

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT
ON THE INSPECTION OF THE
GRAFTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

**Prepared and Submitted by
CIIC Staff**

October 22, 2009

Table of Contents

	Page
INSPECTION PROFILE.....	7
INTRODUCTION TO QUESTIONNAIRES	
INSPECTION SUMMARY	9
Sanitation and Conditions	
Clean and Well Maintained	
D2 Restrooms	
Light and Heat	
Segregation	
Food Services.....	11
Kitchen	
The Meal	
Brunch	
Inmate Dining Room.....	12
Institutional Atmosphere	
Residential Treatment Unit for Mentally Ill	
Library	
Commissary	14
Landscape	
Staff Communication	
The Parole Board.....	15
STATUTORY REQUIREMENT	16
I. Attendance at a General Meal Period	
Food Services	
Kitchen	
Dining Hall.....	17
Inmate Concerns	
<i>Food Services: Expectations Questions and Responses</i>	18
STATUTORY REQUIREMENT	20
II. Attendance at Educational or Rehabilitative Program	
Transitional Education Program	
School Building and Program Area: Community Services.....	21
GCI Educational Services	
Table 1. GCI Educational and Vocational Statistics for July 2009.....	22

Table of Contents

	Page
Re-Entry Programming.....	23
Think for a Change	
Victim Awareness	
Personal Responsibility of Violence Elimination (PROVE)	
Money Smart (FDIC)	
Recovery Services AOD Education Program	
Houses of the Healing	
Community Service Program Area	
Institutional Programs	
Love-A-Pup.....	24
Heart to Heart	
Dope is for Dopes	
Hooked on Giving	
Cage Your Rage	
Friend to Friend	
Authorized Groups and Programs	
<i>Learning Skills and Work Activities: Expectations Questions and Responses</i>	
STATUTORY REQUIREMENT	27
III. Assist in the Development of Improvements	
The Library: Creation or Expansion of Minority Book Sections	
Grafton CI Library	28
<i>Library: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	30
STATUTORY REQUIREMENT	
IV. Grievance Procedure	
CIIC Contacts and Reported Concerns.....	31
Table 2. Number and Type of Reported Concerns received by CIIC regarding the Grafton Correctional Institution	
Table 3. Number and Type of Reported Concerns Received by CIIC Regarding the Grafton Correctional Institution with Subcategories	32
Inmate Concerns.....	33

Table of Contents

	Page
Inmate Grievance Data.....	35
Table 4. Grievance Data, July 2009 from GCI IIS Monthly Report	
Table 5. Informal Complaints Resolution	
Table 6. Number of Grievances Granted and Denied	
Table 7. Breakdown of Grievances by Category, and Total Granted or Denied.....	36
<i>Grievance Procedure: Expectations Questions and Responses</i>	
<i>Staff-Prisoner Relationships: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	<i>42</i>
INMATE CLASSIFICATION AND PROFILE.....	43
Older, Stable Population	
SECURITY THREAT GROUPS	44
Security Threat Group Program-C.O.P.E.	
<i>Bullying and Violence Reduction: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	<i>46</i>
STAFFING COMPOSITION.....	49
Total Staff	
Officers	
Staff Communications.....	50
Rapport, Morale.....	51
Budget.....	52
Impact of Funding Cuts	
Physical Facility	
CROWDING	
Table 8. ODRC Percentage of Crowding per Institution Based on Rated Capacity and Inmate Population Count on August 3, 2009.....	53
USE OF FORCE.....	54
Table 9. GCI Report of racial Breakdown and Use of Force, July 2009	
<i>Good Order-Security and Rules: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Security: Expectations Questions and Responses</i>	
<i>Rules: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	<i>56</i>

Table of Contents

	Page
THE INSPECTION.....	57
Entry Building	
Administrative Building	
THE INFIRMARY	
Medical Staff	
Pharmacy	
Dental Clinic.....	58
Suicide/Safe/Crisis and Isolation Cells	
Exam Rooms	
Table 10. GCI Medical Monthly Report July 2009.....	59
B-8 RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNIT FOR THE MENTALLY ILL.....	60
Mental Health Caseload.....	62
Table 11. Mental Health Classifications with Definitions	
Table 12. Percent of Prison Population on the Mental Health Caseload	
by Institution.....	63
Table 13. Monthly Average on Mental Health Caseload by Institution	
and Mental Health Classification in 2008.....	64
Suicide Attempts.....	65
Pilot Suicide Prevention Program-Offender Observation Aides	
CIIC Perspective	
The Concept.....	66
Inmate Watch/Observer	
Inmate Chaperone	
Watch Without Walls	
<i>Self Harm and Suicide: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	66
SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING (Segregation).....	69
Roster Board	
Meal Loaf and Suicide Watch	70
Atmosphere	
Officer Communication.....	71
Inmate Communication	
Toothbrushes	
Local Control.....	72
Porters	
Security Control, Disciplinary Control	

Table of Contents

	Page
Segregation Recreation.....	72
Forms Access	
Cell Logs.....	73
 INMATE SERVICES AREA	
Barbershop	
Commissary	
 INMATE LIVING AREAS.....	
D-1 Housing Unit-The Bubble	
D-2 Housing Unit-Literacy Unit	
Exhaust System	
Lights	75
Enforcing Cleaning by Porters	
B-5 Housing Unit.....	76
<i>Residential Units: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Clothing and Possessions: Expectations Questions and Responses.....</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>Hygiene: Expectations Questions and Responses</i>	
 QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	
Infrastructure	
Alternatives to Incarceration.....	84
Institutional Programming.....	85
Reentry Programming	87

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE INSPECTION OF THE GRAFTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

INSPECTION PROFILE

August 11, 2009

Type of Inspection:

Unannounced

CIIC Members and Staff Present:

**Representative Tyrone K. Yates, CIIC Chair
Shirley Pope, Executive Director
Darin Furderer, Inspector
Gregory Geisler, Inspector**

Facility Staff Present:

**Margaret Bradshaw, Warden
Deputy Warden of Operations
Major**

Areas and Activities Included in the Inspection:

Entry Building	Administration Building
Infirmary	Segregation
Food Services	General Population Housing Units
Commissary	Residential Treatment Unit
Library	Law Library
Program Building	Community Service
Barbershop	Representative Staff Group Meeting
Pre-Inspection Meeting	Closing

INTRODUCTION TO QUESTIONNAIRES

Two questionnaires were developed by CIIC for use on inspections from 2007 to the present.

One of the questionnaires 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. *The questions and responses are provided at the end of this report.*

The second questionnaire is based on selected sections of *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 for adult incarceration. 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 Expectations are self-described as 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. *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. *Expectations* consists of eight sections and subsections. Sections included in the questionnaire are provided below:

Environment and Relationships:	Residential Units: Overview Residential Units: Clothing and Possessions Residential Units: 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
Services:	Food Services

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 explanations, 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 questions and responses to Expectations are inserted in this report in a section relevant to the particular subject.*

INSPECTION SUMMARY

After each inspection, a summary of the major findings during the walk through of the facility is promptly submitted to the Warden and the Assistant Director of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction for their review. The Grafton CI summary included sanitation and conditions, food services, institutional atmosphere, the Residential Treatment Unit, the library, commissary, landscaping, staff communication, and concerns expressed by inmates *and* staff about the Parole Board. The following summary was submitted by the CIIC Director on August 12, 2009:

SANITATION AND CONDITIONS

- **Clean and Well Maintained:** In spite of its age, the institution appeared clean and well maintained with the exception of the D2 bathrooms (A side and B side).
- **D2 Restrooms:** Bathrooms in the D2 unit contained stained urinals and standing water on the floor. Toilets as well as the walls and floors were filthy. A few plumbing and maintenance issues were also apparent. Inmates relayed that the real problem is caused by staff who do not make the porters do their job. Staff relayed that it is the job of unit staff to ensure that the workers clean the unit. In contrast, the conditions of the bathroom in a similar housing unit, D1, were noticeably cleaner and better maintained.
- **Light and Heat:** The lighting and temperature in the D2 housing unit is an issue of concern among the inmates. Staff confirmed that all units except D2 have fluorescent lights. Inmates relayed that the type of lights used in D2, generate a significant amount of heat and are reportedly labeled with warnings against using them in living quarters. Facility staff commented that it was hotter in D2 than it was outside. Inmates and staff relayed that, until recently the lights were kept off during the day. In the exit meeting, it was explained that the Unit Manager determined that the lights need to be on in the daytime for safety and security reasons, as the visibility in the unit is reportedly unacceptable. This was checked and verified by administrative staff. Inmates stated that the exhaust system has been inoperable for many years, which if repaired, would also alleviate the concerns about the temperature in the unit. Administrative staff relayed that maintenance has checked the ventilation, and nothing is wrong with the exhaust system.

DRC Follow up Communication

The D-2 housing HVAC/air system is and has always been working. It's that time of year when it is difficult to regulate the proper temperature in these buildings. Most of our systems, like D-2, require the balance of outside air mixing with inside air to work. So if it is set to work with the outside temperature at 30 degrees and the outside temperature climbs to 50 degrees for a couple of days then the housing unit will be warmer than it should be for those couple days.

The exhaust system in the shower area of D-2 was looked at just recently because of a concern with too much moisture in that area, possibly from lack of exhaust. Maintenance found the exhaust to be free of obstruction and working properly. We concluded that multiple showers were being used when a single inmate was showering. We are working on a proposal to install push button valves for the showers to regulate and limit the moisture there. Officers will watch that area more until the new valves can be installed.

Concerning plumbing leaks in D-2: Our plumber [along with other maintenance staff] has been carrying other jobs outside of his field at the time of this inspection. Currently 2 of the 3 positions are filled and the 3rd position will be posted this week.

In reference to the discoloration of the ceiling in the D-2 shower area appears to be stain caused by the steam and the impurities carried by that steam. Working with the maintenance supervisor, two options have been considered on how to correct this eye sore.

Paint the ceiling with a stain blocking primer such as KILZ™ and then painting the ceiling with good oil based paint. This option would require shutting down the showers for a least a week. Several days of drying time would be required before the oil paint could be applied.

Clean the ceiling and then cover it with FRP (fiberglass reinforced panels). These panels are the same type used in our kitchen when that ceiling looked bad. Although this option would cost more up front, it would last longer than just paint and these panels can be cleaned. A couple of days would be required to completely dry that ceiling before the ceiling could be installed. Until this process is completed the porters will clean the areas twice on each shift.

SEGREGATION

- The special management housing unit was also an area of contrast. One side of the unit that appeared to house mostly inmates classified to local control was definitely in need of cleaning. However, the other side of the unit where many of the inmates were either in security control or disciplinary control status, was remarkably clean.
- The atmosphere was noticeably calm and free of tension, attributed to the attentiveness of staff to inmate concerns. Only a few relayed concerns related to the length of time it was taking to get transferred to other institutions, or other less pressing issues.
- Some relayed that they have no toothbrush. Officers confirmed that they ran out of toothbrushes the previous Friday, but indicated that they are expecting to receive some. Staff acquired toothbrushes before the CIIC left the unit. The “toothbrushes” are clear, flexible plastic, the size and shape of a fingertip, with

five tiny rows of short plastic for “bristles.” Supervisory staff relayed that they make rounds four times per week in segregation, but no inmates had relayed to him the need for a toothbrush.

- A large board is mounted on the wall in the corridor that lists the abbreviation for various words, such as S/W Suicide Watch and M/L Meal Loaf, with the cell location of each inmate in segregation. On the top of the abbreviations, in large letters, was written, “Captain ... & the ‘Knuckle’ head,” reportedly the nickname of an officer. Supervisory staff immediately directed its removal, and agreed that it was unprofessional.

DRC Follow up Communication

There have been some delays because beds are not available at the security level required for the transfers to occur. Also changes in staff at both GCI and the Bureau of Classification which required staff coordination slowed the process temporarily. All this has been resolved and the process is working smoothly.

FOOD SERVICES

- **Kitchen:** Kitchen and food preparation areas were clean, and there were no equipment deficiencies reported by food service staff. Despite the fact that a meal was in the process of being served, the appearance of the area was good. Many inmate workers were in the kitchen, busy with cleaning, food serving, and food preparation. Some inmates were scrubbing pans in very hot soapy water. The standing water in the dish room was attributed to the general meal preparations. Food Services staff consisting of six staff and two managers, relayed that staffing is adequate. There were reports of a “big mice problem,” but staff relayed that they trap the mice night and day to address it.
- **The Meal:** The meal prepared for the population received mixed reviews by the CIIC team who attended the lunch meal with the inmates. The inmates also expressed mixed comments about the food. Some commented on the food at GCI being much better than food at their previous institution. Portions were sufficient enough that a younger inmate relayed that he did not need to “shop” to supplement what he was provided. It was also apparent that inmates who worked in food service took pride in their work. The CIIC team was impressed with being provided with milk during the meal, rather than Kool Aid, but were advised later by administrative staff that only those under 21 are permitted to have the milk.
- **Brunch:** Most inmates expressed concern about the administration of the newly implemented brunch program. Several staff similarly expressed concerns that the length of time between meals was too long. Some inmates relayed that they have to go without food for 20 hours. Inmates shared their insight that consideration should be given to moving count up one hour earlier so the feeding could begin earlier. According to those that shared this insight, this is how special feeding on holidays is already conducted. Administrative staff relayed that diabetic inmates

receive snacks between meals. The reported concern of the impact of the brunch on the mentally ill who take psychotropic medication, was reportedly looked into and determined to have no merit.

