restricted inmates within the institution. While not inspected during the inspection, a description of the handicap cell included fixtures and furniture adapted to lower levels of access so that inmates in wheelchairs may have full access to the bed, writing table, and bathroom fixtures. The shower reportedly has also been adapted with a lowered shower nozzle, water handles, and a shower seat for the inmate to slide onto from their wheelchair. The cell has also been modified with a lower mirror and safety grip bars (wall handles) so the inmate may maneuver himself more safely within the confines of the cell. C Unit is equipped to handle the needs of the handicapped.

Safe Cell

A safe cell is used solely for suicide watch. The safe cell is designed so that a Correctional Officer may view the inmate at all times when an inmate may be placed on *constant* suicide watch (24-hour watch.) In this case, the CO must be seated directly outside the cell door. A short 'hallway' leads to the cell itself.

The actual confines of the safe cell was observably isolated, in that the cell was at the end of the 'hallway.' The cell door is constructed with full plexiglass panels with a steel grate extending the full length of the door between the plexiglass panels. A food port is part of the door construction. There are also two observation windows positioned within the wall of the short 'hallway' so that the CO on constant watch is able to view the inmate wherever he may be within the cell.

If an inmate is *not* on constant watch, but rather on close watch, a CO within the unit must check on the inmate every 15 minutes. This practice is defined by and in compliance with DRC policies. Reportedly, the COs who are watching over inmates in segregation are trained to inquire of the inmate how he is doing and to engage in light and periodic conversation as one of the means of evaluating his demeanor. Inmates in the safe cell are reportedly provided with paper clothing, which replaces their usual prison issue clothing.

The inspection of the safe cell revealed that the water was in operation for the in-cell shower, toilet, and sink. The bed is positioned in the center of the room and at a lower level than standard bed height. There are no observable fixtures or features of the cell that could be used for hanging. All vents, fixtures, and the window are recessed and/or covered.

Programs and Education: Academic, Vocational, Reentry, Community Service, and Rehabilitative/Life-Skills Programs

Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center offers academic and vocational education through their own resources and also through an arrangement with the local Sinclair Community College. Courses available through Sinclair Community College include Computer Aided Drafting and Design (CADD) and Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC). A specific CADD classroom is housed within the Echo Unit, separate from the other school classrooms and the vocational HVAC shop.

Dominant in the staff descriptions of programming offered to inmates at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center were the headings 'education' and 'reentry.' It was noted that philosophies that underscore the value of education and skills as a key component in reducing recidivism are at the core, and serve the primary purpose of daily operations at Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. Information provided to CIIC by facility staff indicates that Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center provides at least one program under each of the DRC's Approved Reentry Programs Index. The breakdown of MEPRC programs under the seven 'dynamic' domains with measurable outcomes is shown in the following list.

1. Employment/Education Domain

- ABLE/Literacy
- Pre-GED Instruction
- GED Instruction and Work Study
- Work and Family Life
- Career Tech Baking
- Career Tech Administrative Office Technology
- Advanced Job Training

2. Marital/Family Domain

- Responsible Family Life Skills (RFLS)

3. *Associates/Social Interaction Domain*
From the Inside Out
4. *Substance Abuse Domain*
Intensive Outpatient
5. *Community Functioning Domain*
Release Preparation
6. *Personal/Emotional Orientation Domain*
Anger Management
7. *Attitude Domain*
Victim Awareness

Academic, Vocational, and Re-entry Programming. Noting the previous heading for (1) Employment/Education Domain, several components work together to the benefit of inmates. These programs are delivered predominantly through the Central School System, which is the charter school district that serves the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, under the direction of a Superintendent of Schools from the DRC Central Office.

Inmates are placed in programming based upon their out-date, and since overpopulation has not been an issue for the institution, there are minimal waiting lists for entrance to courses. It was relayed that the center could accommodate an increase in the number of inmates.

The physical building and space occupied for academic instruction was designed and built specifically for academics and looks just as any academic building found on a community college campus. A central hallway provides access to several self-contained classrooms. Classrooms are designed for relative small number of inmate student classes. Restrooms are located on the central hallway for inmate use and inmates are permitted to take a restroom break from class as needed without the presence of an officer. In addition to using the school classrooms for academic and vocational courses, the rooms also serve as centers for delivery of some of the other programs, such as Responsible Family Life Skills, offered under the Marital/Family Domain of the Reentry Programs Index established by the DRC.

The library was operating on somewhat limited hours and was not open to inmates during the time of the inspection due to staff shortage and budget cuts preventing the hiring of a second librarian. The library does maintain a relatively large collection of newspapers, magazines, and books. Also located within the library are computer terminals, for limited inmate use. In order to accommodate some of the hours of library operation, inmate library aides have been assigned to fill some of the hours when the regular librarian is not at work.

The school inspection included observations of several classes in session, including a math class, a life-skills class, an administrative office technology class, a GED class, and the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) class. In every classroom, students were engaged in learning at their desks and teachers were either lecturing or engaging in academic dialogue with students. In every classroom, inmate students were observably quiet, respectful, and attentive in their demeanor.

In the math class, there were two inmate tutors working with individual inmate students as the teacher was lecturing. The tutors assisted instruction by answering questions and providing further explanations to individual students to support the teacher. The math instructor explained that this method had proven to be successful in increasing student understanding. The teacher attributed that to the assumption that the inmate tutors, which he referred to as classroom aides, possess an understanding of the learning struggles of fellow-inmate students and they have a way of empathizing and re-explaining details so as to increase clarity and understanding among the students. The effect was positive and similar to a team-teaching concept. Students were seated at individual desks, but the room was also equipped with computer stations, monitors for intra-networked programming and instruction, and multiple other resources for both teacher and student use.

In the HVAC classroom, which is a huge 'shop' room with high-ceilings, much natural light from windows, and concrete floors, the instructor was delivering a lecture related to the content. Students were seated at long tables. The classroom is equipped with drop-down power outlets, multiple heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration appliances and models for the instruction of content. The instruction is clearly hands-on in addition to lecture, as evidenced by disassembled appliances and verified by the instructor.

The baking class was not in session at the time of the inspection, however, it does have its own classroom space and uses the institution's kitchen for baking training, which is completed when the kitchen is not in use for meal preparations. It was relayed that the baking program has become popular.

The vocational computer and information technology program uses computer terminals that are networked, but without access to the Internet and Web. The teacher may however, selectively download information from the Web to the classroom.

The benefit of the inter-institution network is that instructors from other institutions may 'share' instruction with students at other correctional institutions through a video conferencing delivery system.

Inmates who were interviewed during the inspection regarding their academic experiences relayed the following three strengths relevant to the instructional design and delivery methods at MEPRC: thorough test preparations, constant work assignments (much practice), and the use of tutors assigned to teachers and classrooms. Instructors who were interviewed regarding the greatest academic challenges that inmates face,

indicated the a deficit in math and writing skills frequently held them back from grasping and processing assignments and making academic progress.

School Administration reported that there are currently 180 inmates enrolled in the school. Among the desired improvements or changes that were relayed by the administration, were a better means of tracking the successes of graduates after release and the need for additional funding to the education budget. The administration is very pleased with its 100% success rate among GED students.

Monthly Reported Educational Programming. Monthly enrollment data provided to CIIC from MEPRC reveals that for the month of March 2008, the school met its *academic and career-tech (vocational)* goals at 95%-100%, as shown in the following tables.

| Table 3: Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center Academic Goals and Completions – March 2008 | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|
| Program | Course Completers Current Month | Course Completers Year to Date | Course Wait List | Number of Certificates | | Percent of Attained Goals | |
| | | | | Month | YTD | Quarter | YTD |
| Literacy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ABLE (Adult Basic Literacy Education) | 35 | 109 | 10 | 12 | 23 | 100 | 98 |
| Pre-GED | 44 | 115 | 7 | 7 | 38 | 100 | 98 |
| GED (General Education Diploma) | 0 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 35 | 100 | 100 |
| GED Evening (Fast Track) | 14 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 95 | 95 |
| Academic TOTAL | 93 | 251 | 30 | 26 | 100 | 99 | 98 |

| Table 4: Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center Career-Tech Goals and Completions – March 2008 | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|
| Program | Course Completers Current Month | Course Completers Year to Date | Course Wait List | Number of Certificates | | Percent of Attained Goals | |
| | | | | Month | YTD | Quarter | YTD |
| Baking | 6 | 26 | 11 | 5 | 18 | 100 | 100 |
| Administrative Office Technology (AOT) | 12 | 33 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 100 | 98 |
| Work & Family Life | 12 | 40 | 8 | 3 | 33 | 100 | 100 |
| Career-Tech TOTAL | 30 | 99 | 38 | 8 | 61 | 100 | 99 |

Community Service Programs. There were several inmates engaged in tasks associated with two *community service programs* on the day of the inspection. One of the most noted community service programs in operation at MEPRC is Crayons to Computers, which produces goods and services to local entities and to meet local needs within the community. For example, the program maintains a Crayons to Computer ‘free’ store, where teachers may ‘shop’ once a month for instructional materials shown in a catalog. The teachers are typically from the local school in the institution’s adopt-a-school program. Items are selected from a catalog, which inmates have created to display examples and information about the ‘products’ available for acquisition. One group of inmates was working on sewing projects on the day of the inspection. The tasks for the day included the construction of tote bags for children to use in reading programs and patchwork quilts for the homeless. Quilt construction is part of a Bed-N-A-Bag project that provides water resistant sleeping bags to local homeless shelters. A DRC news release of October 2007 reported that 200 sleeping bags were presented to the local shelters by the DRC Director. Inmates from Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center, in conjunction with North Central Correctional Institution and Toledo Correctional Institution, produced the 200 sleeping bags. Another MEPRC inmate arrived in the sewing room during the inspection to continue his work on a crocheted blanket. Last, the inmates showed the inspection team examples of oversized bibs that they had sewn for use in a nursing home. The Crayons to Computers work and sewing rooms are located in the Charlie Unit.