- **Inmate Dining Room:** There was light chat in the dining room, and an overall good, relaxed atmosphere. Tables in the front of the dining room, closest to the serving line, are marked for the handicap with stickers. Staff relayed that the handicapped are called first to the dining room. They currently have only four in wheelchairs, but they have seating for six wheelchairs or for 16 other handicapped.

INSTITUTIONAL ATMOSPHERE

- Throughout the inspection, the administrative staff demonstrated excellent rapport with inmates, good listening skills, positive communication and interaction. They also exhibited the same level of rapport with the staff in the various departments.
- There was no apparent tension between inmates or between staff and inmates.
- Good, orderly movement on the yard was noted.
- Many inmates expressed their appreciation for the positive aspects of Grafton Correctional Institution compared to their previous facilities.
- Many inmates relayed their appreciation of the staff, and of the staff's support to pursue permitted interests.

RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNIT FOR MENTALLY ILL

- The atmosphere of the Residential Treatment Unit was relaxed and considered good. The unit was clean, neat and orderly, with no foul odors.
- Inmates expressed the desire for more programs and activities, but they reportedly have "three programs a day."
- Inmates expressed their appreciation for the mental health staff. They relayed their confidence in the mental health staff's ability to provide them with good mental health treatment.
- Residential Treatment Unit staff relayed that the close relationship between treatment staff and custody staff provides a positive working environment. However, the suggestion was relayed that it would be wiser to have specially selected security staff uniquely suited to work with the mentally ill in a treatment environment. Others suggested that additional specialized areas of the institution could benefit by such a special selection of security staff. This has been a long time suggestion expressed system-wide over many years at multiple institutions with Residential Treatment Units.
- The new administrative and program wing of the RTU was most impressive, with a fresh, bright appearance. It seems highly functional to have mental health staff close to their sickest patients. The program space will be a definite asset to all on the caseload.

LIBRARY

- A comment box was noted on the entry/exit area of the library, a positive indication that suggestions are welcomed. The school building in which the

library is located was very clean and well maintained, providing an excellent environment. The law library was very organized, and clerks were knowledgeable and enthusiastic about their work.

- A small station attended by an inmate worker provides audio tapes for use in the library with earphones. It was noted that there are only three outlets at the table, and that more inmates could take advantage of their collection with one or more additional outlets.
- Administrative Rules and Policies were present and neatly organized in binders, along with a Halfway House Program Overview.
- The library appeared well stocked and widely used by inmates. However, the CIIC Chair relayed that this and other prison libraries could improve on providing a good staple of diverse materials, including classic African American literature selections.
- Some inmates expressed interest in the prison acquiring recycled state computers to use solely as a typewriter or word processor in the law library to prepare their briefs and filings. It was added that inmates could sign up for blocks of time to work on their legal work, and as always, pay for the pages they print.

DRC Follow up Communication

All future purchases will include both Hispanic and African American literature. This will also be a topic at the regular meetings of the GCI Library Advisory Committee which can monitor the progress of future purchases. We already subscribe to recommended magazines such as Jet, Ebony, and Black Enterprise, but the purchase of other diverse publications will be explored.

We are presently increasing the number of typewriters that are available to inmates in the law library. The idea of computers to be used as word processors is being explored, as it would cut down on the number of typewriter ribbons and correction tapes that have to be purchased. In the meantime, we will try to maximize the number of typewriters that can be placed in the area.

There are actually four outlets at the audio table, but we only have three audio players. The Librarian has been asked to purchase an additional player in order that all outlets can be utilized.

The DRC Reentry Resource guide (online via DRC intranet) provides all social service agency contact information for all Ohio counties. These are provided to Transitional Educational Programming (TEP) students. Copies are also available at the reentry desk in the GCI library. In addition, for Cuyahoga County inmates, the county's reentry publication "Going Home to Stay" is also available.

COMMISSARY

- The commissary was clean, well organized and well stocked. There was ample storage space for the inventory. However, staff stated the commissary was originally built to accommodate five hundred inmates.
- Although inmates relayed that there is a mice problem in which they eat the loaves of bread, staff relayed that there is not a serious problem anymore, because sonic light sensors are being used which plug into electric sockets. The restroom in which one sensor was observed was very clean. Staff stated that they do not have roaches, but mice were getting into the pastries and the bread.

LANDSCAPE

- The new wide sidewalks reportedly made with inmate labor were very impressive, and especially useful for inmates confined to wheelchairs, or who needed to use aides to walk. Staff noted that they have a Braille program, about which they seemed quite proud.
- With the walk completed, inmates enrolled in the horticulture program are beginning to improve upon the landscape, with clusters of flowers beside the buildings, including a huge circular area of striking, tall flowers.

STAFF COMMUNICATION

- Staff relayed that GCI staff work together. Some described it “as clean and laid back as I’ve seen.”
- Others discussed their changing inmate population, with inmates getting younger and “short-timers” coming in. Some termed the change in the inmate population as “dramatic.” Segregation is reportedly as full as it has ever been, with 35 to 40 consistently, whereas in the past, only nine to 12 inmates were in segregation. Staff relayed that young inmates used to have to face the Parole Board to be released, which served as a deterrent in terms of behavior while in prison. With flat time, the inmates reportedly do not care if they go to segregation. Staff suggested that time spent in segregation for rule violations should not count toward the inmate’s sentence. Some relayed that there has been an increase in gang activity and fights from those who came from the juvenile system. Staff relayed that they are celling them together, which reportedly does not help, but there are reportedly so many, they cannot separate them. Some discussed their belief that the inmates serving sentences under the old law vs. those serving flat time live under a different culture, with the old law abiding by the convict code and prison culture, while the new law inmates are reportedly in the gang culture.
- One staff person commented on the different practices between the institutions on requirements for titles for property. Administrative staff relayed that there is one DRC policy on the subject, but discretion in areas has resulted in differing practices.
- One security staff person relayed the need for more officers to supervise recreation, where reportedly 300-500 inmates can be out at one time.
- Some cited the budget as the biggest issue of concern, adding that they have less money, less resources and “all of us work harder.”

- Staff morale was described as having its ups and downs. Inmate morale was described as “not as high as it could be.”
- Some discussed how staff are affected by overcrowding and job insecurity, causing stress, which affects the inmates and co-workers.

THE PAROLE BOARD

- Many inmates expressed frustration with the parole procedures.
- One inmate stated that the most recent *Hall* decision resulted in negative outcomes for inmates. Reportedly, the Courts have ordered the Parole Board to give new hearings to old law inmates. As a result, many inmates reported that the Board was issuing even longer continuances than the inmate previously had from the prior hearing. Some alleged that they are retaliating for the Court’s intervention. Concerns were also expressed about the alleged attitude of the Board, based on their comments to inmates.
- Institutional staff surprisingly echoed similar frustration with Board decisions. It was relayed that the Board is giving 10 year continuances to model inmates, and releasing inmates with poor institutional records. To staff, their decision making negatively impacts the institution as a whole.
- Some staff expressed concern over the special difficulties faced by the mentally ill not only in making parole, but in having needed services provided after release.

The following communication was received on November 2, 2009 from the Parole Board Chair through the DRC Assistant Director, regarding the above concerns expressed about the Parole Board:

We are not retaliating against inmates for having to conduct the Hall rehearings. However, we are not restrained or required in our decision making at these hearings to only continue the inmate back to the previously imposed continuance if release is deemed inappropriate. The inmate is receiving an accelerated hearing from the continuance date previously set, and the decisions are being made based on a review of all relevant factors, both aggravating and mitigating and within all rules, processes and procedures.

I understand that staff may feel that we release inmates with poor institutional conduct and continue others with good institutional conduct. I question whether these staff know the sentences the inmates are serving and whether they are actually subject to release at the discretion of the parole board or are SB2 definite sentence releases. If the offenders are SB2 definite sentence releases, they are released regardless of their conduct. In addition, many factors are considered when making release decisions, beyond institutional conduct. Much of the information the Parole Board considers and is privy to is not available to institutional staff. If they were privy to the same information, they may not be as critical of our decisions.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT

I. Attendance at a General Meal Period

The statute requires each inspection to include attendance at a general meal period. The meal consisted of a single hamburger patty, cheese, ketchup, two slices of bread, collard greens, cold-buttered noodles, and an unripe pear. Milk was provided only for those under 21 years of age. The others received Kool-Aid. The meal received mixed reviews by CIIC staff and according to inmate comments in the dining hall. Institutional staff reported that they also sample the meals to ensure they are properly prepared.

Some inmates relayed that compared to other institutions, this meal was the best they ever had. Of three who just arrived from three other prisons, one described his previous institution's food as "nasty, not enough and the food's horrible, while two termed their previous facility's food services as "alright." Other inmates expressed their reservations about the quality and portion sizes at Grafton CI.

FOOD SERVICES

The food services department is responsible for managing the operations of the institution's kitchen. These responsibilities include managing inmates assigned to work in food services, ensuring meals are produced per menus established by central office, ensuring the correct quantities of food are stocked and ordered, maintaining kitchen and dining hall sanitation, and reporting equipment malfunctions. Food services staff is also responsible for preparing meals eaten by inmates who are quartered at the prison's farm, the inmates who work on the road crews outside of the institution, inmates in segregation, and some inmates in the Residential Treatment Unit. The Food Services department appeared to be well run.

Kitchen

The kitchen's food preparation area, food storage and freezers, walls and flooring were observed to be clean and in good to excellent condition.

Staff stated that they do not have any maintenance needs that cannot be quickly addressed by the maintenance staff. Tools were observed to be secured properly in a cage for staff to distribute to inmates. The staff explained that they have an exterminator visit weekly, and they set out traps nightly for the field mice drawn in from the surrounding fields. It was also relayed that the Food Service Manager distributes bleach and other cleaning chemicals as needed to ensure an appropriate level of sanitation is maintained.

In the pre-inspection meeting, staff relayed having no problem with food services equipment. While in the kitchen during the inspection, staff did not indicate that they have any inoperable equipment. They relayed that there has not been any serious problems with equipment malfunctions such as kettles or ovens, sharing that the maintenance staff repair equipment quickly. The kitchen appeared overall to be in good condition. The floors appeared to be well

maintained, and even though there was standing water in the dish room, the working conditions did not appear to be unsafe.

The coolers where milk and meat products were stored were also inspected. The food storage units appeared to be clean and in good condition. It was relayed in addition to daily cleaning, on the weekends the freezers are emptied and scrubbed by inmate workers. The temperatures seemed appropriate, which staff reportedly monitored three times each day.

Even though inmate workers had not served any meals yet, indicators of poor sanitation practices such as accumulated dirt and debris under the serving lines were not observed. Food storage boxes used to maintain the appropriate temperature prior to serving also appeared to be in good repair. All inmates and staff were observed wearing head coverings and gloves where appropriate. It appeared as if the inmate workers knew how food services are supposed to be run, and took pride in their work.

Food services staff relayed that they have six staff now, plus two managers. They relayed that they are not short of staff. Inmate workers were busy with their chores. Many inmate workers were present, some using hot soapy water to scrub the pans.

Reportedly, the facility has had a “big mice problem,” which causes them to set “traps night and day.”

Dining Hall

The inmate dining hall has a capacity to seat 250 inmates for each meal. Two officers were present in the dining room, with one up front and one in the back. Staff relayed that one unit is called at a time to go to meals, and there is an automatic rotation. Staff also relayed that there are no competitions in which inmates get to go to their meals first.

Special seating is reserved for handicapped inmates near the front of the dining hall nearest to the serving lines. Staff cited their arrangement as “proactive,” noting that stickers were painted on the tables for easy observation on July 22, 2009. The handicapped are reportedly called first to the meals. Staff relayed that they only have four in wheelchairs, but the seating can accommodate six in wheelchairs and 16 other handicapped.

There are two serving lines in the chow hall, one labeled “meat” and one labeled “non-meat.” There was light chat among the inmates in the dining room, where the atmosphere was considered to be good.

Inmate Concerns

Many inmates relayed complaints about the newly implemented “brunch program” that is served on weekends. Most expressed concerns that the length of time between the evening meal served the day before and when they were served the brunch was in excess of 18 to 20 hours. This same frustration has been echoed by inmates at each institution CIIC has inspected since it was started. As stated in the summary above, inmates shared their insight that consideration should be given to moving count up one hour earlier so the feeding could begin earlier. According to those that

shared these remarks, this is how special feeding on holidays is already conducted. Administrative staff relayed that diabetic inmates receive snacks between meals. The reported concern of the impact of the brunch on the mentally ill who take psychotropic medication, was reportedly looked into and determined to have no merit.

One inmate relayed that he was upset with regard to how meals that were prepared were not served in accordance to his religious doctrine. According to the inmate, the meals he has to eat are not being prepared or served with kosher utensils, and he receives no meals on Shabbats. The staff relayed that he receives the standard kosher meals served to inmates who are authorized to receive it.