Another group of inmates was also working under the Crayons to Computers program. These inmates were packaging die-cut paper shapes of animals in kits for use by a preschool or elementary class. The paper shape kits are prepared in response to requests from school districts that are operating on reduced funding.

Still another community service venture under Crayons to Computers is the bicycle repair shop. Old and discarded bicycles are donated or acquired at no cost to the institution, and

inmates refurbish and rebuild the bicycles, which are then distributed at no cost to children in need through the local adopt-a-school program.

It takes the efforts of one MEPRC staff member to identify, create, and coordinate the Crayons to Computer activities and projects. With all materials being provided or donated at no cost to the institution and the inmates providing the labor, these community services ventures make a positive impact on the local community and help to establish a spirit of service and stewardship among the inmates. The inmates reported that they felt quite good about being able to give something back to the community through their efforts. The inmates accumulate community hours of service, which are entered to their records. Collectively, the inmates at MEPRC contributed over 180,000 hours to community service during 2007.

Medical Services

The medical services department at MEPRC is small compared to an average medical unit in other DRC institutions. The need for a large medical unit at MEPRC is offset because the inmate population is comparatively small, there are no inmates on psychotropic medications, and the medical department at the adjacent Dayton Correctional Institution serves the inmate populations at both institutions. The medical unit includes a waiting area with multiple chairs and television. The waiting room also is equipped with a pill call window for distribution of medication during hours that the clinic is not open. The clinic itself includes a central intake area equipped with a nurse's desk and locked storage cabinets, one adjacent exam room, a locked nurse's work room, a locked storage room for supplies, and a staff restroom. The nurse on duty relayed that working for the institution is very rewarding. Her suggestions for improvements to the medical unit, aside from its eventual merge with the full medical services at Dayton Correctional Institution, were to enlarge the overall space of the clinic and to redesign the space so as to create more privacy for the inmates.

One Correctional Officer staffs the medical unit with the nurse on duty at all times that there is an inmate receiving services. The nurse relayed the challenges faced when called to respond to an immediate medical emergency. Due to the location of the clinic on the second floor of the administrative building and the requirement to pack-up two equipment 'duffle' bags and other emergency tools, the nurse is challenged to reach any site at the opposite end of the institution within the required four-minute arrival time. The nurse relayed that some type of cart would be helpful in meeting the requirement, although the nurse also relayed that a new motorized golf cart is available upon request.

A Doctor holds office hours and appointments two times per week, a Nurse-Practitioner is on staff five days a week, and Registered Nurses are on staff every day of the year. At times when the need for medical services is greater than one person at a time, inmates are referred to the Dayton Correctional Institution medical unit. Plans are in place to combine the medical and dental services of the Dayton Correctional Institution and Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. The Dayton institution is located

adjacent and within a short walking distance to MEPRC. Staff indicated there would be no reduction in quality or quantity of medical services with the consolidation.

The Institutional Inspector relayed that there had been only two medical grievances that he had to deal with over the preceding three years. Likewise, the nurse on duty reported that the medical unit was efficient, managed accountably, and provided 'wonderful' care to the inmates it serves.

Monthly Reported Medical Services. Monthly data reported to CIIC from MEPRC for March 2008 regarding medical services reveals that, in a manner consistent with other institutions, the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center experiences the most medical activity in Nurse Sick Calls, Doctor Sick Calls, and Pharmacy activity. The following table displays this data for the first quarter of 2008.

| Table 5. Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center Monthly Medical Services for January – March 2008 | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| | January | February | March | Quarter TOTAL |
| Sick Call | | | | |
| Nurse Intake Screen | 47 | 27 | 35 | 109 |
| Nurse Referrals to Doctor | 8 | 15 | 5 | 28 |
| Nurse Sick Call and Assessments | 34 | 62 | 33 | 129 |
| Doctor Sick Call | 47 | 117 | 92 | 256 |
| Pharmacy | | | | |
| Medical Refills | 83 | 55 | 54 | 192 |
| Medical New Prescriptions | 306 | 234 | 234 | 774 |
| TOTAL Prescriptions | 389 | 289 | 289 | 967 |

Mental Health Services

Since the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center does not accept inmates with serious mental illness or those taking psychotropic medications, there is no active mental health service department of significance. When an inmate may present with some form of mental health need that cannot be met at MEPRC, the inmate is referred to Dayton Correctional Institution for help.

Exit Meeting

The exit meeting for Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center was informally conducted enroute from the center to the Dayton Correctional Institution, where summary comments were offered regarding both institutions by the Warden and CIIC staff. Among the comments were indicators that the DRC is engaged in phases of downsizing due to budget cuts and that considerations and services are being provided to assist staff through potentially stressful transitions, particularly unit staff suffering job loss.

CIIC DATABASE: CONTACTS AND CONCERNS

System-wide Distribution of Contacts and Concerns to CIIC

From January 1, 2007 through April 22, 2008, a total of **2,502** *system-wide* contacts were received by CIIC thus far in the biennium. Most of these contacts to CIIC are in the form of letters. Of interest is that there have been **no contacts** made to the CIIC from inmates or staff at the **Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center**. In contrast to this notable absence of contacts is the degree of communication received from the four institutions with the largest number of contacts to CIIC.

- The *largest* number of contacts were received from the maximum security (level four) ***Southern Ohio Correctional Facility***, with 448 contacts, comprising nearly *18 percent* of all contacts during the period of January 1, 2007 through April 22, 2008.
- The two medium security (level two) prisons in Marion, Ohio, the ***North Central Correctional Institution and the Marion Correctional Institution***, rank *second* in number of contacts to CIIC, with *155 contacts each or 6.2 percent*.
- The close security (level three) ***Warren Correctional Institution*** in Lebanon, Ohio, ranks *third* in volume of contacts with *141 or 5.6 percent of the current total contacts*.
- The ***Grafton Correctional Institution*** ranks fourth system-wide with 118 contacts comprising 4.7 percent of the total contacts.

Table 6 shows the broad system-wide distribution of Contacts submitted to the CIIC.

| TABLE 6. NUMBER OF CONTACTS RECEIVED BY CIIC REGARDING THE PRISONS FROM JANUARY 1, 2007 TO APRIL 22, 2008 | |
|--|-----------------|
| INSTITUTION | CONTACTS |
| SOCF | 448 |
| NCCI | 156 |
| MCI | 156 |
| WCI | 141 |
| GCI | 118 |
| OSP | 109 |
| ManCI | 108 |
| CCI | 106 |
| ACI | 100 |
| LeCI | 100 |
| LaECI | 93 |
| MaCI | 80 |
| LoCI | 71 |
| ToCI | 61 |
| Other | 59 |
| NCI | 55 |
| ORW | 47 |
| TCI | 35 |
| NEOCC | 32 |
| BeCI | 31 |
| HCF | 26 |
| OCF | 22 |
| LorCI | 19 |
| CRC | 18 |
| NCCTF | 13 |
| SCI | 13 |
| CMC | 5 |
| FPRC | 4 |
| NEPRC | 4 |
| DCI | 3 |
| TOTAL | 2,502 |

So far in the current biennium, the number of *concerns* reported to CIIC have totaled approximately **9,187** problems, issues or concerns regarding the prisons. System-wide, the CIIC received **1,304** reported concerns in the category of “**Force/Supervision**”, which is the largest volume of reported concerns, comprising **14 percent** of all 9,187 reported concerns. The category “**Force/Supervision**” is a subcategory of “**Staff/Inmate Relations**”. The category “**Force/Supervision**” includes: Use of Force with No Report, Abusive Language, Racial or Ethnic Slurs, Conduct Reports for No Reason, Intimidation/Threats, Retaliation, Privacy Violations, and Harassment.