Food Services: Expectations Questions and Responses

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? **N/a**
 - 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 e.g. **Yes**

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**

7. Do medical clearance forms exist on food service workers, and are training courses offered? **All are trained. Medical restriction forms used when not able to work.**
8. Are prisoners' meals healthy, varied and balanced and always include one substantial meal each day? **Yes**
 - 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? No**
9. 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**
10. Are prisoners consulted about the menu, and can they make comments about the food? **Yes. Food preference sheets are used we no longer have managers choice entrée on Sunday evenings.**
 - a. If logs of comments are kept, how frequently are they consulted? **No logs are kept on consulted prisoners making food comments.**
 - b. Is there a food comments book? **We use food service inmate preference surveys.**
11. Is the breakfast meal prepared on the morning it is eaten? **With the exception of medical breakfast bags on Saturday and Sunday.**
12. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm? **Roughly it depends on count.**
13. Do prisoners have access to drinking water (including at night time), and the means of making a hot drink after evening lock-up? **Yes**
14. Are prisoners able to eat together (except in exceptional circumstances)? **Yes**
15. Does staff supervise the serving of food in order to prevent tampering with food and other forms of bullying? **Yes**
16. Where prisoners are required to eat their meals in their cells, are they able to sit at a table? **Yes-SMU has one man tables (per SMU officers).No-RTU soft cell inmates inside only and cannot have a table.**

17. Do pregnant prisoners and nursing mothers receive appropriate extra food? **N/a**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT

II. Attendance at Educational or Rehabilitative Program

Transitional Education Program

The Transitional Education Program, a voluntary program for inmates soon to be released, was observed during the inspection. The classroom has a camera and a large television used for video conferences with inmates at other institutions. The program was reportedly developed by Community Connections, located in Lima and Columbus, and provides pertinent information about the various people and agencies that can assist inmates upon their release. Inmates work on resumes and will use the Transitional Education Program website to set up an e-mail account that is activated after they leave prison. The website also offers access to “employment opportunities/resources, a statewide community resource directory, and virtual case management.”

Staff stated that it is a “hi-octane” version of pre-release because it is more in depth and provides them with necessary tools, including interviewing skills. They are reportedly “deluged with information.” Staff relayed that because this program is voluntary, all are motivated. One inmate, who had served time on previous numbers, stated that the program provides more information than traditional pre-release programs.

When asked about problems or barriers facing inmates after release, one inmate stated that employment barriers are difficult due to the stigma of being labeled a felon. He relayed that inmates can become desperate, lose hope, and resort back to their previous lifestyle. He also spoke of concerns about being behind with child support. Another inmate inquired about paying restitution and establishing better credit. One spoke of the added problems stemming from the type of crime on one’s record that can be an added barrier. He stated that some get “too nervous,” and feel they have “no chance.” One relayed that it would help if they had a list of employers who will hire ex-offenders.

One inmate relayed that he is single and has no children. He requested information on whether or not he would be eligible for Medicaid after his release from prison. The CIIC Chairman relayed the suggestion that a brochure with phone numbers and addresses of agencies which may provide temporary support to released prisoners be provided.

One inmate relayed that he owes restitution, and asked if he could be sent back to prison if he is unable to pay it. He noted that he has a poor credit history. Other inmates discussed concerns regarding money management.

According to literature provided by staff on site, the Transitional Education Program (TEP) is a:

...comprehensive collaborative that enables offenders, who will be released from correctional facilities to successfully return to their communities and families. The Transitional Education Program model focuses on the use of technology to educate male and female offenders in pro-social skills and transition into the community. The program is (provided by) Community Connection for Offenders, Inc., a private non-profit agency, in collaboration with the Ohio Department of Correction and the Ohio Central School System. The TEP program is unique in that it is the first program of its kind to incorporate the use of assisted videoconferencing, web-based research design, and individualized CD-ROM based instruction to provide transitional and life skills curricula coupled with post-release case management services and evaluation.

DRC Follow up Communication

The DRC Reentry Resource guide (online via DRC intranet) provides all social service agency contact information for all Ohio counties. These are provided to Transitional Educational Programming (TEP) students. Copies are also available at the reentry desk in the GCI library. In addition, for Cuyahoga County inmates, the county's reentry publication "Going Home To Stay" is also available.

School Building and Program Area: Community Services

The walk through of the school building, which is a very nice area, included discussions with staff who administer the community service projects performed by inmates. According to staff, the inmates volunteer their time to complete projects used to benefit different organizations. The community service program area was busy with inmates working on a variety of projects. Each month the inmates in this program complete several hundred hours of community service toward this goal. Inmates were observed assembling blankets, stuffed animals, book bags, and folding booklets for the Ohio reads program. One project they displayed was stuffed teddy bears for a local police department to provide to children in traumatic situations. Another group of inmates were making book bags for the "Day with Dads" event that occurs at the institution. Projects completed by the community service program are also donated to Birthright Hospitality Center, and other neighborhood hospitality centers for needy families in the community. Some projects are auctioned off to staff in silent auctions and the proceeds of which go towards other charities.

According to the ODRC August 2009 Community Service Monthly Report, there are 43 inmates at the Grafton CI involved in community service projects. Of that number, 21 are white, 20 are black and two are "other." Grafton CI's Total service hours for the month are reported as 3,217, with year to date total hours consisting of 24,638 hours. Of the total service hours for the month, most were for community groups, with a smaller portion for schools.

GCI Educational Services

The institution provides different academic opportunities for inmate participants. According to the institution's website, the institution conducts programming in Adult Basic Education, Pre-

GED, GED, advanced job training, career enhancement, apprenticeships, career technical programs (auto mechanics, horticulture, welding/cutting, work and family life), college courses through Ashland University, and the Transitional Education Program.

Table 1. GCI Educational and Vocational Statistics for July 2009

Program	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	# of Certificates		% Attained Goals			
					Month	YTD	QTR	YTD		
Literacy	45	1	45	34	0	0				
ABLE	6	0	6	0	0	0				
Pre-GED	28	0	28	15	0	0				
GED	48	1	48	42	2	2				
GED Evening	16	0	16	29	1	1				
HS/HS	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Academic	143	2	143	120	3	3				
Career-Tech (by program)	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	# of Certificates		% Attained Goals			
					Month	YTD	QTR	YTD		
Auto Mechanic	16	0	16	99	0	0				
Machine	20	2	20	56	0	0				
Welding	18	0	18	163	0	0				
Horticulture	16	0	16	83	0	0				
Career-Tech Total	70	2	70	401	0	0				
Special	2	2	2	0	0	0				
	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	Program Cert.		1-Year Cert.		2-Year Cert.	
					Term	YTD	Term	YTD	Term	YTD
Advanced Job Training	142	2	142	116	13	13	6	6	3	3
	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	# of Certificates		% Attained Goals			
					Month	YTD	QTR	YTD		
Total GEDs	0		0							
Total GEDs	6		6							
Literacy	21		21							
Other Tutors	10		10							
Tutors Trained	0		0							
Tutor Hours	1,126		1,126							
Children served in	311		311							
Narrator Hours	135		135							

RE-ENTRY PROGRAMMING

As an element of the re-entry initiative conducted by the Department, the institution conducts a variety of re-entry programming for inmates who have a short period of time remaining on their sentences. Literature provided onsite shared the following regarding the programs offered.

Thinking for a Change: This program is intended to improve skills related to the following socio-cognitive deficit areas of poor control of thinking and actions, poor social skills, poor and problem solving skills. Inmates participate in structure scenarios and skill assessments, complete homework and in class assignments, and self-evaluations.

Victim Awareness: This program seeks to improve skills related to the following deficit areas such as victim empathy, taking personal responsibility for actions resulting in criminal behavior. Inmates conduct homework and in-class assignments, participate in victim impact panels, and complete pre and post surveys.

Personal Responsibility of Violence Elimination (PROVE): This program assists participants in developing insight into factors leading to and the effects of their violent behavior and abuse. The curriculum assists participants in developing positive thinking skills, emotion management and healthy relationships. It also prompts participants to accept responsibility for their violent and abusive behavior.

Money Smart (FDIC): This program seeks to enhance the money management skills of participants, provides better understanding of basic financial terminology and services, and using bank services more effectively.

Recovery Services AOD Education Program: This 24 hour substance abuse program is a treatment modality that delivers services that affect the knowledge of the consequences and effects of alcohol and other drug use.

Houses of Healing: This program promotes self-awareness of compulsive, addictive, violent, acting out behaviors and introduces victim empathy. Drugs, alcohol, anger and violence are identified as inappropriate coping strategies, even within the prison system.

COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM AREA

Grafton Correctional Institution has a rather robust community service program that permits inmates the opportunity to give back to the community. The institution's website lists the following programs: Dope is for Dopes, Heart to Heart, Adopt-A-School, Crocheting/Quilting, Highway Litter Pickup, Service Learning, Ohio Reads, Quilting, Kids in Need, and Love-A-Pup.

Institutional Programs

Information provided to CIIC by the institutional staff shares a brief description of some of the community service programs conducted at the institution.

Love-A-Pup: The Lorain County Animal Protective League provides dogs that need basic obedience to be trained. Inmate handlers, along with an outside handler, train the dogs for nine weeks.

Heart to Heart: Bring juveniles into the institution to experience the reality of prison life. Inmates give testimony of what led them to incarceration and how it affects their life.

Dope is for Dopes: Program is taken into the community to schools and organizations for inmates to tell juveniles the reality of drug usage.

Hooked on Giving: Inmates crochet and knot blankets, pot holders, and miscellaneous items for community service projects.

Other programs described in the literature provided to CIIC staff onsite relayed that there are a series of programs conducted by Unit Management. These programs include a variety of reentry and recovery services programs.

Cage your Rage: This program intends to help inmates connect with themselves and others. According to literature, it “takes a hard look at anger, its definition, how it becomes habit and the immense affect it has on our lives. Identifies sources of resentment and anger and develops strategies to move beyond them to forgiveness. Examines how to let go and move on when relationships end.

Friend to Friend: Volunteers are matched with inmates to visit and support the inmates in making decisions regarding job possibilities and contacts for parole release planning. This program is from the Community Re-Entry program.

Authorized Groups and Programs

During the pre-inspection discussion with facility staff, it was relayed that inmates are involved in many groups and programs. Several of the more well known groups such as the NAACP, AMVETS, VVA, and the Jaycees have an active presence at the institution. Inmates also participate in a number of available community service programs, which were observed during the inspection.

Learning Skills and Work Activities: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Are prisoners encouraged and enabled to learn, and do they have access to good library facilities? **All inmates are encouraged to participate in GED classes, vocational classes or advanced job training. The library supports these activities with support materials.**
2. Is sufficient purposeful activity available for the total prisoner population?

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? **The education department takes care of the academic and vocational assessment. Employability is also made available through education classes to all inmates.**
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? **GCI is open during Count-1497 (8-14-09) day.**
 - b. How many are formally registered as unassigned? **16, (8-14-09) incoming inmates.**
 - c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population?
 - d. **How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job?** All inmates are assigned a job within seven days reception.
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? **Yes**
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? **Yes**
 - a. Is a full schedule of activities available to all prisoners? **Yes, posted.**

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**
 - c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures? **Job reclass is completed on all inmates.**
 - 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? **?**
- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities? **No**
13. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay? **Yes**
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? **Incentivizing for participation.**
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, reentry management team case management.**
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? **N/a**
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? **Education and programming is entered into the inmates re-entry plan.**
-
-

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:

III. Assist in the Development of Improvements

The statute requires the CIIC to “Evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition or operation of correctional institutions; (and to) Prepare a report for submission to the succeeding general assembly of the findings the committee makes in its inspections and of any programs that have been proposed or developed to improve the condition or operation of the correctional institutions in the state.”

The Library: Creation or Expansion of Minority Book Sections

During the course of the 2009 inspections which always include the library, the CIIC Chairman, Representative Tyrone K. Yates, has cited the need for African American and also Hispanic designated Book Sections in Ohio prisons and juvenile correctional facilities. There is also a need for sufficient copies of periodicals of popular magazines for the African American and Hispanic inmates. Jet, Ebony, and Black Enterprise were suggested. In addition to the literature, African American and Hispanic movies, and books on tape should be provided. The purpose of the proposed improvements is to enhance cultural awareness, not only one’s own but of others, and to enlighten inmates through classic biographies.

The proposal will help to improve inmates, contribute to good order, and improve the libraries. So much good could be done by a focus on the library, which could provide books about real people who inspire and bring out the best in us. In the therapeutic community model of substance abuse treatment in prisons, they insist that the critical ingredient for success is that a real person is on the staff who has been where the offender is, and who has succeeded in changing their life. They provide the model and this is said to provide renewed hope and confidence that they, too, can overcome addiction and make something of their life. The same inspiration can come from books about real people.

With the overcrowding and understaffing, it is a constant challenge for staff to keep the inmates busy with programs and activities, yet idleness leads to serious safety and security problems. Many inmates seem to crave the library, possibly for the solace that it provides. Many more could learn to enjoy reading with the right selection available.

Surely some of the reading incentives that the public libraries and schools use for school children, could be used within the DRC and DYS institutions. The facilities could form ad hoc committees to include inmates in order to zero in on making their library the best that it can be.

There are dedicated librarian staff in the prisons. Unfortunately, a number of librarian positions have been left vacant due the budget problems. At some institutions, other staff volunteer their time just to keep the library open for a few hours a day.

Inmates in segregation have limited access to the library. Those in Local Control are in segregation for up to six months. Those in “4B” and above are effectively in isolation indefinitely, sometimes for years. If they were provided with good biographies and even good self-help books, at least the isolation would be filling their mind with something positive that may make a difference in their life. Reading can keep them sane, as well as make them think, which ultimately affects their actions.

Grafton CI Library

In the pre-inspection meeting, facility staff relayed that they have a “fine” library. The library and the law library appeared to be well stocked and both were making the most of limited resources for inmates. For example, there is space for booths where inmates can listen to music, but there are only three outlets.

During the inspection, many inmates were using the available resources. Inmates commented that sometimes it is so busy in the library that they can barely walk around. According to what was relayed, the magazines and newspapers are the most popular among inmates who use the library. This area was well stocked with a variety of major newspapers from Ohio and other nationally circulated newspapers. It was explained that the newspapers are usually a day behind due to the time it takes from when the institution receives them to when they are placed in the library. Inmates may only view magazines and newspapers in the library, and must leave their ID badge with the library aide until the reading material is returned.

Inmates also have the opportunity to request books through the inter-library loan system. The inmate responsible for packaging outgoing books and processing the incoming requested books described the books most frequently requested by inmates as “urban” books. Other popular subjects requested by inmates included real estate licensure, and literature on starting small businesses. When asked if there was much demand for black history or literature associated with African Americans, it was relayed that there are not many books associated with that subject. The inmate relayed that the library staff are very helpful and do their best to make sure the library runs well. Reportedly, staff even purchase their own supplies like packing tape, etc. because there is no money for these items.

The inmates working in the law library relayed that the staff do an excellent job at supporting the needs of the law library. It was apparent that the inmates assigned to work there were knowledgeable and helpful for inmates seeking particular resources in that part of the library. The law library provides binders for Halfway House Placement Overview, ACA Guidelines and Administrative Rules. Inmates may copy material at the cost of five cents per page.

The inmates requested to know if the state would consider acquiring computers from the state warehouses where old computers which are no longer being used by state agencies could be set up for inmates to work on their cases. Inmates relayed that inmates could sign up for periods of time to work on their cases, and purchase copy cards to print off their work. The inmates also relayed that there was a delay in acquiring typewriter ribbons, and using computers would alleviate this non-renewable resource. It would also provide an opportunity for inmates to become more knowledgeable about working with computers.

Staff indicated that not all staff have computers, so meeting the staff's needs is a greater priority. Staff also relayed that they are never going to be able to purchase computers because the money to purchase the computers is drawn from the I&E fund. Reportedly, the population of the institution does not have the money to support these purchases.

DRC Follow-up Communication

In follow up communication from institution staff, the following information was provided:

- All future purchases will include both Hispanic and African American literature. This will also be a topic at the regular meetings of the GCI Library Advisory Committee which can monitor the progress of future purchases. We already subscribe to recommended magazines such as Jet, Ebony, and Black Enterprise, but the purchase of other diverse publications will be explored.
- We are presently increasing the number of typewriters that are available to inmates in the law library. The idea of computers to be used as word processors is being explored, as it would cut down on the number of typewriter ribbons and correction tapes that have to be purchased. In the meantime, we will try to maximize the number typewriters that can be placed in the area.
- There are actually four outlets at the audio table, but we only have three audio players. The Librarian has been asked to purchase an additional player in order that all outlets can be utilized.
- The DRC Reentry Resource guide (online via DRC intranet) provides all social service agency contact information for all Ohio counties. These are provided to Transitional Educational Programming (TEP) students. Copies are also available at the reentry desk in the GCI library. In addition, for Cuyahoga County inmates, the county's reentry publication "Going Home to Stay" is also available.

Library: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Does the prison have an effective strategy for maximizing access to and use of a properly equipped, organized library, managed by trained staff? **The library is open for more than the required number of hours, with two evenings and one weekend day per week on the schedule. The librarian has a Masters Degree in library science.**
 - a. How do prisoners with mobility problems get access? **The library is accessible to those with physical disabilities. Those not able to get to the library may request materials by kite.**
 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. The Librarian obtain books and materials following the guidelines of the local library advocacy committee.**
 3. Do all prisoners have access to a range of library materials, which reflect the population's needs and support learning and skills? **Yes. The Librarian tries to fulfill requests whenever possible.**
 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. These are available in print format and in Westlaw on the law library computers.**
-
-

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:

IV. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The statute requires the CIIC to evaluate and report on the grievance procedure at each institution. This section provides information on the contacts and concerns received by CIIC since January 1, 2009 regarding the Grafton Correctional Institution, information on the grievance statistics and content, and the Expectations questions and responses regarding the grievance procedure.

CIIC Contacts and Reported Concerns

From January 1, 2009 to August 25, 2009, the CIIC has received contacts from 1,628 persons regarding the prisons, expressing 6,691 total concerns *system wide*. According to the CIIC database, there have been 46 contacts (2.8%) expressing 149 concerns (2.2%) regarding Grafton Correctional Institution. The top five most reported areas of concern were about Staff Accountability 25, Health Care 23, Supervision 23, Non-Grievable Concerns 20, and Special Management Housing 10. The following tables reflect the number of concerns relayed to the CIIC regarding Grafton Correctional Institution during the current biennium.

Table 2. Number and Type of Reported Concerns Received by CIIC Regarding Grafton Correctional Institution

Category of Concerns	Number of Concerns
Staff Accountability	25
Health Care	23
Supervision	23
Non Grievable Concerns	20
Special Management Housing	10
Inmate Grievance Procedure	7
Protective Control	6
Inmate Relations	6
Force	5
Institutional Assignment	5
Visiting	5
Housing Assignment	3
Safety and Sanitation	3
Discrimination	2
Inmate Account	2
Recovery Services	1
Educational/Vocational Training	1
Job Assignment	1
Food Services	1
Total	149

The following table provides the documented categories of concern and their subcategories to explain in more detail the nature of the concern. The largest categories include: Staff Accountability, Health Care, Supervision, and Non-Grievable Concerns.

Table 3. Number and Type of Reported Concerns Received by CIIC Regarding Grafton Correctional Institution with Subcategories

Category of Concern	Number of Concerns
Staff Accountability	
Failure to Perform Job Duties	8
Failure to Follow Policies	6
Failure to Respond to Communication	5
Access to Staff	4
Other	2
Total	25
Health Care	
Improper/Inadequate Medical Care	9
Access/Delay Receiving Medical Care	6
Medical Transfer	3
Disagree with Diagnosis	3
Delay/Denial of Medications	1
Other	1
Total	23
Supervision	
Unprofessional Conduct	6
Intimidation/Threats	4
Harassment	4
Abusive Language	3
Retaliation for Voicing Complaints	3
Other	2
Racial/Ethnic Slurs	1
Total	23
Non Grievable Concerns	
APA	8
RIB/Hearing Officer	6
Transitional Control	3
Legislative Action	2
Court	1
Total	20
Special Management Housing	
Placement	10
Total	10
Inmate Grievance Procedure	
Inspector of Institutional Services	3
Chief Inspector	3
Informal Complaint	1
Total	7
Protective Control	
Personal Safety	4
Separation	2
Total	6
Inmate Relations	
Security Threat Groups	4
Assaults	1
Other	1
Total	6

Force	
Use of force with no report	3
Reported use of force	2
Total	5
Institutional Assignment	
Transfer or Denial	5
Total	5
Visiting	
Visitor denied access	1
Visit cut short	1
Hours	1
Rules	1
Special visit	1
Total	5
Housing Assignment	
Unit assignment	2
Cell/Bed assignment	1
Total	3
Safety and Sanitation	
Handicapped facilities	2
Unsafe work practices	1
Total	3
Discrimination	
Jobs	1
Other	1
Total	2
Inmate Account	
Funds lost	1
Account balance	1
Total	2
Recovery Services	
Recovery services program	1
Total	1
Educational/Vocational Training	
Other	1
Total	1
Job Assignment	
Job removal	1
Total	1
Food Services	
Religious diet	1
Total	1

Inmate Concerns

Some staff relayed that they have not received many inmate complaints about the brunch and no complaints about crowding. According to facility staff, most of the inmate complaints to the CIIC team were anticipated to be about the smoking ban, possibly the food and also medical services.

The brunch program is a cost saving measure in which inmates are provided two meals on the weekends rather than three meals per day, but the quantity of food provided is the same as on the

weekdays. That is, breakfast and lunch are combined into the brunch meal, which results in costs savings due to reduction in food services staff on the weekends.

During the inspection of the food services area, an inmate worker discussed the grievance procedure, expressing his belief that the decision is “always on the staff’s side.”

Facility staff relayed that the prison has no cable, just an antenna for TV reception. Inmates reportedly describe the reception as “terrible.”

One Jewish inmate relayed concerns about Kosher meals and kosher utensils. Staff relayed that the facility has three Jewish inmates and they reportedly want the chapel all to themselves. Kosher meals are purchased and brought into the facility. The facility has no Rabbi on contract, but they work with the Jewish Federation once per quarter. *CIIC staff continue to recommend that DRC provide written procedures for use by Food Services staff on Kosher requirements.* The current system consists of a wide range of reported practices and arrangements, all being implemented by staff working in good faith but with little to no knowledge in the requirements of Kosher meals. The CIIC Director obtained detailed information from The Aleph Institute including their Institutional Handbook of Jewish Practice and Procedure, based on previous reported issues of concern system-wide from Jewish inmates. On July 9, 2007 the Kosher food section of the handbook, which was designed to assist chaplains and institutional staff, was provided to the DRC Religious Services Administrator, *with the hope that it would be used to draft a policy, procedure or guidelines to standardize practices system-wide. There are six DRC food services policies, including on vegetarian diets and meal loaf, yet none provide information or guidance on Kosher meals.*

DRC Follow up Communication

In regard to the above, the institution responded, “This requires a DRC policy to provide written procedures for use by Food Services Staff on Kosher Requirements.”

Inmate Grievance Data

The Inspector of Institutional Services coordinates the collection of all data pertaining to the inmate grievance procedure at the institution. The tables below describe the activity with regard to the amount of grievances filed for the year, the number of informal complaints received from inmates for the month, the grievances granted and denied by the Inspector for the month, and a breakdown of the categories for each area of concern grieved by the inmate.

**Table 4. Grievance Data, July 2009 from
Grafton Correctional Institution's Institutional Inspector Monthly Report**

Grievance Data	Number
Total Number of Grievances filed during the year	134
Total Number of Inmates who filed grievances during the year	83
Highest Number of grievances filed by a single inmate	12
Grievances on hand at the beginning of this period	10
Grievances Received during this period	17
Total	27
Grievances Completed during this period	11
Grievances on hand at end of this period	16
Total	27

Table 5. Grafton CI Informal Complaint Data

Informal Complaint Resolution Summary	Number
Number of Informal Complaints Received	94
Number of Informal Complaints Received	78
Number of Informal Complaints Untimely	16

Table 6. Number of Grafton CI Grievances Granted and Denied

Grievance Disposition	Number
Denied	8
Granted	3
Total	11

**Table 7. Breakdown of Grafton CI Grievances by Category with
Number Granted or Denied**

Institutional Grievance Statistics			
Category	Granted	Denied	Total
Health Care			
Improper/Inadequate Medical Care	1	0	1
Medical Aide/Device	1	1	2
Total	2	1	3
Personal Property			
Lost, Damaged, Confiscated by Staff	0	1	1
Denied Permission to Receive/Possess	0	1	1
Total	0	2	2
Staff/Inmate Relations-Supervision			
Harassment	0	1	1
Abusive Language	0	1	1
Total	0	2	2
Laundry/Quartermaster			
Denied Item	0	1	1
Total	0	1	1
Commissary			
Denied Commissary Privileges	0	1	1
Total	0	1	1
Recreation			
Other	1	0	1
Total	1	0	1
Institutional Operations			
Inmate Account	0	1	1
Total	0	1	1
Monthly Total	3	8	11

Grievance Procedure: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Are there effective complaint procedures in place that are easy to access, easy to use, and provide timely responses? **Administrative regulation 5120-9-31 outlines the ODRC Inmate Grievance Procedure.**
2. Do prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are they aware of an appeal procedure? **Some inmates tell me they do and some inmates tell me they don't. Yes they are all aware of the appeal process.**

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? **ODRC has designed an inmate pamphlet outlining the inmate grievance process. Information is also in inmate handbooks and in policy manuals in the library. The grievance process is available in Spanish upon need.**

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? **Inmate grievance procedures are listed in the inmate handbooks. Pamphlets are also available for handout. Postings are put up concerning changes and clarifications.**

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? **ODRC Policy mandates that inmates are instructed within the reception process and upon transferring into other facilities around the state.**

c. Is information on the units/blocks always displayed and do prisoners understand it? **Inmates are told about the Grievance Procedure upon arrival to the institution and then in orientation process.**

d. What are the procedures for blind prisoners? **Blind inmates receive orientation as other inmates do. They are instructed about the grievance procedure within the orientation process. If inmates need help with filling out forms, they make a request of staff for assistance.**

4. Are prisoners encouraged to solve areas of dispute informally, before making official complaints? **ODRC Grievance procedure states that inmates should talk to or kite staff with problems or questions. Procedures state that if this doesn't work, they can try to solve it by using the inmate grievance procedure.**