The broad system-wide distribution of concerns reported to CIIC is displayed in the following table. Each contact to CIIC relays one or more concerns.

| TABLE 7. NUMBER OF CONCERNS REPORTED TO CIIC REGARDING THE PRISONS FROM JANUARY 1, 2007 TO APRIL 22, 2008 BY CATEGORY OF CONCERN | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Category of Concern | Number of Concerns |
| Force Supervision | 1,304 |
| Staff Accountability | 1,126 |
| Health Care | 934 |
| Inmate Grievance Procedure | 845 |
| Non-Grievable | 634 |
| Institution Assignment | 368 |
| Other | 324 |
| Safety/Sanitation | 290 |
| Special Management Housing | 287 |
| Protective Control | 278 |
| Personal Property | 260 |
| Facility Maintenance | 254 |
| Food Service | 254 |
| Discrimination | 215 |
| Mail | 179 |
| Security Classification | 164 |
| Housing Assignment | 148 |
| Psychiatric/ Psychological | 148 |
| Legal Services | 139 |
| Inmate Account | 138 |
| Commissary | 132 |
| Visiting | 130 |
| Job Assignment | 123 |
| Education/Vocational Training | 87 |
| Laundry | 68 |
| Recreation | 68 |
| Dental | 61 |
| Records | 45 |
| Librarian | 44 |
| Recovery Services | 44 |
| Telephone | 41 |
| Religious Services | 35 |
| Inmate Account | 20 |
| TOTAL | 9,187 |

Monthly Reported Grievance Activity. The absence of contacts to the CIIC from Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center is paralleled in the absence of grievances that MEPRC inmates filed to the Inspector. Data provided from MEPRC to the CIIC during the current biennial period represents grievance activity for the majority of the months within the biennial reporting period. Within eight reported months of 2007, there were a total of seven grievances filed to the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center's Institutional Inspector. For the first quarter of 2008, January through March, the Institutional Inspector at MEPRC received no Grievances. Beginning in April 2008, grievances from both Dayton Correctional Institution and the Montgomery institution

were filed to the same Institutional Inspector, with no separation between the two institutions.

Grievances and Concerns Regarding Prisons

Of the seven grievances filed specifically to the MEPRC Institutional Inspector during the 2007 through 2008 months, there were three complaints of *use of force with no report*, one reported *harassment*, one reported visitor not approved complaint, one food portion complaint, and one alleged *conduct report for no reason*.

Even though there were only seven grievances at MEPRC, five (comprising Use of force with no report, Conduct report for no reason, and Harassment) or 71% of those complaints, fell into the system-wide subcategory of most frequently addressed complaints under “**Force/Supervision.**”

Monthly Reported Racial Breakdown and Use of Force. A review of monthly data supplied to CIIC from MEPRC for the most recent month of April 2008, shows there was one Use of Force incident reported. The incident in which force was used on one black inmate, was assigned to a Use of Force Committee for investigation, extending beyond the initial 30-day period.

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Based on BRITISH EXPECTATIONS and FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Two questionnaires were developed by CIIC for use on 2007-2008 inspections. One of the questionnaires is based on selected sections of British Expectations, which contain inspection criteria used by the British Inspectorate. These Expectations were the subject of one of the presentations at an international conference on effective prison oversight in 2006. They are reported to be consistent with international standards. The purpose of gathering information on the extent to which Ohio correctional institutions are similar or different from selected sections of Expectations is twofold: To identify possible areas in need of improvement, and to identify possible means of addressing reported areas of concern.

The second questionnaire is based on the 16 recommendations of the Ohio Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force. The purpose of the questionnaire is merely to gather information on the extent to which progress is being made in implementing the recommendations. Brief, handwritten responses to the questions by any staff person knowledgeable of the subject, were requested.

To avoid burdening any one staff person at the facility with the task of responding to the entire questionnaire, sections and subsections identified by topics were separated and stapled, ranging from one to three pages each. The Warden could choose to give each section or subsection to a different staff person who is knowledgeable in the particular area. Very brief responses, such as “yes”, “no” and/or explanation, indicating the extent

to which the facility's practices are similar or different from Expectations, were requested. Completed questionnaires were requested to be returned to the CIIC office within ten days of the inspection.

The following provides a brief summary showing the organization of each of the two questionnaires and also a section for each instrument that presents the 'Notable Responses' provided by the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. In the last section of this report, the complete set of questions and responses are provided for review.

BRITISH ADULT EXPECTATIONS

The British Expectations is a tool for examining every aspect of prison life, from reception to reentry. The expectations draw upon, and are referenced against, international human rights standards. The Inspectorate's four tests are:

- **Safety**
- **Respect**
- **Purposeful Activity**
- **Reentry**

These are increasingly accepted internationally as the cornerstones of a "healthy" custodial environment, providing consistent criteria in a system that is increasingly under pressure and subject to conflicting demands. The Expectations have been used as the basis for an independent and evidence-based assessment of conditions in prisons. Its content and approach have proven to be helpful to those who are monitoring and examining prisons in other jurisdictions. The Expectations consist of separate sections and subsections. Sections included in the questionnaire are provided below:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Environment and Relationships: | Residential Units Clothing and Possessions Hygiene Staff – Prisoner Relationships |
| Duty of Care: | Complaint/Grievance Procedure Bullying and Violence Reduction Self-Harm and Suicide |
| Activities: | Learning and Skills and Work Activities Library |
| Good Order: | Security and Rules Rules |
| Services: | Food Services |

***NOTABLE RESPONSES TO BRITISH ADULT EXPECTATIONS – from
Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center***

In reviewing the responses to the questions pertaining to Expectations, some are notable because they indicate a possible area in need of improvement. Others are notable because they reflect a particularly positive practice. Selected responses are indicated below, while the complete questions and responses are provided at the end of this report.

SECTION 1 – ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS

Residential Units

MEPRC administrative responses to the British Expectation questions confirm the visual observations of the inspection. The residential environment appears to support the mission of the institution to create a safe, secure, and humane environment for the purpose of providing opportunities for treatment, educational programming, and other services that will enhance inmate reintegration into society as law abiding and productive citizens.

The response time to cell emergencies, as indicated by MEPRC administration, is three minutes.

Clothing and Possessions

Provisions and maintenance measures for clothing and possessions are in place and readily accessible to inmates.

Hygiene

The immediate access and relative privacy of the institution's hygiene provisions favors regular and comprehensive personal care. Inmate privacy is provided.

Staff-Prisoner Relationships

During the inspection, there was observable and pleasant interaction and dialogue between staff and inmates. Staff showed interest in inmates and inmates appeared honest and unafraid in their demeanor toward staff,

SECTION 2 – DUTY OF CARE

Complaint/Grievance Procedure

It was indicated that staff believe that complaint procedures are in place and easy to access, timely in responses, and inmates do not fear repercussions from use of the grievance procedure.

Bullying and Violence Reduction

MEPRC attempts to engage inmates in ownership of strategies to reduce and eliminate bullying. Administration believes the strategies are “good” at promoting safer custody and reducing intimidation.

Self-Harm and Suicide

The infrastructure for reducing self-harm and suicide includes before, during, and after plans and arrangements for inmates in need of mental health support. Administration relayed that early identification and care for mental health concerns is routine. Regular reviews are reportedly conducted to monitor the mental health of inmates. Unit staff receive regular annual in-service training regarding mental health issues and care. A specific ‘first night’ center for inmates new to mental health services is deemed not applicable to the operations at MEPRC.

SECTION 3 – ACTIVITIES

Learning Skills and Work Activities

Since the overall organization and operations at MEPRC is designed and administered toward education and job acquisition, the institution reported that channels to learning a basic and postsecondary education are very good, job acquisition is very good, and inmates are also given incentives such as Earned Credit for full and effective participation in learning and work activities.

Library

Administration indicated the institution’s library provides materials for all academic disciplines, work-related topics, vocational subjects, and social and life skills. Library materials reportedly reflect cultural and handicap differences in materials. Library materials include legal textbooks, DRC Administrative Rules and DRC Policies.

SECTION 4 – GOOD ORDER

Security

Administration acknowledged the ‘dynamic security’ is established at MEPRC through positive staff-prisoner relationships based upon mutual respect, attention to physical and procedural matters, personal attention from staff, constructive activity for inmates, absence of clustering of staff, effective security intelligence, careful and selective use of strip searches, and a visible and unambiguous system to direct and appeal visitation.

Rules

The Inmate Handbook is posted, distributed, and publicized prominently. Explanations are required in addressing rule violations with inmates, rule issues are handled beginning at the lowest staff level first, language and literacy differences are respected and accommodated, and rules are reportedly applied openly, fairly, and consistency, without discrimination.

SECTION 5 - SERVICES

Food Services

Food services reportedly respect special diets, religious diets, medical diets, and all meals are deemed to be 'Heart Healthy.' It was also reported that foods are stored, prepared, and served to meet high standards of cleanliness. All food workers are health-screened and trained in food handling and service. Inmates on transfer do miss a main meal, but are offered a snack to compensate. Inmates are given opportunity for input regarding menus and foods as possible.

FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES RECOMMENDATIONS

The faith-based community has become increasingly more present within the adult prison system and has cultivated a following of people who are engaged in contact with the incarcerated population. The recommendations offered in the faith-based initiatives are framed in sixteen questions with subordinate questions, which extend the application of the recommended concept. The responses that an institution makes to each question and the relevant recommendation(s) may serve as a base point from which the institution may identify its strengths, weaknesses, gaps in services, and perhaps overlap of services. If used in a constructive way, the recommendations may serve to aid in the realization of improvements in services delivered to inmates and staff alike. The sixteen questions, distributed among four headings (infrastructure, alternatives to incarceration, institutional programming, and re-entry programming), call attention to the many aspects of institutional operations and programs. As with each institution upon CIIC inspection, Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center responded to the following sixteen initiatives:

1. The degree to which institutions are engaged in faith-based or community programs.
2. The degree to which the Director of the DRC agency works with Wardens to develop programs that facilitate cultural change.
3. The presence or absence of a marketing plan at agency level to recruit volunteers.
4. The degree to which DRC has developed training for staff, volunteers and community.
5. Identification of state law(s) that remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions that inhibit offenders' successful re-entry.
6. Recognition of improvements in communication among staff within institutions and within communities.

7. The degree of statutory latitude to increase judicial use of community options for non-violent offenders, making space in prisons for violent offenders.
8. The presence and/or encouragement of connections between faith-based programs and community programs, such that diversion programs and other services are provided at and during probation.
9. The prevalence of working relationships and connections between the DRC agency and the faith-based community.
10. The degree to which the DRC agency and the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services have partnered to increase employment opportunities for offenders in the community.
11. The degree to which the DRC is working with faith-based community volunteers to develop and expand *specific* programs within the institutions.
12. The existing or planned partnerships between the DRC agency and *national* organizations to provide programming within the institutions.
13. To what degree does DRC engage the faith community in the development of offenders' release plans?
14. Have methods been developed to increase and promote the faith community in the re-entry process of offenders, and also to encourage collaboration among faith groups?
15. In what ways are offenders informed of various housing options before leaving prison or at release?
16. In what ways has the institution partnered with grassroots and community organizations to decrease the negative stigma of ex-offenders to the general public?

***NOTABLE RESPONSES TO CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES
RECOMMENDATIONS – from Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center***

Overall, the responses of the staff at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center to the sixteen faith-based initiatives revealed that the institution is currently engaged with the local faith community and also that they continuously seek new partnerships and local connections that offer opportunities to engage offenders prior to and post-release in activities that will benefit both the offender and the community. Specific evidence of this activity is summarized under the four primary headings found in the questionnaire.

Infrastructure

Administration at MEPRC reported that faith-based and community programs do address criminogenic needs through specific programs. Communication from the DRC Director suggests that there is the expectation for evidence-based programs. It was indicated that the Director's recommendations are carried out through policies.

It was noted that infrastructural culture change is cultivated through collaborative program development and the engagement of Wardens throughout the process. Marketing efforts are implemented in an effort to seek new volunteers, while the funding of programs remains a challenge. Training for staff, volunteers, and

community remain in place and the addition of postings, e-mails, and seminars aid in the communication of programs.

Alternatives to Incarceration

Reportedly, there is an effort from MEPRC to increase judicial use of community options and to draw upon the impact of faith-based and community service providers to provide treatments so as to encourage the success of alternative measures to incarceration. Local faith-based organizations supplement institutional efforts through diversionary programs and to assist ex-offenders at re-entry with their basic needs. Funding remains one of the greatest challenges to programs that address offenders' basic needs at re-entry. Faith-based groups have become increasingly involved in job searches and placements.

Institutional Programming

MEPRC administration indicated there is collaboration and cooperation with faith-based groups to develop and deliver programs *within* the institution. It was noted that a primary purpose of these programs is to address criminogenic needs so as to change offender attitudes, cognitions, behavior toward authority, employment instability, education, housing, and leisure time.

Specific life skills programs are among those created to support re-entry and an orientation to community-based living. It was relayed that to date, the institution and DRC program linkages are with local communities, programs, and organizations rather than with national entities.

Re-entry Programming

MEPRC indicated that the linkages between DRC and the faith-based community have evolved at a 'natural' pace, without much intervention to accelerate those linkages. The MEPRC administration indicated no knowledge of cross-training among faith-based groups with regards DRC institutional programs, avenues of involvement, needs of offenders, etc. It was acknowledged that the DRC has added updates to its website to cultivate interest and engagement of faith-based organizations.

Regarding housing and re-entry, offenders are reportedly versed on all options available in the community at large. Verbal orientations are supported by seminars, free legal services and consultation, and additional information regarding faith-based organizations and the assistance that they may have to offer. Also, re-entry advice and education to the offender includes presentations by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as education options and linkages to sources for those services.

**COMPLETE QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO BRITISH EXPECTATIONS
from Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center**

SECTION 1: ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS

Residential Units

1. Do prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions? **Yes**
2. Are cells and communal areas (blocks, dorms, dayrooms) light, well decorated and in a good state of repair? **Yes**
3. Do all prisoners occupy accommodation that is suitable for the purpose and for their individual needs? **Yes**
 - a. Are there cell sharing risk assessments? **Yes**
 - b. Are cells sufficiently warm in winter and cool in summer? **Yes**
 - c. Are cells ventilated and do they have sufficient daylight? **Yes**
 - d. Do prisoners have their own bed, corkboard, lockable cupboard/locker box, and use of a table and chair? **Yes**
 - e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks? **Yes**
 - f. Do shared cells have screened toilets?
No – N/A
4. Are reasonable adjustments made to ensure that prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems can access all goods, facilities, and services? **Yes**
 - a. Do prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems have ease of access to different locations and services? **Yes**
 - b. Are older, infirm and disabled prisoners assigned to landings, which hold most of the communal facilities? **Yes**
5. Is there a system whereby nominated volunteer prisoners on each residential unit are trained to help less able prisoners and they are paid for this work? **Yes**
 - a. How are volunteers identified, trained and assigned? **Yes**

6. Are residential staff aware of prisoners within their care with disabilities and their location? **Yes**
- a. Are safe evacuation procedures in place to assist those prisoners who may need help in an emergency? **Yes**
 - b. Are there visible markers on cell doors? **Yes**
 - c. What system is in place to highlight to other staff that any prisoners with disabilities and/or mobility problems may need assistance in an emergency?
Door Notice
7. Do prisoners have access to drinking water, toilet and washing facilities at all times?
Yes
- a. Is water in the cells certified as drinking water, if used in this way for prisoners?
Yes
8. Are age-appropriate risk assessments in place to ensure the safety of young adults from any other prisoners? **Yes**
- a. Are there single cell risk assessments? **Yes**
 - b. What are procedures in any case where young adults are identified as posing a risk to others? **Yes**
9. Do all prisoners have access to an in-cell emergency call button/bell that works (**NO**) and is responded to within five minutes? **Response is made within three (3) minutes.**
10. Do observation panels in cell doors remain free from obstruction? **Yes**
11. Is there a clear policy prohibiting offensive displays, and is it applied consistently?
Yes
12. Are prisoners' communal areas (activity and shower areas) clean, safe, meet the needs of the prisoner population, and effectively supervised by staff? **Yes**
- a. Are there adaptations for older, infirm and disabled prisoners? **Yes**
13. Do prisoners feel safe in their cells and in communal areas of the residential units?
Yes
- a. Is there a suitable design of residential units e.g. good sightlines, and supervision in high-risk areas? **Yes**

14. Are notices displayed in a suitable way for the population? **Yes**
- a. Is adequate provision made for any prisoners who cannot read notices because of literacy, language, or eyesight problems or any other disability? **Yes**
15. Are residential units as calm and quiet as possible both to avoid incidents and to enable rest and sleep, especially at night? **Yes**

Clothing and Possessions

1. Do prisoners have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs? **Yes**
- a. Are older prisoners provided with additional clothing and bedding, if required, without the need for medical permission? **Yes**
2. Do prisoners have at least weekly access to laundry facilities to wash and iron their personal clothing? **Yes**
- a. Do they have access to laundry/exchange facilities outside the weekly rotation? **Yes**
3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request? **Yes**
4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage? **Yes**
5. Is there a standard list detailing the possessions that women prisoners are allowed to keep, and used across all women's prisons? **Yes**
- a. Is there a standard list also employed for male facilities of the same security category? **Yes**
6. Are suitable clothes and bags available to discharged prisoners who do not have them? **Yes**
7. Are facilities available before discharge to launder clothes that have been in storage for long periods? **Yes**