5. Can prisoners easily and confidentially access and submit complaint forms? **Inmates can get informal complaint forms from their pod officers, unit staff or they may kite the Inspector's Office to request the form.**

a. Are forms required to access complaint forms? **Inmates may verbally ask staff or send a written request for forms. There is no form required to request a grievance form.**

b. Are there forms, and at least one kite box on each block/dorm? **Locked institutional mailboxes are in front of the chow hall, which is centralized to all living units. Inmates drop their own mail in these locked boxes when they**

are on the yard or on their way to a meal. Forms are available with pod officers, unit staff, inmate's library, and Inspector's Office.

c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer? **Mail Officers pick up the mail at designated times during the day. They take the mail to the mail room, process it and take it to the local post office.**

d. Are form dispensers always stocked with forms? **Staff have informal complaint forms. Pod officers, unit staff, library and Inspector's office.**

e. Are informal complaints and grievance files secured on a limited access basis? **Inspector files are secured and no inmates or staff-other than Inspector Office staff have access to the files.**

6. Do prisoners make use of the procedures, and are they free of pressure to withdraw any complaints or grievances? **Yes, inmates use this procedure. Here at this facility there are over 1000 informal complaints and an average of 250-350 formal grievances per year.**

a. What are the procedures for prisoners with learning or other disabilities? **Inmates may come to or contract the Inspector's office with questions concerning the Grievance Procedure. They may also seek assistance with workers in the inmate library.**

7. Are all complaints and grievances, whether formal or informal, dealt with fairly and answered within three days, or 10 days in exceptional circumstances, with either a resolution or a comprehensive explanation of future action? **Administrative Regulations outline the mandated time frames/limits for inmates to file their complaints and for staff to respond. 3 days and 10 days are not mentioned in any of our time limits. GCI scores 100% on audit standards dealing with the grievance procedure. These standards monitor time frames, quality and format of responses, appeal process, and the like.**

a. Are complaints resolved? **Complaints are resolved if factual evidence deems that it needs to be resolved or something needs to be corrected.**

b. Are complaints answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances? **Three day and ten day time limits are not consistent with our administrative regulation mandated time limits here in our inmate grievance procedures in Ohio. We meet time requirements as outlined in AR 5120-9-31.**

c. Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure? **It depends on the technical problem with their form. If they didn't sign it or attach their informal complaint-yes, it would be returned, asking them to sign or include and then return it.**

d. Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner? **Inmate complaints are not permitted to be referred or forwarded to other staff members per the administrative regulations.**

e. Are target return times recorded? **All info concerning informal complaints and formal grievances and appeals are logged into the ODRC computer system. All filing time lines are logged into this system.**

f. Are letters of complaint/concern from third parties, such as legal representatives, family or voluntary organizations, logged and answered? **The Warden's office handles correspondence of this nature.**

8. Do prisoners receive responses to their complaints/grievances that are respectful, legible, and address the issues raised? **ODRC Inspectors are trained and have operations manuals to guide them in the manner in which they are to respond to grievances.**

9. Are formal grievances signed and dated by the respondent? **Yes, formal grievance responses are signed and dated by the Inspector.**

a. Regarding the quality of responses, is there a quality assurance system in place? **There is an official appeal process for the inmates to go through.**

b. Does the staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly print their name on the response? **No, the Inspector signs the response so the signature can be read.**

c. Are staff responses to confidential complaints returned in sealed envelopes? **Inmate grievances are returned to inmates in regular inmate mail. Envelopes, kites, etc are utilized.**

10. Do prisoners feel able to ask for help in completing their complaint or grievance form and in copying relevant documentation? **Inmates ask fellow inmates, staff and Inspector for assistance when needed with the grievance process.**

a. Are staff responsive to requests for help with forms? **Yes staff are very responsive to requests for assistance or information.**

b. Are translation services provided for those who need them? **No, the Inspector signs the response so the signature can be read.**

c. What are the arrangements for prisoners with literacy problems, and for those who are blind? **Inmate grievances are returned to inmates in regular inmate mail. Envelopes, kites, etc. are utilized.**

11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered? **ODRC Administrative Regulations outline that inmates are protected from recriminations for utilizing the inmate grievance procedure.**

a. Are staff responsive to requests for urgent help? **Yes, staff are responsive to requests for urgent help.**

12. Are prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners protected from possible recrimination? **ODRC Administrative Regulations outline that inmates are protected from recriminations for utilizing the inmate grievance procedure.**

a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice? **If inmates feel they have been retaliated against because of their use of the grievance procedure, they would be investigated by supervisors and Inspector and corrective action is taken if warranted.**

b. Are responses objective and factual, and conclusions based on evidence rather than supposition? **Responses are always based on evidence-not supposition-not opinion.**

c. What are the adverse effects of filing complaints? **Adverse effect of filing complaints-Some inmates would say yes and some would say no.**

d. Do prisoners know that there are protection measures if they complain about staff or other prisoners? **Yes, prisoners know that staff aren't permitted to retaliate against them for utilizing the grievance procedure.**

13. Do prisoners know how to appeal grievance decisions? **Yes, inmates know how to appeal grievances. Directions are on the bottom of the Disposition form the Inspector sends back to them. Procedures are listed in the administrative regulations, in the pamphlet provided by DRC, and in the inmate handbook-all things inmates have access to.**

a. Are appeals dealt with fairly, and responded to within seven days? **Appeals are handled in Central Office above my level of judgment or authority.**

b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms? **Yes, appeal option is listed at the bottom of the disposition form that's returned to the inmate when his grievance is responded to.**

c. How many have appealed in the last six months? **Computer records tell us that 38 appeals were filed from January 1, 2009 to June 30, 2009.**

d. What was the outcome, and how promptly were they answered? **In most, the Inspector's disposition is affirmed. I cannot judge how promptly my Central Office supervisors responded to appeals.**

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? **Inmates may seek information concerning CIIC in the inmate library. Incoming CIIC mail is treated like legal mail for confidentiality.**

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? **See above.**

b. Are there any difficulties with access to the CIIC? **None.**

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, prisoners receive help from staff if they need it.**

16. Do all prisoners know how to contact the Inspector and Chief Inspector? **Yes, inmates know how to contact Inspector and Chief Inspector.**

a. Do blocks/dorms have contact details and information? **Information is provided in ODRC pamphlets and in the inmate handbook.**

17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need to? **The grievance procedure is used inside the ODRC-not for outside ODRC entities.**

a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisers or making direct applications to the courts? **Inmates may seek assistance in the law library. Staff do not give inmates legal advice.**

b. In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector? **ODRC computer records indicate one original grievance was filed in the last 30 days.**

c. What do they tend to be about? **Inmate was unhappy with how the Inspector investigated his grievance.**

d. What proportion are generally resolved? **I can only remember one original grievance in the past several years that was resolved.**

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? **Data is looked on an institutional level one to two times per year looking for patterns/trends.**

a. Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge?
See above.

Staff-Prisoner Relationships: Expectations Questions and Responses

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? **Education reentry team, recovery services.**

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**

11. Are prisoners encouraged and supported to take responsibility for their actions and decisions? **Yes**

INMATE and CLASSIFICATION PROFILE

According to the information on the institution's website on the day of the inspection, the racial composition of the population consisted of 770 Black inmates, 652 White inmates, 77 Hispanic inmates, and 18 inmates classified as "other." The total population of 1,517 consisted of 50.76 percent black, 42.98 percent white, 5.08 percent Hispanic, and 1.19 percent "other."

<u>Race</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Black	770	50.76%
White	652	42.98
Hispanic	77	5.08
Other	18	1.19
Total	1,517	100%

The Grafton Correctional Institution is an institution with mixed level one (minimum) and level two (medium) security classifications. According to the website, there were 858 inmates classified as security level one, 657 inmates classified as security level two. In addition, two inmates classified as level 3 (close security) were awaiting transfer. Level one inmates comprised 56.56 percent of their population, while level two inmates comprise 43.31 percent.

<u>Security Level</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Level One (Minimum)	858	56.56%
Level Two (Medium)	657	43.31
Level Three (Close)	2	.13
Total	1,517	100%

Older, More Stable Population

Staff relayed that they have the *oldest population of inmates in the state*, reportedly even older than the Hocking Correctional Facility. Most of the inmates at Grafton Correctional Institution are reportedly serving very *long sentences*, and many have *worked their way down from higher security levels*. As a result, staff remarked that they have a *well behaved population*. Issues that

plague other institutions like rampant theft, security threat group (gang) activity, and assaults reportedly do not occur as frequently at the Grafton Correctional Institution.

SECURITY THREAT GROUPS

Staff relayed a string of property thefts occurred when the smoking ban was initially implemented. However, the thefts have declined as more time has expired between the implementation of the tobacco prohibition.

Staff also relayed that there was a slight rise in security threat group (STG) activity recently that consisted of attempts of a few gang members to recruit other inmates, hold meetings, and one assault on another inmate. Reportedly due to the *good work of the STG Coordinator*, the perpetrators were placed in segregation, and are awaiting a pending transfer to a higher security institution. High praise was expressed regarding the STG Coordinator, who was described as “really good.”

Security Threat Group Program - C.O.P.E.

Staff noted that the Department’s grant money ran out for a unique anti-gang program called “Creating Opportunities for Positive Endeavors” (COPE). The COPE program was developed to address the needs of inmates involved in gangs who are soon to be released. Facility staff relayed that *the program worked well, that it was well liked by the administration, and they are trying to obtain renewed funding*. Excellent written material was provided on the program, termed an “Intensive Residential Treatment Program” for the security threat group (STG) or potential STG population. Excerpts are provided below:

In 2004 the DRC STG Investigator/Coordinator created a group known as the COPE team to develop the program to *address needs of inmates who were already involved with gang or had the potential to become involved with them. Its purpose is to avert or intervene in progression towards security threat group involvement*. The program provides a positive environment and cohesive atmosphere where those with similar obstacles can work together to improve their lives by addressing employment, education, marital/family relations, associates, social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional orientation and attitude. It is a voluntary program in which potential candidates are screened for appropriateness of treatment, *targeting those 18 to 35 years of age with one to three years remaining on their sentence*. The inmate must demonstrate a commitment to lifestyle change and follow the program and rules.

The program material cited the number of participants as 80. Each COPE participant receives incentives based on their participation and involvement in each stage of treatment, including earned credit, job change to “student” with pay increase, extra family visits, uniform t-shirt, increased commissary spending to \$100, relaxed family visit or alternative family access to distant family.

The program's duration consists of *six months as an intensive outpatient, three months of continuing care that focuses on comprehensive life skills and planning, and ongoing intensive case management, and six months pre-release and ongoing intensive case management through community services.*

Participants attend one and one half hour sessions three days per week. Group counseling and didactic education are 90 minutes each. The program includes Rational Self-Counseling as used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The Getting it Right program brings organization and structure to each session and creates a permanent record of personal life change for every participant. Topic groups are presented by outside consultants and community volunteers.

Program evaluation methods included: Resource Utilization Review, Peer Review, Clinical Record Review, Client Satisfaction Survey, and Client Withdrawal Questionnaire. Resources cited for the program include: community volunteers, independent contractors, inmate health services, mental health services, recovery services, recreational services and dietician education.

Possibilities: *Based on a careful review of the impressive written material describing the COPE Program, a great deal of work, including teamwork, went into planning the best program possible to meet the needs. Success would not only impact recidivism after release and therefore helps with ongoing prison overcrowding concerns, but the program could directly contribute to the safety and security of the institutions.*

*The 2009 inspections to date indicated that at many of the prisons, there is a new, serious concern about the youth population entering the prison system due to a characteristic extremely negative, anti-authority attitude, bold disrespect and predatory gang activity. **If this program was more widely available, especially where gang activity is the most voluminous and problematic, it would provide a door for those who believe there is no way out. It could help to address what appears to be a burning issue among inmates and staff at the affected institutions.***

It is suggested that consideration be given to reactivating a COPE team of DRC staff to determine how the program could be adapted to existing resources, perhaps revisiting the core of the program as originally devised by DRC employees. The program could be of great benefit to a number of institutions who may appreciate a meaningful intervention that may be equally appreciated by inmates.

DRC Follow up Communication

The COPE program and services were provided through a federal grant to the U.S. Attorney General's office which coordinated all agencies involved. Unless additional grant monies were available this program would be nearly impossible to replicate with the current budget restrictions. Also reductions in staffing have impacted programming.