Hygiene

1. Are prisoners encouraged, enabled and expected to keep themselves, their cells and communal areas clean? **Yes**
 - a. Are older and disabled prisoners enabled to keep themselves and their cells clean? **Yes**
2. Do prisoners have ready access to both communal and in-cell toilets, baths and showers in private? **Yes**
 - a. Are screened toilets in shared cells? **Yes**
 - b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older, less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles? **Yes**
3. Are prisoners able to shower or bathe daily, and immediately following physical activity, before court appearances and before visits? **Yes**
 - a. Is there access at any time during the day? **Yes**
 - b. Are older, less able or disabled prisoners helped to have a bath or shower every day? **Yes**
4. Do prisoners have access to necessary supplies of their own personal hygiene items and sanitary products? **Yes**
5. Is fresh laundered bedding provided for each new prisoner on arrival and then on at least a weekly basis? **Yes**
 - a. Is there a system for the replacement of mattresses in operation? **Yes**
 - b. Are clean pillows available for new prisoners as well as other bedding? **Yes**
6. Is a prisoner's valuable property routinely security marked before it is issued? **Yes**

Staff-Prisoner Relationships

1. Are prisoners treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions? **Yes**
2. Is there a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness? **Yes**

3. Are all prisoners treated with humanity, and with respect for the inherent dignity of the person? **Yes**
 - a. Is staff aware that the prison has a duty of care for all prisoners, to ensure no prisoners are at risk of physical or emotional abuse by staff or prisoners, and that prisoners are to be held in decent and humane conditions? **Yes**
4. Are staff aware that they should set a personal example in the way they carry out their duties at all times? **Yes**
5. Are staff always fair and courteous in their day-to-day working with prisoners? **Yes**
6. Do staff positively engage with prisoners at all times? **Yes**
7. Is interaction between staff and prisoners encouraged by the senior management team? **Yes**
 - a. Does staff help and encourage older and less able prisoners to participate in and access all facilities offered across the prison? **Yes**
8. Does staff routinely knock before entering cells, except in emergencies? **Yes**
9. Are prisoners encouraged by staff to engage in all activities and routines, promoting punctuality, attendance and responsible behavior? **Yes**
 - a. What methods are used to encourage prisoners to get involved? **Recreation postings, etc.**
10. Is inappropriate conduct on the part of prisoners challenged? **Yes**
 - a. Do staff demonstrate skill in confronting low-level disputes without using official disciplinary measures? **Yes – IPC**
11. Are prisoners encouraged and supported to take responsibility for their actions and decisions? **Yes**

SECTION 2 - DUTY OF CARE

Complaint/Grievance Procedure

1. Are there effective complaint procedures in place that are easy to access, easy to use, and provide timely responses? **Yes**
2. Do prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are they aware of an appeal procedure? **Yes**

3. Is information about the grievance procedure reinforced through notices and posters that are produced in English and other languages and displayed across the prison? **Yes**
 - a. Are there posters in prominent places on all residential units, including for those with literacy problems and those with disabilities so that they can understand and are able to access the procedures? **Yes – Oral and Handouts**
 - b. Since some prisoners, e.g. foreigners, may need to be specifically told about the whole process, is there a single channel of contact or clear information on how to make a complaint? **Yes**
 - c. Is information on the units/blocks always displayed and do prisoners understand it? **Yes**
 - d. What are the procedures for blind prisoners? **Currently, no blind inmates, but IIS would handle.**
4. Are prisoners encouraged to solve areas of dispute informally, before making official complaints? **Yes - ICR**
5. Can prisoners easily and confidentially access and submit complaint forms? **Yes**
 - a. Are forms required to access complaint forms? **No - verbal**
 - b. Are there forms, and at least one kite box on each block/dorm? **Yes, forms – Centralized kite box.**
 - c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer? **Yes**
 - d. Are form dispensers always stocked with forms? **Yes – by IIS**
 - e. Are informal complaints and grievance files secured on a limited access basis? **Yes - IIS**
6. Do prisoners make use of the procedures, and are they free of pressure to withdraw any complaints or grievances? **Yes**
 - a. What are the procedures for prisoners with learning or other disabilities? **Yes**
7. Are all complaints and grievances, whether formal or informal, dealt with fairly and answered within *seven* days, or 10 days in exceptional circumstances, with either a resolution or a comprehensive explanation of future action? No, administrative rules provide for 14 days to respond to formal complaints, seven days for informal complaints. **Yes**

- a. Are complaints resolved? **Yes**
 - b. Are complaints answered within *seven* working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances? **Yes**
 - c. Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure? **Yes**
 - d. Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner? **Yes**
 - e. Are target return times recorded? **Yes**
 - f. Are letters of complaint/concern from third parties, such as legal representatives, family or voluntary organizations, logged and answered? **Yes**
8. Do prisoners receive responses to their complaints/grievances that are respectful, legible, and address the issues raised? **Yes**
9. Are formal grievances signed and dated by the respondent? **Yes**
- a. Regarding the quality of responses, is there a quality assurance system in place? **Yes**
 - b. Does the staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly print their name on the response? **Yes**
 - c. Are staff responses to confidential complaints returned in sealed envelopes? **Yes**
10. Do prisoners feel able to ask for help in completing their complaint or grievance form and in copying relevant documentation? **Yes**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for help with forms? **No – but can send a kite**
 - b. Are translation services provided for those who need them? **Yes**
 - c. What are the arrangements for prisoners with literacy problems, and for those who are blind? **IIS will provide services**
11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered? **Yes**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for urgent help? **Yes**
12. Are prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners protected from possible recrimination? **Yes**

- a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice? **PC**
 - b. Are responses objective and factual, and conclusions based on evidence rather than supposition? **Yes**
 - c. What are the adverse effects of filing complaints? **None**
 - d. Do prisoners know that there are protection measures if they complain about staff or other prisoners? **Yes - PC**
13. Do prisoners know how to appeal grievance decisions? **Yes**
- a. Are appeals dealt with fairly, and responded to within *fourteen* days? **Yes**
 - b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms? **Yes**
 - c. How many have appealed in the last six months? **Zero**
 - d. What was the outcome, and how promptly were they answered? **N/A**
14. Do all prisoners (and staff) know how to contact members of the Ohio General Assembly's Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, and can they do so in confidence? **Yes – on Unit bulletin boards, Segregation, and Library.**
- a. Is CIIC contact information posted in dorms, blocks, library and other areas to ensure that staff and inmates are aware of how to contact CIIC? **Yes**
 - b. Are there any difficulties with access to the CIIC? **No**
15. Do prisoners receive help to pursue complaints and grievances with unit managers, prison administrators, or other central office staff, if they need to? **Yes**
16. Do all prisoners know how to contact the Inspector and Chief Inspector? **Yes**
- a. Do blocks/dorms have contact details and information? **Yes**
17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need to? **Yes**
- a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisers or making direct applications to the courts? **Yes**
 - b. In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector? **N/A – Contact Chief Inspector 's office**
 - c. What do they tend to be about? **N/A**

d. What proportion is generally resolved? **N/A**

18. Do prison managers analyze complaints (both granted and denied) each month, by ethnicity, disability, block/dorm/unit, prisoner type, etc., and if necessary, make any appropriate changes? **No**

a. Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge? **No**

Bullying and Violence Reduction

1. Does everyone feel safe from bullying and victimization (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault)? **Yes**

2. Are active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation known to staff, prisoners and visitors? *(left blank)*

3. Has the prison developed an effective strategy to reduce violence and intimidation, which has earned the commitment of the whole prison and has drawn on multi-disciplinary consultation including feedback from prisoners? **Yes**

a. Is the violence reduction strategy widely publicized? **Yes**

b. Is monitoring part of the strategy and as a minimum, does it cover feelings of safety among prisoners, incidents of bullying (verbal and physical), number of assaults, number of racist incidents, location of incidents and action taken?
Yes

c. Do staff understand their duty to maintain a safe environment and what they do to promote this? **Yes**

d. Are staff alert to threats to a safe environment, and do they confront all forms of victimization? **Yes**

e. Are prisoners consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance?
No

f. How effective is the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction? **Good!**

4. Are prisoners consulted and involved in determining how their lives in the prison can be made safer, how bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence are confronted, how conflicts can be resolved and what sanctions are appropriate? **Yes**

a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months? **No**

- b. Has an annual confidential survey to all prisoners about bullying been undertaken? **No**
 - c. Are there wing representatives? **No**
5. Do staff supervise and protect prisoners throughout the prison from bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence? **Yes**
6. Are staff consistent in challenging these behaviors? **Yes**
 - a. How many incidents occurred in the last six months? **N/A**
 - b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying? **No**
 - c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners? **Contact Staff - PC**
 - d. Do staff lead by example in the way they treat their colleagues/prisoners, and understand that their duty is to foster a safe environment, by confronting unacceptable behavior quickly and fairly? **Yes**
 - e. What are the arrangements for movement, exercise, mealtimes and discharge, especially for those who are considered vulnerable? **None**
 - f. Is particular attention given to prisoners who have asked for protection from other prisoners or those who may be victimized because of the nature of their offense or other individual circumstances? **Yes**
7. Are prisoners' families and friends encouraged to make suggestions about how the prison could better protect prisoners from victimization and to provide information to help identify those prisoners likely to be at risk? **No**
 - a. Are prisoners' families encouraged to come forward if they feel they are being bullied to bring drugs into prison? **Yes – OSHP (Ohio State Highway Patrol)**
 - b. Is a visitors' survey distributed systematically? **No**
 - c. Do visiting families know about reporting procedures and do they think that visiting staff are approachable and sympathetic? **Yes**
 - d. Are there posters in visiting rooms? **Yes**
8. Is an effective strategy in place to deal with bullying which is based on an analysis of the pattern of bullying in the prison and is applied consistently throughout the prison? **No**