Bullying and Violence Reduction: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Does everyone feel safe from bullying and victimization (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault)? **It would be hard to say that everyone feels safe from bullying, but it would be safe to say that all inmates know that this type of behavior is not tolerated.**
2. Are active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation known to staff, prisoners and visitors? **Yes, inmate rules of conduct 5120-9-06/Use of Force policy 63-UOF-01 and AR 5120-9-01.**
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, inmate grievance procedure AR 5120-9-31.**
 - 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, when there is a violation of an inmate rule it is documented by conduct report, incident report or special incident report if needed.**
 - 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? **Very effective, this institutions assault numbers are below most in the state.**
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, all inmates are trained on the inmate rules of conduct.**
 - a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months? **Yes**

- 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? **Four fights, one sexual assault.**
 - b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying? **Recreation, inmate cells, recreation yard.**
 - c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners? **64-DCM-01 and AR 5120-9-04.**
 - 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? **Inmate that might be vulnerable are escorted by staff also safe are available if needed to separate inmates from aggressor.**
 - 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, if inmate requests protective custody then we arrange a committee to interview inmate and determine whether a separation is required.**
- 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? **N/a**
 - a. Are prisoners' families encouraged to come forward if they feel they are being bullied to bring drugs into prison? **Yes**
 - b. Is a visitors' survey distributed systematically? **N/a**
 - c. Do visiting families know about reporting procedures and do they think that visiting staff are approachable and sympathetic? **Yes, they know the reporting procedures/contact shift supervisor or written response to warden.**

- d. Are there posters in visiting rooms? **Posters are located in A-building with visiting rules and procedures and also for the inmates in the library.**
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? **Yes**
 - a. Has a strategy been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison? **Yes, in the inmate handbook.**
 - b. Is a central log of bullying kept, and are incidents of bullying reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee? **Yes, investigators monthly report (DRC form 1449E)**
 - c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization? **Yes**
 - d. Are all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. used for evidence of bullying/intimidation? **Yes**
 - e. How do staff contribute to the strategy? **Monitoring of inmates and signs of abuse.**
 - f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments? **Yes**
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**
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? **N/a**
 - b. What information is distributed to new arrivals? **Inmate handbook/rules of conduct/sexual assault policy and grievance process.**
 - c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners? **Yes**
 - 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? **n/a**
13. Are appropriate interventions in place to deal with bullies and support victims? **N/a**
- a. What interventions are available to challenge bullies and to support victims of bullying? **Victim support committee and mental health committee regarding assaults.**
- b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior? **Yes**
- c. Do prisoner records contain comprehensive updates on how bullied and bullying prisoners have been supported and/or challenged?
-
-

STAFFING COMPOSITION

As of the August 10, 2009 Grafton CI website data, they had 350 total staff, including 189 security staff.

Based on the ODRC Workforce Composition Monthly Fact Sheet of October 1, 2009, Grafton CI had a total staff of 349, including 192 correctional officers, comprising 55 percent of their workforce.

Total Staff:

- Of their total staff, 229 are *male (65.6 percent)* of which 182 are *white (79.5 percent)*, 31 are black (13.5 percent), and 15 are "other."
- Of their total staff, 120 are female (34.4 percent), with 90 *white (75 percent)*, 26 black (21.7 percent) and four "other."

Officers:

- Of the 192 correctional officers, 145 are *male (75.5 percent)*, of which 113 are *white (77.9 percent)*, 18 are black (12.4 percent), and 14 are "other."
- Of the 192 officers, 47 are female (24.5 percent). Of the 47 female officers, 31 are *white (66 percent)*, 13 are black (27.7 percent), and three are "other."

Staff Communication

Administrative staff relayed that facility staff concerns include worry about layoffs, reduction in pay due to the “cost savings” days, and the budget cuts. As expressed in the closing, the CIIC team was most impressed with the employees of the facility. It was also observed that inmates felt comfortable approaching administrative staff with questions or problems. The staff/inmate interaction was observed as good, and facility staff addressed concerns brought to their attention. The following is based on the group discussion including a representative employee from the departments operating at the prison:

- Staff work together. Very few grievances are processed, most are disciplinary in nature.
- This facility is “as clean and laid back as I’ve seen.”
- The work in the Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally ill and outpatient treatment is interesting. Positives were relayed regarding the overhaul of mental health policies to allow clinician flexibility. Staff are especially pleased with the changes in suicide watch and the pilot Offender Aide program. The Central Office mental health staff visited GCI the week prior and listened to the officers regarding additional screening by custody staff for eligibility for training and assignment as an Offender Aide.
- GCI is getting younger inmates and short-timers, a big change for the institution. Others also cited this change in the inmates as “dramatic.” Segregation is reportedly the “fullest it has ever been.” There used to be from nine to 12 in segregation, but “now consistently, there are 35-40.” Fights reportedly occur once or twice per week. Staff relayed that Grafton CI used to be called an “old timers’ camp, laid back, but not now.”
- One staff person relayed that the facility has experienced “increased gang activity” from inmates who graduated from the Department of Youth Services institutions to the prison system. They are reportedly “more into gangs and fighting.” Other staff relayed that “the inmate situation” is paramount, with the “young, rowdy guys.” Others relayed that the young inmates “seek safety in numbers,” but that also affects the safety of the other inmates and could cause them to also seek safety through gang involvement.
- A unit staff member shared that the critical change in the inmate’s conduct came with flat time or definite sentences. One staff person relayed that the situation can be described as the “old law vs. new law” inmates. Old law inmates reportedly “live under the rules of prison culture.” However, new law inmates reportedly live under “gang culture.” Staff view it as a “kind of new culture,” which does not respond to the former ways in which the older inmates “used to bond them.” Conduct reports, segregation placement and classification security level reportedly matter to those who face the Parole Board. They have reportedly served as a deterrent to misconduct for those serving indefinite sentences who are eligible for early release on parole. However, flat timers reportedly “don’t care.” Even when they are placed in segregation, “they still know they’re leaving.” Staff relayed that older inmates who will face the Parole Board want to follow the rules, yet they “can’t let the other young inmates steal from them.” This is a dilemma that has been relayed by inmates to the CIIC over a long period of time, prompting some to recommend that the inmates serving indefinite sentences be separated by institution or housing area from the flat timers. One staff member relayed the belief that time in segregation should not count toward their sentence. This is similar to the former DRC practice in which Wardens could authorize “bad time” to inmates as a penalty for rule violations. This was deemed

unconstitutional by the courts, but some suggested that the reasoning could be researched to determine if the practice could be reinstated in a way that would address the legal concerns.

- Staff discussed inconsistencies in Parole Board decisions, based on their knowledge of the inmates. For example, one reportedly “model inmate” recently received a long continuance from the Board, while another with a “bad record” was reportedly released. These decisions from institutional staff’s perspective, negatively impact the otherwise positive motivation that old law inmates have to follow all rules to create a good conduct record to improve their chance of release by the Parole Board.
- A staff person relayed the importance that staff serve as a liaison for the mentally ill who are considered for release by the Parole Board. Concerns were also expressed regarding a gap in transition services between intensive mental health treatment and the community. Some mentally ill are reportedly retained longer in prison or returned to prison “because there is no place for them” in the community. Mentally ill inmates are discharged from prison with two weeks of medication. However, some counties are so taxed, the inmate is unable to get an appointment to continue mental health services.
- Grafton CI reportedly used to have two officers assigned to recreation, where a lot goes on. It was expressed that they should put an extra officer on recreation because they have from 300 to 500 out at one time, and with a fight every week and a half, more security staff are believed to be needed.
- Regarding the package room all institutions are reportedly “not on the same level.” They reportedly do not title the same items. Inmates arriving from some institutions arrive with property for which they have no titles. (In follow-up with the Warden, it was relayed that there is a DRC standard property list. However, some wardens grandfather items that are not on the list, so they transfer with those items.)
- One security staff person assigned to the kitchen shared that the area “is pretty good.” The big issue is that they have less money, less resources, and they are all working harder.
- Staff morale reportedly has “its ups and downs.” Inmate morale was described as “not as high as it could be – the same with staff.” Staff are reportedly negatively impacted by overcrowding and stress, as well as job insecurity. As to the solution to overcrowding, one staff person suggested that the courts should not send offenders to prison for non-violent crimes and frivolous reasons, because it is a “waste of money.”
- One staff person relayed that inmates complain about their pay and have actually requested raises. In response to a CIIC staff inquiry to DRC Central Office staff, it was relayed that there have been no inmate pay raises or increases for the last 20 years.

Rapport, Morale

The morale of the staff was described as good, which was evident throughout the inspection. Many inmates expressed positive comments about treatment staff and other program staff. Throughout the inspection, the Warden and executive staff demonstrated good rapport with other staff and the inmates. On many occasions they were approached by inmates, and they listened and documented the issues or concerns expressed.

Budget

According to the August 10, 2009 Grafton CI website data, their GRF budget is \$27,422,683, with a daily cost per inmate of \$56.53.

Impact of Funding Cuts

On the day of the inspection, staff relayed that they were down one recovery services staff member. However, all treatment and rehabilitation programs have reportedly suffered due to the loss of funding for program staff. As to whether there are problems obtaining supplies, staff relayed that they “provide their own supplies.” Staff relayed that they have lost 14 employee positions consisting of seven unit management positions, and have three employees were laid off.

In addition, the contract with the company that facilitated the residential substance abuse treatment program through a Therapeutic Community (TC) was not renewed. The Therapeutic Community model is a long established, successful, intensive recovery services program in which participants receive in-patient treatment to address anti-social behaviors associated with long term substance abuse and criminal activity. According to the staff, the contract with the company that facilitated the TC previously cost approximately \$315,000 to operate.

DRC Follow up Communication

The ordering of supplies had been temporarily suspended by the previous warden unless approved by her due to budget constraints. With the start of a new fiscal quarter supplies can be ordered by staff on an as needed basis with the close monitoring of supervisors.

Physical Facility

Staff relayed that they just received new windows in the administration building and a new program building or wing opened.

Staff relayed that they have no major structural issues. The funding request to repair the sally port gate was reportedly denied due to the current budget situation. The aging mechanical system that operates the sally port is reportedly in disrepair, and causes problems especially in winter.

Outside the compound, the facility has fine, wide sidewalks which were built by inmates. Good movement on the yard was observed, with a relaxed, yet orderly environment.

CROWDING

Prior to beginning the inspection, CIIC met briefly with the Warden and executive staff. Staff relayed that the facility has ten pods or housing units and an approximate population of 1,500 inmates. According to staff, 100 inmates have had to be placed on the floors in bunks in the celled housing units. To reduce the impact of the crowding, staff spread the inmates who have to

live on bunks among the housing units. Reportedly, there are only about 20 inmates on the floor of each of five units. While this resulted in less privacy for the inmates in the bunks, there still is ample room between the bunks to store their property, and it did not appear that it was too crowded. The facility has two dormitories, with the remainder celled housing.

Table 8. ODRC Percentage of Crowding per Institution Based on Rated Capacity and Inmate Population Count on August 3, 2009

Prison	Percent of Crowding	Rated Capacity	Population Count
Lorain Correctional Institution	266.76% (297.5% on 9-22-09)	746*	1,990 (2,219 on 9-22-09)
Lebanon Correctional Institution	182.78%	1,481	2,707
Warren Correctional Institution	173.85%	807	1,403
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	172.14%	1,673	2,880
Grafton Correctional Institution	161.44%	939	1,516
Mansfield Correctional Institution	160.22%	1,536	2,461
Allen Correctional Institution	160.18%	844	1,352
Hocking Correctional Facility	159.39%	298	475
Ohio Reformatory for Women	156.18%	1,641	2,563
Correctional Reception Center	155.00%	900	1,395
Ross Correctional Institution	154.59%	1,643	2,540
Trumbull Correctional Institution	154.32%	902	1,392
Belmont Correctional Institution	141.99%	1,855	2,634
Marion Correctional Institution	136.79%	1,666	2,279
Richland Correctional Institution	135.30%	1,855	2,510
Noble Correctional Institution	133.53%	1,855	2,477
North Central Correctional Institution	122.26%	1,855	2,268
Southeastern Correctional Institution	119.14%	1,358	1,618
London Correctional Institution	109.34%	2,290	2,504
Madison Correctional Institution	106.13%	2,167	2,300
Dayton Correctional Institution	100.00%	482	482
Pickaway Correctional Institution	99.97%	2,465	2,460
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	99.86%	1,498	1,496
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	99.10%	660	654
Franklin Pre Release Center (Females)	98.75%	480	474
Toledo Correctional Institution	97.06%	1,192	1,157
Northeast Pre Release Center (Females)	90.15%	640	577
Oakwood Correctional Facility	88.48%	191	169
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	88.35%	352	311
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	85.90%	1,540	1,323
Ohio State Penitentiary	78.80%	684	539
Corrections Medical Center	66.19%	210	139
TOTAL	131.85%	38,715	51,045

*On occasion, the infirmary cells may be used as segregation cells, with a capacity for 10 inmates. (These 10 cells constitute the difference between the institution's definition of their rated capacity at 746 and the DRC's definition of the Lorain institution's rated capacity at 756.)

USE OF FORCE

Staff is trained and authorized to use force in the commission of their duties when necessary. The type or amount of force used by staff is dictated by the threat to safety and security to self or others. The situation may dictate the officer employ a greater level of force by use of authorized tools and techniques to gain compliance of the inmate. Tools such as PR-24 batons or OC spray can be used to subdue an inmate or inmates when necessary, as can be “come-along” techniques where the officer manipulates an appendage of the inmate to gain compliance.

Per Departmental rules and policies, all incidents in which force is used by staff is documented, and subject to review by a use of force committee who determines if the amount of force used was authorized and not excessive. The table below shows the documented incidents in which force was used in the month of July at Grafton.

The staff relayed that the incidents in which force is used at Grafton CI is often times not severe enough to warrant a review by an institutional use of force committee. According to one staff member, there are higher rates of force used by staff in the Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally ill than the general population housing units.

According to the most recent information provided in institutional monthly reports, there were 15 incidents requiring staff to use force in the month of July that required no further investigation by a use of force investigation committee. However, the information does not provide the area of the facility in which the use of force incidents occurred.