- a. Has a strategy been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison? **No**
 - b. Is a central log of bullying kept, and are incidents of bullying reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee? **No**
 - c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization? **No**
 - d. Are all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. used for evidence of bullying/intimidation? **No**
 - e. How do staff contribute to the strategy? **Reporting**
 - f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments? **Yes – Incident Report**
9. Are allegations of bullying behavior treated consistently and fairly? **Yes**
- a. Are they investigated promptly? **Yes**
 - b. Are outcomes of investigations recorded and is the prisoner who reported the bullying supported? **Yes – DRC forms**
10. Are prisoners made aware of behavior that is unacceptable through a well-publicized policy and are made aware of the consequences of bullying? **Yes**
11. Is inappropriate behavior consistently challenged? **Yes**
- a. Are there bullying posters throughout the prison? **No**
 - b. What information is distributed to new arrivals? **Grievance, sex offense information**
 - c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners? **No**
 - d. Are staff aware of both direct and indirect forms of bullying? **Yes**
12. Do anti-bullying measures support the victim and take the victim's views about their location into account? **Yes**
- a. Do staff understand the link between bullying and aggressive and disruptive behavior generally? **Yes**
13. Are appropriate interventions in place to deal with bullies and support victims? **Yes**

- a. What interventions are available to challenge bullies and to support victims of bullying? **None**
- b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior? **N/A**
- b. Do prisoner records contain comprehensive updates on how bullied and bullying prisoners have been supported and/or challenged? **No**

Self-Harm and Suicide

1. Does the prison work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach? **Yes**
2. Are prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide identified at an early stage, and is a care and support plan drawn up, implemented and monitored? **Yes**
3. Are prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity? **Yes**
4. Are all staff aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, appropriately trained, and have access to proper equipment and support? **Yes**
5. Is there a safer custody strategy in place that recognizes the risks to prisoners, particularly in the early days in custody, and sets out procedures, which help to reduce the risk of self-harm? **Yes**
 - a. Are the specific needs of different prisoner groups recognized, as are the levels of risk in different areas of the facility? **Yes**
 - b. Does the strategy recognize the specific needs of the population e.g. women and minority groups, those with substance misuse problems, and those not on normal location? **Mental Health, STG, etc.**
 - c. Is staff training appropriate? **Yes**
 - d. What is the availability and use of safer cells, particularly in areas of the prison where risks of self-harm are higher? **Good**
 - e. Does the *policy* in place recognize the need for continued interaction, and avoid an over reliance on the safer cell as a preventative measure? **Yes**
6. Does a multi-disciplinary committee effectively monitor the prison's suicide prevention policy and procedures? **Yes**

7. Is the committee chaired by a manager responsible for the policy and does membership include prisoners, staff representatives from a range of disciplines, and a member of the local community mental health team? **No**
8. Are prisoners' families, friends and external agencies encouraged, through local arrangements, to provide sources of information which may help identify and support those prisoners likely to be bullied or who have a history of self-harming behavior? **Yes**
 - a. Are there posters in the visiting room about who to contact with concerns and is that information sent out with visiting orders alerting families to the help available? **Yes**
9. Is there a detailed care and support plan prepared with input from the prisoner, which identifies needs, as well as the individuals responsible including a key worker? **Yes**
10. Are personal factors or significant events that may be a trigger to self-harm identified? **Yes**
11. Do regular reviews take place involving staff from a range of disciplines and family and friends as appropriate, which provide good support and care for all prisoners at risk? **Yes**
12. Are arrangements in place for following up after a care and support plan has been closed? **Yes**
 - a. Do unit officers have knowledge of policy and support plans? **Yes**
 - b. What level of training have they received? **Annual In-Service Mental Health Training.**
13. Are prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm held in a supportive and caring environment with unhindered access to sources of help including peer supporters? **Yes**
 - a. Is a care suite available to support the work of Listeners? **Room / Office**
 - b. Is there access to counselors, the chaplains team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times? **Yes**
 - c. Are appropriate free telephone help lines/interventions available, in particular, to address specific aspects of women's prior victimization such as rape crisis, domestic violence and others? **N/A**
14. Are prisoners encouraged to express any thought of suicide and/or self-harm, and encouraged to take part in all purposeful activities as part of the support plan? **Yes**

- a. Are prisoners given the opportunity and assistance to make a written contribution to their review?
Yes but inmates typically have not made written responses/contributions.
 - b. Are prisoners encouraged to identify their own support needs and are they able to draw on opportunities for informal support from other prisoners if they wish? **Yes**
15. Are all staff, including night staff, fully trained in suicide prevention and clear on what to do in an emergency? **Yes**
- a. Is there a program of refresher training in place? **Yes**
 - b. Do staff have access to first aid kits and shears? **Yes**
 - c. If facility does not have a first night center, do night staff know where first night prisoners and those at risk are located? **N/A**
16. Are incidents of self-harm closely monitored and analyzed at regular intervals to establish any trends and to implement preventive measures? **Yes**
17. Are serious incidents properly investigated to establish what lessons could be learned and to promote good practice? **Yes**
18. Where appropriate, are family or friends of the prisoner informed through a family liaison officer? **No**
19. Is an action plan devised and acted upon promptly as a result of an investigation into an apparent self-inflicted death? **Yes**
- a. Is this reviewed following subsequent findings of an investigation? **Yes**
 - b. Are there attempts to understand underlying causes and/or trends? **Yes**
 - c. Have there been any reviews of recommendations from previous deaths in custody? **Yes – Mortality review of all deaths.**
20. Is all information about prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide communicated to people who are able to offer support in the community? **Yes**

SECTION 3 - ACTIVITIES

Learning Skills and Work Activities

1. Are prisoners encouraged and enabled to learn, and do they have access to good library facilities? **Yes**
2. Is sufficient purposeful activity available for the total prisoner population? **Yes**
3. Are all prisoners assessed to provide a clear understanding and record of their learning and skills needs including literacy, math, and language support, employability and vocational training, and social and life skills? **Yes**.
4. Is the learning and skills and work provision in the prison informed by and based on the diverse needs of prisoners and provides prisoners with both the opportunity of and access to activities that are likely to benefit them? **Yes**
 - a. Does provision meet the needs of older, younger adult, and disabled? **Yes**
5. Are there sufficient activity places to occupy the population purposefully during the core working day? **Yes**
 - a. How many prisoners are locked up during the day? **Yes**
 - b. How many are formally registered as unassigned? **Unknown**
 - c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population?
Extremely overcrowded. **Perfect**
 - d. How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job? **Very Easy**
6. Are activities that fall outside the learning and skills provision purposeful and designed to enhance prisoners' self-esteem and their chances of successful reentry? **Yes**
7. Are facilities and resources for learning and skills and work appropriate, sufficient and suitable for purpose? **Yes**
8. Are all prisoners able to access activity areas? **Yes**
 - a. Is there access for older and disabled prisoners? **Yes**
 - b. Are there any inaccessible areas because of poor mobility and insufficient help to get to them? **No**

9. Is every prisoner who wishes to able to engage fully with all prison activities offered, and is no one excluded from participation, other than as a result of a disciplinary punishment? **No**
- a. Is a full schedule of activities available to all prisoners? **Yes**
Limited due to overcrowding.
10. Is allocation to activity places equitable, transparent, and based on identified reentry planning needs? **Yes**
11. Can prisoners apply for job transfers and are they given written reasons for any decisions? **Yes**
- a. Does case management link with the reentry planning process? **Yes.**
 - b. Do prisoners with identified learning needs work in low skilled, production line work, rather than relevant classes? **Yes**
No.
 - c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures? **Inst to /Balance**
 - d. Is there any favoritism or line jumping? **No**
12. Do local pay schedules provide disincentives for prisoners to engage in education or training activities? **No**
- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities? **Yes**
13. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay? **Yes**
I do not know.
14. Do prisoners who are unemployed through no fault of their own or who are exempt from working unlocked during the day, provided with access to the library and other activities? **Yes**
15. Does the prison have an effective strategy to ensure that learners are able to regularly and punctually attend those activities that meet their needs and aspirations?
Yes.
- a. What systems are in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities? **Earned Credit**

16. Are all prisoners given accurate information, advice and guidance about prison activities, which support their learning and sentence plans and link to their reintegration into the community? **Yes**

17. Does the assessment and provision of individual learning and skills form an effective part of prisoners' reentry plans and are they used effectively to record and review overall progress and achievement? **Yes**

18. Do work placements provide purposeful and structured training for prisoners? **Yes**

a. Wherever possible, can vocational qualifications be obtained alongside their work? **Yes**

b. In the absence of such qualifications, are developed skills recognized and recorded? **Yes**

19. Are prisoners helped to continue on their courses when transferred or to progress to further education, training or employment on release? **Yes**

20. Does the prison accurately record the purposeful activity hours that prisoners engage in, excluding non-purposeful activities in their calculations? **Yes**

Library

1. Does the prison have an effective strategy for maximizing access to and use of a properly equipped, organized library, managed by trained staff? **Yes**

a. How do prisoners with mobility problems get access? **N/A**

2. Are the library materials broadly reflective of the different cultures and needs of the prison population, including Braille, talking books, and foreign language books? **Yes**

3. Do all prisoners have access to a range of library materials, which reflect the population's needs and support learning and skills? **Yes**

4. Does this include:

a. Literacy? **Yes**

b. Math? **Yes**

c. Language? **Yes**

d. Employability? **Yes**

e. Vocational training? **Yes**

f. Social and life skills? **Yes**

5. Do library materials include a comprehensive selection of up-to-date legal textbooks and DRC Administrative Rules and DRC Policies? **Yes**

SECTION 4 - GOOD ORDER

Security and Rules

1. Are security and good order maintained through positive staff- prisoner relationships based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters? **Yes**
2. Are rules and routines well publicized, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behavior? **Yes**
3. Are categorization and allocation procedures based on assessment of a prisoner's risks and needs? **?**
4. Are they clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed? **?**
5. Are there any obvious weaknesses or anomalies in the physical and procedural security of the facility? **No**
6. Are the elements of "dynamic security" in place? **Yes**
 - a. Are staff-prisoner relationships positive? **Yes**
 - b. Do prisoners receive personal attention from staff? **Yes**
 - c. Is there constructive activity to occupy prisoners? **Yes**
 - 1) Do staff cluster during association? **No**
 - 2) Are there enough staff in dorm/block areas to facilitate good officer work? **Yes**
7. Does effective security intelligence safeguard prisoners' well-being? **Yes**
 - a. Do staff comply with security requirements in terms of filing reports? **Yes**
 - b. Are there recent incidents where security reports have led to action? **Yes**
8. Is prisoners' access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessarily restrictive approach to security? **No**
9. Is strip and squat-searching of prisoners carried out only for sound security reasons? **Yes**

10. Are prisoners strip or squat searched only in the presence of more than one member of staff, of their own gender? **Yes**
 - a. If squat searches are used, does their incidence and authorization need to be logged and regularly checked? **Yes**
 - b. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances? **No – with each search**
11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available? **Yes**
 - a. Are the visitors subject to bans or restrictions reviewed every month? **Yes**

Rules

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas? **Yes – in Inmate Handbook**
 - a. Are rules and routines posted/distributed on units/blocks/dorms? **As above – Inmate Handbook**
 - b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs? **Yes**
2. Are rules and routines applied openly, fairly and consistently, with no discrimination? **Yes**
3. Does staff use only the level of authority necessary to ensure a prisoner's compliance with the rules? **Yes**
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned? **Yes**
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoners, are appeal arrangements explained and made available? **Yes**

SECTION 5 - SERVICES

Food Services

1. Are prisoners offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements? **Yes**
2. Is food prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes**

3. Do all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to the relevant food safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes**
4. Are religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving, fully observed and communicated to prisoners? **Yes**
 - a. Are Halal certificates displayed where prisoners can see them? ?
 - b. Are appropriate serving utensils used to avoid cross-contamination? **Yes**
 - c. Do kitchen staff make special arrangements for different types of food, and special dietary requirements for specific inmate groups?

Pregnant inmates? **N/A**
Specific religions? **Yes**
Prisoners with disabilities? **Yes**
 - d. Do prisoners who are on special diets have confidence in the preparation and content of the meals? **Yes**
5. Are all areas where food is stored, prepared and served properly equipped and well managed? **Yes**
6. Are prisoners and staff who work with food, health screened and trained, wear proper clothing, and prisoners are able to gain relevant qualifications? **Yes**
 - a. Do medical clearance forms exist on food service workers, and are training courses offered? **Yes**
7. Are prisoners' meals healthy, varied and balanced and always include one substantial meal each day? **All are 'Heart Healthy'**
 - a. Are prisoners encouraged to eat healthily and are they able to eat five portions of fruit or vegetables a day? **Yes**
 - b. Do prisoners on transfer miss out on their main meal? **Yes**
8. Do prisoners have a choice of meals including an option for vegetarian, religious, cultural and medical diets? **Yes**
 - a. Are all menu choices provided to the same standard? **Yes**
 - b. Are options for religious or cultural groups open to all, and not just those who practice their religion officially? **No**

9. Are prisoners consulted about the menu, and can they make comments about the food? **Yes – Food Service Manager**
 - a. If logs of comments are kept, how frequently are they consulted? **Quarterly**
 - b. Is there a food comments book? **No**
10. Is the breakfast meal prepared on the morning it is eaten? **Yes**
11. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm? **Yes, but dinner is between 4:30 and 6:30 pm**
12. Do prisoners have access to drinking water (including at night time), and the means of making a hot drink after evening lock-up? **Yes**
13. Are prisoners able to eat together (except in exceptional circumstances)? **Yes**
14. Does staff supervise the serving of food in order to prevent tampering with food and other forms of bullying? **Yes**
15. Where prisoners are required to eat their meals in their cells, are they able to sit at a table? **Yes**
16. Do pregnant prisoners and nursing mothers receive appropriate extra food? **N/A**

**COMPLETE QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE
RECOMMENDATIONS – Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center**

INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Is DRC/DYS being encouraged, wherever practical, to use faith-based and community programs that address documented criminogenic needs? How? By whom?
Yes – Exodus II Program, Jehovah’s Witness, Solid Rock Church, and Christian Science.
 - a. Is DRC/DYS in conjunction with the Governor’s Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, making available to the faith community, examples of evidence-based programming shown to impact offenders’ lives? What examples? How are they being made available? **Surveys of the above named programs.**
 - b. Is information being used and disseminated to faith-based and community organizations so that they provide programs that are evidence based and can truly impact the lives of ex-offenders and their families? **Yes**
 - c. What is in place to ensure that the recommendation is implemented? **Yes**
 - d. What methods of program evaluation are being explored to further document program success? What methods are in place? **Policy and Surveys**

2. Is the DRC/DYS Director working with wardens/superintendents to develop programs that will facilitate a cultural change in institutions to encourage collaboration with faith-based and community service providers? **Yes** How? What programs have been developed? **Exodus II, Use of Ex-offenders, etc.**
 - a. Is the culture within the institution continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers? Explain. **Yes**
 - b. How is the warden/superintendent supporting and encouraging a cultural shift and institutional change as a day-to-day practice to encourage community volunteers? **New programming, Use of Ex-Offenders**
 - c. How is the DRC/DYS administration working with wardens/superintendents to collaboratively develop protocols that will proactively assist with changing the culture? **Visitor ID System**
 - d. Have such protocols been developed? **Yes**

- e. What are they? **Policies through Camera Systems**
 - f. Have policies been reviewed to determine if they might inhibit use of community volunteers, and have necessary changes been made accordingly? **Yes**
 - g. What policies have been reviewed? By whom? **Visitation Volunteers**
 - h. What policies have been changed so that they do not inhibit use of community volunteers? **Use of Ex-Offenders, Posters, E-Mails**
3. Has DRC/DYS developed a marketing plan to assist in recruiting volunteers from the community and faith-based institutions? **Yes**
- a. Does the plan discuss educating volunteers about the justice system? **Yes**
 - b. Is there a need to increase programming for incarcerated offenders to improve the likelihood they will be reintegrated into the community successfully upon release from prison? **Yes** What programming exists? **ReEntry** What programming is needed? **Funding**
 - c. Is the faith community being encouraged to volunteer to provide programs and services to assist offenders in both the institutions and the community? **Yes** How? Other programs in and out of the institution.
 - d. Has a marketing plan been developed to overcome the public's misperceptions of offenders? **Yes**
 - e. Has DRC developed an educational program to motivate the faith community to get involved in volunteering, including a video to educate volunteer groups about offenders and their needs in institutions? **Yes**
 - f. Is information provided on how individuals and groups can volunteer in the prisons? **Yes**
 - g. Does the marketing campaign include information on the needs of the adult/youthful offenders, information on how the justice system works, and information on the different ways to volunteer? **Yes**

4. Has DRC/DYS developed a standard training program for staff, volunteers, and the community to facilitate working in institutions together? **Yes, Volunteer Orientation**

a. Does the program include information on:

- Ethics of working with offenders? **Yes**
- Confidentiality issues? **Yes**
- Ensuring safety and security of volunteers? **Yes**
- Working with volunteers? **Yes**
- Rules and regulations for volunteers? **Yes**

b. Does the program include information to volunteers on the security requirements for the institution, why the requirements are in place, and how to properly work with offenders? **Yes**

c. Has a standardized training program been developed for volunteers to facilitate their work in institutions? **Yes**

d. Has DRC/DYS established an orientation program for volunteers, held at preset intervals to allow community organizations to plan for the training as part of their program planning? **Yes**

5. Has Ohio law been revised to remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions that inhibit offenders' successful reentry? **Yes**

6. What improvements have been made regarding communication about programs and services between:

Staff and volunteers: **Postings, e-mails, seminars**

Staff and the community? **Seminars and e-mails**

Other parts of the criminal justice system and the community? **Same as above**

a. What improvements have been made in effectively communicating among staff within the facilities, as well as with the community? **As above**

b. Has an improved communication mechanism been developed in order to ensure these efforts? **Yes**

c. Has the system been developed collaboratively with staff and volunteers to address observed problems? **Yes**

ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION

7. Has the statute been revised to increase judicial use of community options for non-violent offenders so prison space can be reserved for violent offenders? **Yes**

- a. Working with faith-based and community service providers, have programs been developed in the community to effectively provide treatment while protecting public safety? **Yes**
 - b. Has the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission reviewed additional options to encourage judges to use these community options rather than sending non-violent offenders to limited prison space? **Check with them**
 - c. Have local probation departments prepared a listing of community options currently available for judicial use? **Check with them**
 - d. Have faith-based and community programs contacted local probation departments through the Juvenile Court, Common Pleas Court, and Municipal Courts to inform them of programs and services available? Explain. **Check with them**
8. Are faith-based and community programs being encouraged to supplement existing community and diversionary programs for offenders and to provide services that are not currently available? How? **Check with them**
- a. Is DRC/DYS working with community organizations and probation departments to expand services available for offenders? How? **Yes, Reentry**
 - b. Has a community model been created that will help meet the basic needs of offenders within the community? Is it being created? Explain. **No**
9. Has DRC/DYS taken a more active role in linking with the faith-based community to develop programs to meet the gaps in services to adult and juvenile offenders? **No**
How? **Staff layoffs, lack of money, closing of prisons.**
- a. Has DRC/DYS reviewed current grant or subsidy programs to determine eligibility for faith community programs, in order to increase the number of faith-based and community programs available to judges for sentencing? **Yes – all denied.**
 - b. Following identification of funding sources, is DRC/DYS actively working with the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives to provide information to these organizations on funding availability? How? What is in place? **Check with them**
 - c. Is the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives providing technical assistance to the faith community to assist them in developing competitive applications for state and federal funding? **Check with them**

10. Has DRC/DYS, and Job and Family Services expanded efforts in partnership to work with employment centers and the faith community to increase practical employment opportunities for offenders in the community? Explain. **Yes - seminars, posters.**
- a. Has a job placement program been implemented? **No**
 - b. Does it provide:
 - Information on job fairs to ex-offenders? **Yes**
 - Education of businesses/employers on the benefits of hiring ex-offenders? (?)
 - Incentives for employers to hire ex-offenders (i.e., tax breaks)? **Yes**
 - Increased involvement of faith-based and community groups? **Yes**
 - c. Is there collaboration between the DYS, DRC and Job and Family Services who started the employment centers in Ohio? In what way? **Yes, but all closed?**
 - d. Has a program been implemented with the goal to get jobs for offenders upon release, and also to match them up with jobs of interest to the offenders, specifically ones at higher wages and skill levels, if possible? Explain? **No – no jobs**
 - f. Has the DRC Omnibus Reentry legislation been enacted to reduce unnecessary sanctions in the law and thus made training more relevant? **Yes, seminars and posters**

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMMING

11. Is DRC/DYS working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions? **Yes**
- a. Do current programs include the following? Are they being developed? Are they being expanded?
 - Life skills? **Yes**
 - Financial management and budgeting? **Yes**
 - Personal hygiene? **Yes**
 - Family programs including:
 - Family and community-based orientation? **Yes**
 - Family mediation? **Yes**
 - Family education and orientation program? **Yes**
 - Transportation and video conferencing for visitation? **Yes**
 - Parenting? **Yes**

Current programs do include the list items. Yearly we look at the program offered and tailor the program to fit the need of the institution.

- b. Dynamic risk factors that impact offender behavior and risk of re-offending include: antisocial personality, companions, interpersonal conflict, social achievement, substance abuse, and criminogenic needs. Treatment programs can influence and change offender behavior during the time they are in an institution. Programs that address criminogenic needs are programs designed to change offender attitudes, cognitions, behavior toward authority, employment instability, education, housing, and leisure time.

Is DRC/DYS working proactively with faith-based and community groups in the development of programs that will meet the criminogenic needs of offenders in institutions? How? **Yes – Re-entry**

- c. Have specific life skills programs been developed in the following areas?
- Budgeting? **No**
 - Parenting? **No**
 - Job searches? **No**
 - Anger management? **No**
 - Appropriate leisure-time activities? **No**
- d. Is emphasis centered on using a mentor-type relationship for such training? **Yes**
- e. Has legislation created a new community-based reorientation program whereby non-violent offenders could be released to the community up to 30 days prior to the expiration of their sentence to arrange for suitable employment, housing, treatment services, etc.? **Don't know, check with them**
- f. Have video-conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders, been expanded? Are they used as an incentive program? **No**
- g. Do volunteers facilitate the improvement of family relations through coaching in basic relational skills or involvement in family mediation programs? **No**
12. Has DRC/DYS expanded partnerships with national organizations including faith-based and community organizations to provide programming in state institutions? Explain. **No**
- a. Does DRC/DYS have a stated plan for the extent of their involvement in prison programming that specifies any limitations seen as necessary? What is it? **No**
13. Does DRC/DYS involve the faith community when appropriate, in the development of release plans for the offender that flow from the institution to community reentry? Explain. **No**

- a. Are community actors and organizations a part of reentry planning for those offenders who will shortly be returning home? Explain. **No**
- b. The best ideas and programs will serve no purpose in helping offenders live out productive lives after their release if there is no effective community follow-through. Is there effective community follow-through? **No**
- c. Is there a mentorship program for offenders at your facility? **No**
- d. Are faith-based and community volunteer groups actively developing such a program for participation by offenders at your facility? Explain. **No**

REENTRY PROGRAMMING

14. Have methods been developed to increase and encourage the involvement of the faith community in various reentry efforts, and to encourage collaboration among faith groups? What are they? **No**
 - a. What has been done to make the faith community aware of programs and training for the faith community's involvement? **Don't know – check with them**
 - b. What has been done to create awareness among the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and the avenues to get involved? **Don't know – check with them**
 - c. What effort has been made to inform the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and volunteer opportunities available? **Previously stated**
 - d. Have leaders among the faith community been identified? How? When? **No**
 - e. Have staff been used to accomplish this, using existing organizations, groups and established relationships? Explain. **No**
 - f. Has this educational opportunity been extended to faith groups of all kinds? **No**
 - g. Has an easily visible section been added to the DRC (or DYS) web site for the faith community that identifies different programming opportunities for volunteers? **Yes**
 - h. Does the section contain volunteer opportunities linked to specific communities in Ohio, including contact information for volunteer coordination within each department or institution as needed? **Yes**

15. Are offenders informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release? How is this done? **Yes – community at large**

- a. Although the offender is no longer in prison, he/she is still subject to housing restrictions due to the crime committed (i.e. sex offenders), which creates more difficult circumstances and specialized needs. Are seminars, with free legal or consultation services provided, along with increased involvement of the faith community? **Yes – after release**
- b. Is legal advice in these situations available? Have partnerships been formed with local law schools to achieve this end? **Yes**
- c. Are presentations by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development provided to ex-offenders to provide information on their options upon leaving prison, and knowing how to navigate through the many restrictions placed on them? **Yes**
- d. How has DRC/DYS made better use of existing federal programs that aim to address the issue of housing? **Yes**

16. Has DRC/DYS partnered with grassroots and community organizations in an educational effort towards the general public aimed at decreasing the negative stigma of ex-offenders and making the public aware of the needs involved in the process of reentry? What has been accomplished and how? **Yes – education linkage**

- a. What educational efforts have been made to:
 - Assure the public that their best interest is at hand, that public safety is not at risk, but will improve with these efforts, and to: **Community advisory boards**
 - Inform the public of the many needs of ex-offenders to help them transition successfully back into society? **Numerous linkage programs**
- b. Are grassroots agencies and advocacy groups being made aware of and sold on this effort, so that they can help to market the increased public safety and reduced criminal justice costs associated with effective offender reentry? How? **Yes – Re-entry programs in and out of the institution**