**Table 9. GCI Report of Racial Breakdown and Use of Force
July 2009**

	Black	White	Other	Total
Use of Force Incidents during the month	4	11	0	15
Number of those reports (from #1) above that were:				
Logged as “No Further Action Required”	4	11	0	15
Assigned to a Use of Force Committee	0	0	0	0
Referred to the employee disciplinary process	0	0	0	0
Referred to the Chief Inspector	0	0	0	0
Number of those reports (from #2) where the investigation was not completed in 30 days and were extended	0	0	0	0
Number of extended investigation(s) from previous months that were:				
Completed	0	0	0	0
Not Completed	0	0	0	0

Good Order-Security and Rules: Expectations Questions and Responses

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? **Yes**
4. Are they clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed? **Yes**
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?
 - a. Are staff-prisoner relationships positive? **Yes**
 - b. Do prisoners receive personal attention from staff? **Yes**
 - c. Is there constructive activity to occupy prisoners?

Security: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Do staff cluster during association? **No**
2. Are there enough staff in dorm/block areas to facilitate good officer work? **Yes**
3. Does effective security intelligence safeguard prisoners' well-being?
4. Do staff comply with security requirements in terms of filing reports? **Yes**
5. Are there recent incidents where security reports have led to action? **Yes**
6. Is prisoners' access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessarily restrictive approach to security? **No.**
7. Is strip and squat-searching of prisoners carried out only for sound security reasons? **Yes**

8. Are prisoners strip or squat searched only in the presence of more than one member of staff, of their own gender? **Yes**
9. If squat searches are used, does their incidence and authorization need to be logged and regularly checked? **Yes**
10. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances? **Yes**
11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available? **Yes**
12. Are the visitors subject to bans or restrictions reviewed every month? **Weekly.**

Rules: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas? **Each inmate is provided access to a handbook with this information available in it.**
 - a. Are rules and routines posted/distributed on units/blocks/dorms? **Available in inmate handbook.**
 - b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs? **Handbooks are available in Spanish and staff assistance is available.**
2. Are rules and routines applied openly, fairly and consistently, with no discrimination? **Yes, fair, firm and consistent is the DRC standard.**
3. Does staff use only the level of authority necessary to ensure a prisoner's compliance with the rules? **Yes, Staff are trained in the use of force continuum annually.**
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned? **Yes. However, depending on the circumstances the explanation may not occur immediately it may occur at a later time.**
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoners, are appeal arrangements explained and made available? **Yes, in the RIB process they (inmates) are given an appeal form when they are informed of the discussion of the RIB panel. Inmates are also told how to file an appeal. There are also copies of the ARs made available to them in the library and the SMU to review for additional information.**

THE INSPECTION

Entry Building

The entrance building contained adequate amenities, including sufficient seating for visitors waiting to be processed into the institution, vending machines, and clean restrooms for visitors. The Officer assigned to the post was very friendly, courteous and professional, and followed security procedures appropriate for the post.

Administration Building

The administration building, which is the institution's nerve center, contains the offices of the executive staff such as the Warden and the Major, the business office, the records office, training rooms, officer's roll call room, and various other administrative areas. The cleanliness of the building was most impressive, including a truly shiny floor. Staff relayed that porters are assigned to the administration building to clean, and they reportedly earn more than porters assigned to the inmate housing areas.

THE INFIRMARY

The inspection included a walk through the infirmary, which despite the effects of frequent use and age, appeared clean and well maintained. The infirmary waiting room is medium in size with the capacity to hold approximately ten inmates. Literature on various health and wellness issues is available for inmates to take as needed. The common areas where staff worked were well kept and organized.

An officer monitors the nurses and doctors' station. It was relayed that sometimes there are five doctors on site, though on the day of the inspection, three doctors were present. It was noted that files are organized by the last two digits of the institution numbers.

Medical Staff

Staff relayed that they employ 11 Registered Nurses that are all civil service employees. The other services such as optometry, podiatry, physicians and dental staff are provided by private contractors. Staff relayed that physicians are present five days per week.

Pharmacy

Pharmaceutical services used at the Grafton Correctional Institution are reportedly shared with the nearby Lorain Correctional Institution. Having a Pharmacist on site has reportedly prevented the institution from encountering some of the complications reported by other institutions. In addition, staff relayed that having a Pharmacist on site allows them the latitude to make adjustments when the central pharmacy fails to send the proper quantities of medications to the institution.

Dental Clinic

The dental services are provided by one company that provides services to all of the institutions in the north region. The staff indicated that they have been satisfied with the services provided by the medical contractors. The dental contractor provides four dentists, one hygienist, and two dental technicians who are all present five days a week. Minor problems with the qualifications of one contract employee have reportedly been resolved.

The dental clinic appeared clean and organized with adequate resources. The area where x-rays are taken adjoined the dental clinic. Based on the information provided, many of the larger x-rays that are needed are taken in the infirmary at the Lorain Correctional Institution.

Suicide/Safe/Crisis and Isolation Cells

The infirmary is equipped with two safe cells for suicidal inmates. There are three infirmary cells for medical purposes only. The safe cells have a padded bed, a sink and toilet. The outer window is covered by a heavy screen to prevent access to the horizontal bars. During the inspection of the infirmary, an officer was monitoring an inmate who was on suicide watch. The officer sat directly outside of the door observing the inmate on constant watch, and recorded his actions every 15 minutes.

With one exception, the medical isolation cells were vacant, with linens folded neatly on the ends of the beds, and no garbage or filth observed remaining from previous occupants. One of the cells was observed with gnats present and was not clean.

In follow up communication provided from the Department regarding the Suicide/Safe/Crisis and Isolation Cells, as well as regarding the Exams Rooms discussed below, it was relayed that, "All rooms will remain secured unless being used. Other area is clean and free of gnats. Area is cleaned after each use."

Exam Rooms

Several exam rooms in the infirmary were observed unsecured with the doors open. Even though only one inmate was waiting to be seen, it is recommended that all rooms be secured until they are needed. The exam rooms appeared to be sufficient in size and uncluttered.

As noted above, the Department relayed in follow up communication that the rooms will remain secured at all times unless they are being used.

One inmate who just saw the doctor, spoke pleasantly and positively about medical services.

**Table 10. GCI Medical Monthly Report
July 2009**

Primary Health Care	
Physician Appointments/Doctors Sick Call Totals	458
Physician Screening	458
Nurses Screening/Nurses Sick Call Totals (non-segregation)	224
Referred to Physician	35
Intake Nurses Screening	35
Reception Intake H & P	25
Emergency Triage	
Inmate Injuries Treated Onsite	41
Sent to local ED (Emergency Department)	13
Sent to OSU ED from local ED	3
Sent to OSU ED (Emergency Department)	0
Emergency treatment of staff	0
Emergency treatment – visitor	0
Infirmiry Care	
Total number of infirmiry Bed Days	49
Number used for Medical	32
Number used for Mental Health	10
Number used for Security	7
Dental Care	
Number seen by appointment	384
Number of emergent appointments	54
Totals	438
Optometry	
Number of inmates seen	54
Hours on site	12
Podiatry	
Number of inmates seen	90
Hours on site	16
Pharmacy	
Number of Medical and Mental Health Prescriptions Refills	3,580
Number of New Prescriptions	1,326
Total number of prescriptions	5,103
Controlled Med Scripts	0
Lab Data	
Blood draws	254
Blood draws for mental health	53
Number of X-Rays	39
EKG's for medical and mental health	23
DNA Blood Draws	0
Infectious Disease Data	
Inmates incomplete INH	1
Number of positive PPD's	0
Number of staff PPD's	0
Inmates completing INH prophylaxis	0
Inmates refusing INH	0
Inmates tested for TB disease	0
Number of inmates HIV positive	6
Inmate HIV conversions	0
Deaths	
Within Institution	0
Local Hospital	0
OSU	0
CMC	0

B-8 RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNIT FOR THE MENTALLY ILL

Staff relayed that the Residential Treatment Unit has 73 beds, with a population of 57 on the day of the inspection. The unit serves Grafton Correctional Institution, as well as additional prisons in their mental health services cluster, including Lorain Correctional Institution, Marion Correctional Institution, North Central Correctional Institution, Richland Correctional Institution and Lake Erie Correctional Institution. Staff include 24 hour coverage by nurses. The unit also has three correctional officers on first and second shift, two psychology assistants, and three activity therapists. In follow-up communication from the institution, it was clarified that, “We do not have a staff psychologist for the unit but rather a psychology supervisor. The entire unit is not single celled – only 27 cells on the unit are single celled.”

The Residential Treatment Unit is a highlight of the institution both in terms of staff’s spirit and conditions. The pod was very well maintained, sanitary and not crowded. The CHC team was most impressed with the RTU appearance and conditions, and even more impressed with the character and caliber of the staff.

Inmates assigned to the RTU are either celled alone or with a cellmate. According to staff, only 27 of the total amount of cells are reserved for inmates to cell alone. Cells are the same size as general population cells, but the cell windows are equipped with screens for safety reasons. Each tier of the cell block is equipped with showers for inmates to use, all of which were observed to be in good condition. The unit is also equipped with several safe cells, which staff explained are also used for segregation so inmates can remain on the unit if they violate the inmate rules of conduct.

Using mental health levels, inmates that are newer to the unit are kept in their cells for longer periods of time so that RTU staff can assess their stability. On the day of the inspection, those that were under this status were mostly asleep or quietly passing time in their cells. Inmates who had been in the RTU for awhile were clustered about the unit in small groups talking quietly to one another, or watching television. Even though staff reported that they have a higher number of use of force incidents by staff in the RTU, *the atmosphere of this unit was calm and free of tension.*

Inmates have access to a television in the dayroom, a reading spot with a bookshelf, two laundry rooms, several exercise bikes, and an air hockey table, as well as a program room used for therapeutic activities, such as art and music. The unit also has several murals on the walls, which staff indicated were painted by inmates. The paintings were obviously completed by someone with great talent as they had an aesthetic and professional appeal.

The activities and programs available to RTU inmates were very impressive. The activities board showed that inmates have access to games such as Uno, cards, Connect Four, Parcheesi, Chess, Scrabble, ping-pong, Dominoes, Backgammon, Othello, checkers, Triominoes, Jenga, Monopoly, and Upwards. A list of scheduled indoor and outdoor therapeutic activities included: stretching, music, listening, art studio, weight training, community service projects, and current events, games on unit, sports talk, drum circle, reward video, music studio, jam session, and walking program.

The walk-through of the RTU included discussion with inmates and staff. Some inmates relayed their appreciation for the staff in the RTU, commenting that the assistance they have been provided has helped them greatly. While most inmates reportedly only spend brief periods of time in the RTU, many of the inmates indicated that they have had frequent and lengthy RTU placements during their incarceration. Several indicated that they have been residents of RTUs at one institution or another for the majority of their incarceration as they could not function in the prison's general population due to their mental illness. One inmate relayed that "We need more to do," but he added, "We only have three programs a day!"

One inmate aged 62 relayed that he has served 25 straight years in prison and would be released in September, yet has "nowhere to go and no family." He reportedly knows no one outside of prison and receives "no mail from anyone." The concern was followed-up through communication with the Warden and with unit staff. *The staff relayed that his unit staff were probably working on his placement, and that they would not just let an inmate leave without a place to go. However, the inmate expressed great appreciation for the effort to speak to staff about his problem and insisted that staff had not communicated with him about any effort being made to help him to find a place to go when he is released on September 29, 2009.*

The staff expressed satisfaction with their job assignment in the RTU, stating the combination of the treatment and custody staff together makes an *excellent team*. One staff member relayed that he spent most of his career in the unit because the *combined efforts of security and treatment* staff make the job easier, and make the time go by much more quickly.

The greatest challenge according to one staff person is to "juggle" the program in such a way as to meet the needs. The more challenging patients are cutters, those who act out, and the higher functioning. Staff seek to stabilize them quickly on the unit. Reportedly, their behavior can go off because they do not want to be discharged. *The importance of the front end classification process in reception was emphasized regarding the mentally ill, so that they are identified and properly placed.*

Some staff relayed the wish that the Residential Treatment Unit should be able to *recruit, screen and assign the best possible candidates for correctional officers to work with the mentally ill. This same sentiment has been expressed to the CIIC by staff at other Residential Treatment Units in the prison system. It has been shared most recently with the DRC Mental Health Director and Mental Health Administrator.*

DRC Follow up Communication

All inmates that are being released from the RTU are seen by Community Linkage in preparation of their departure. Release of Information Forms are obtained and information compiled that is then sent to communities/parole to assist with appropriate MH follow up. Additionally, RTU staff may communicate with parole if the inmate is going to be released with supervision. However, at times it may become necessary to release an inmate to a local shelter in his community due to limited housing or housing restriction issues. If the inmate is EDS and he refuses assistance from Community Linkage, then unless he qualifies

to be involuntarily hospitalized, he will be released without designated follow-up as that is his right. Release and transition concerns are placed on an inmate's treatment plan about 12 to 6 months prior to his release when possible and these concerns are addressed in treatment team. There is also a transition group on the RTU along as well as staff available to discuss concerns in this area.

Programming on the RTU is a priority and it currently offers about 120 AT group programs, individual therapy with AT staff, psychology groups and individual therapy as well. We continue to strive to increase targeted, clinically relevant programming and coordinate with other departments such as recovery services and education to solicit their participation on the RTU as well. Programming is targeted at the various skill levels and functional levels of the inmates that are housed there.

Mental Health Caseload

On December 31, 2008, the ODRC reported a total inmate population of 51,448. For the 2008 calendar year, the system-wide monthly mental health caseload averaged 9,113 inmates. According to the data, an average of 4,172 inmates were diagnosed as C1 (serious mental illness) per month. The mental health classifications are defined by DRC as follows:

Table 11. Mental Health Classifications with Definitions

C1
The inmate is on the psychiatric caseload and meets criteria for Seriously Mentally Ill designation: a substantial disorder of thought or mood which significantly impairs judgment, behavior, and capacity to recognize reality or cope with the ordinary demands of life within the prison environment and which is manifested by substantial pain or disability. Serious mental illness requires a mental health diagnosis, prognosis and treatment, as appropriate, by mental health staff.
C2
The inmate is on the psychiatric caseload but does not meet the criteria for Seriously Mentally Ill. Inmate is receiving mental health care and supportive services, which include medication prescription and monitoring, individual and group counseling and therapy, crisis intervention and behavior management.
C3
The inmate is receiving group or individual counseling, therapy and skill building services. He/she has a mental health diagnosis and treatment plan and is being treated by mental health staff other than the psychiatrist.

According to the data, 17.7 percent of the total prison population was on the mental health caseload. The following table provides the percent of the inmate population on the Mental

Health Caseload at the end of 2008. The population for each institution was taken from population data as of January 9, 2009 as provided on the DRC website.

Table 12. Percent of Prison Population on the Mental Health Caseload by Institution

Institution	Percent of 2008 Total Population on Mental Health Caseload	Institutional Population January 9, 2009	2008 Monthly Average on Mental Health Caseload
Oakwood Correctional Facility	56%	133	75
Franklin Pre-Release Center (females)	50%	455	229
Northeast Pre-Release Center (females)	49%	551	269
Ohio Reformatory for Women (females)	41%	2470	1004
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	30%	1406	428
Trumbull Correctional Institution	26%	1363	348
Allen Correctional Institution	24%	1323	317
Corrections Medical Center	24%	134	32
Hocking Correctional Facility	21%	486	101
Chillicothe correctional Institution	20%	2923	592
Mansfield Correctional Institution	20%	2452	487
Toledo Correctional Institution	20%	1088	220
Grafton Correctional Institution	18%	1507	270
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	18%	661	116
Southeastern Correctional Institution	17%	1642	274
Pickaway Correctional Institution	17%	2409	413
North Central Correctional Institution	17%	2335	406
Warren Correctional Institution	17%	1393	243
Marion Correctional Institution	16%	2237	360
Correctional Reception Center	16%	1754	286
Belmont Correctional Institution	15%	2784	422
Lebanon Correctional Institution	15%	2669	403
Noble Correctional Institution	15%	2456	379
Richland Correctional Institution	14%	2571	349
London Correctional Institution	14%	2563	351
Madison Correctional Institution	14%	2222	307
Ross Correctional Institution	13%	2613	345
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	12%	1493	181
Lorain Correctional Institution	7%	1999	144
Ohio State Penitentiary	7%	548	39
Dayton Correctional Institution	0%	475	1
Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center	0%	333	1
TOTAL	17.7%	51,488	9,113

The following table provides the monthly average of inmates on the mental health caseload in 2008. The data represents approximately 91 percent of 2008 monthly data as approximately nine percent of the data was not available.

**Table 13. Monthly Average on Mental Health Caseload by Institution and
Mental Health Classification in 2008**

INSTITUTION	2008 Monthly Average Number on Mental Health Caseload	C1	C2	C3
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1,004	466	401	137
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	592	312	245	35
Mansfield Correctional Institution	487	192	223	72
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	428	232	175	21
Belmont Correctional Institution	422	257	118	47
Pickaway Correctional Institution	413	174	196	43
North Central Correctional Institution	406	85	248	73
Lebanon Correctional Institution	403	184	193	26
Noble Correctional Institution	379	219	106	54
Marion Correctional Institution	360	184	138	38
London Correctional Institution	351	140	186	25
Richland Correctional Institution	349	107	179	63
Trumbull Correctional Institution	348	97	194	57
Ross Correctional Institution	345	100	170	75
Allen Correctional Institution	317	170	136	11
Madison Correctional Institution	307	143	132	32
Correctional Reception Center	286	163	107	16
Southeastern Correctional Institution	274	136	136	2
Grafton Correctional Institution	270	185	62	23
Northeast Pre-Release Center	269	146	101	22
Warren Correctional Institution	243	167	72	4
Franklin Pre-Release Center	229	101	104	24
Toledo Correctional Institution	220	66	116	38
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	181	83	83	15
Lorain Correctional Institution	144	50	84	10
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	116	15	62	39
Hocking Correctional Facility	101	40	54	7
Oakwood Correctional Facility	75	58	15	2
Ohio State Penitentiary	39	3	23	13
Corrections Medical Center	32	20	10	2
Dayton Correctional Institution	1	0	0	1
Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center	1	0	0	1
TOTALS	9,113	4,172	3,954	987

Suicides, Suicide Attempts

System-wide, 57 suicide attempts occurred in Ohio prisons from January through August 2009. Five suicide attempts occurred at Grafton CI in the period.

System-wide, two suicides occurred in the prison system, one at Lebanon CI and one at Pickaway CI.

Pilot Suicide Prevention Program – Offender Observation Aides

Staff discussed the pilot Offender Observer Aide Program, in which inmates assist institutional staff to help with inmates who are suicidal. According to the staff, they have recruited and trained inmates to work in the program, but there were setbacks resulting in dismissal of several trained volunteers. According to what was relayed, security staff conducted a more in-depth screening of the volunteers that exposed past STG activity and certain rule violations that made them inappropriate choices for such an important program. Screening reportedly includes a criminal check, conduct report review, and STG history. Regardless of certain apprehension expressed by staff, the mental health staff is very excited to implement the program.

CIIC Perspective: Based on communication to the CIIC on issues and concerns expressed by suicidal inmates system-wide since 1978, *the infusion of new and innovative ideas regarding long time practices in the response to an inmate's suicidal depression is highly praised.* In brief, countless inmates have long expressed the need for improvements in the reported over-use of safe/crisis/suicide cells. Suicidal inmates, as well as friends and relatives of suicidal inmates have written the CIIC in the past, instead of alerting prison staff of their concern about their friend, reportedly because they wanted their friend to receive *help*, not suicide cell placement, which may temporarily postpone the act of suicide, but has also reportedly deepened a feeling that they no longer want to live.

In April 2005 when the CIIC discovered a wider range of options in place within the juvenile correctional facilities, where a youth might be in school, yet be on a form of suicide watch, this was shared with the DRC Chief of Mental Health Services, along with the DYS policies on the subject. Further ideas were drawn from a review of *Expectations* of the British Inspectorate on the subject of Self-Harm and Suicide Prevention, which were also shared with the DRC Chief of Mental Health Services. *CIIC staff are extremely pleased with the DRC willingness to re-think old practices.*

The beauty of involvement of carefully selected inmates as helpers in this process is that it counters the dangers of isolating one who is suffering from suicidal depression. In addition, a trained inmate has the knowledge and the time to be a good, caring listener. The Aide position provides a meaningful role for inmates to fill their need for a sense of purpose, and to experience the satisfaction of helping another. The greatest benefit, however, is believed to be the inmate with suicidal thoughts, and the mental health staff (at Grafton CI and Lorain CI). Both institutions have the honor and opportunity to pilot the program which hopefully will prove to be successful and expanded system-wide so that the other prisons may also benefit.

The Concept: In 2008 preliminary information on the concepts under consideration was shared by the DRC Chief of Mental Health Services. Under the proposal, Constant Watch is de-emphasized and considered a minor option among many better options. The ideas included:

- **Inmate Watch/Observer:** The inmate Watch/Observer must meet a stringent set of criteria. One option for the mental health professional is the use of an Inmate Watch/Observer. Inmate Watch is a step down from Constant Watch that can be recommended.
- **Inmate Chaperone:** In addition, an Inmate Chaperone option can be used when the mental health professional determines that the offender has suicidal thoughts, but is not currently assessed to be at imminent risk of self-harm. The Inmate Chaperone is a specially trained individual who accompanies the individual during daily activities. If arrangements can be made for the Inmate Chaperone to cell with the other offender, it can be allowed where appropriate.
- **Watch Without Walls:** Another option for the mental health professional is for an inmate to be in a supervised situation, but engaged in a work assignment or other activity. Under this option, the Inmate Chaperone or a staff person could be assigned to “watch” or observe the inmate.

As referenced below in the responses to relevant questions based on *Expectations*, a revised 2009 DRC mental health policy adds a section on “*Offender Observation Aides*” noting that *they may be used for those on suicide watch status and/or observation status*. Although close and constant suicide watch has long been a possible response to suicidal inmates, *observation status* is an additional option now available to mental health professionals.

Self-Harm and Suicide: Expectations Questions and Responses

1. Does the prison work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach? **Yes, mental health is available to work collaboratively with other departments in the institution to mediate these concerns. Such as housing, RIB, LC, jobs, etc.**
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, but it is always a challenging balance between mental health needs and custody or environmental needs.**
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?
 - 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? **Yes**
 - 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? **17 safe cells at GCI. 13 on RTU, 2 in Seg, and 2 in medical. All are easily made available for use.**
 - e. Does the protocol 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, SPART meets quarterly or as needed.**
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, there is no inmate representative or member of community.**
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, where appropriate.**
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? **Regular reviews occur but generally do not formally include family or friends but we often have ongoing contact.**
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? **Ongoing in service mental health training and many have the two day specialized 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? **An inmate's placement is determined by their clinical needs.**
- a. Is a care suite available to support the work of Listeners? **I'm not aware of the definition for "listeners."**
 - b. Is there access to counselors, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times? **There is one mental health staff available 24 hours at the institution. The disciplines vary depending on the time of day I work.**
 - 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? **They are encouraged to contribute to their mental health plan and may write in it as they wish.**
 - 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, yearly in service reviews SW procedures.**
 - 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? **New inmates are evaluated in medical within the first 24 hours for SW issues/risks.**
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? **Yes, usually through mental health staff if proper release of information is available.**
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**
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**

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING (Segregation)

On the day of the inspection, there were 39 inmates in the segregation unit. In the pre-inspection meeting with administrative staff, it was noted that the segregation unit has two sides, contains 80 cells, and holds 56 beds which can be doubled except for the two safe/crisis/suicide cells which are always single celled.

Roster Board

According to a roster board in the hallway, 19 inmates were listed under Security Control (SC) status, eight under Disciplinary Control (DC) status, and 12 under Local Control (LC) status.

<u>Segregation Status</u>	<u>Number</u>
Security Control	19
Local Control	12
<u>Disciplinary Control</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	39

The dry erase board provides information about what cell each inmate is in, what status they are under, and identifies whether they have any meal restrictions or special accommodations.

At the top of the roster board was written, “Captain ... & the ‘Knuckle’ head.” Upon inquiry, the officer to whom the nickname refers was introduced. As relayed in follow-up communication from the institution, “This was handled on the spot and follow up was done with supervisor.”

Meal Loaf and Suicide Watch

The segregation board indicated that the inmate in one of the cells is on suicide watch, and is to receive “meal loaf” rather than a regular meal. Meal loaf was sampled by the CIIC Director at the Ohio State Penitentiary in 2009. It had a foul odor, was considered inedible, and is required to be eaten with one’s hands. There was no question that the meal was punitive in nature.

Regarding the placement of a suicidal inmate on meal loaf at Grafton CI, administrative staff relayed that such is “*not unusual*” and can be ordered if the inmate misused his food or utensils. However, when checking the cell in which the inmate was reportedly on meal loaf, segregation staff relayed that none of their inmates in segregation are currently on meal loaf. Based on follow up communication from the Department, “No meal-loaf has been issued this year. We have not served meal loaf to an inmate for over two years.”

The crisis cells in both sides of the segregation unit were vacant, and observed to be clean.

It is hoped that a careful review is made of the use of meal loaf for suicidal inmates to ensure that practices are in compliance with written DRC policy. It is suggested that such decisions should be based solely on common sense necessity for safety and security purposes, so as not to unnecessarily contribute to an environment which adversely impacts depression and loss of the will to live. Years ago, a suicidal inmate was transferred to a crisis unit at a different prison, and wrote CIIC about the reportedly automatic requirement that suicidal inmates must eat with their hands. It was clearly disturbing to the inmate, and was cited as one of the many humiliating aspects of seeking help for suicidal depression. It is hoped that a system-wide review of practices be made to ensure best practices are standardized and in accord with applicable policy.

Atmosphere

The segregation unit contains two cell blocks monitored by staff in a central control room. Each cell block contains two ranges, one above the other with an upper and lower range. Most of the cells were double celled, containing two inmates each. Neither shouting nor tension was present on the ranges. While there are a number of reasons that could contribute to the absence of tension, a primary causal factor is believed to be staff responsiveness to inmate concerns, which tends to diffuse issues before they become explosive. Staff relayed that Grafton Correctional Institution is a “relatively good institution,” that inmates are content, and staff try to be proactive.

Officer Communication

A veteran officer shared concerns about staffing, noting that they are short staffed, yet paperwork including logs duplicate information, costing unnecessary time to complete. It was also relayed that in segregation, they only have two people assigned, which is “not enough staff.”

Inmate Communication

Several inmates expressed concerns regarding the amount of time it was taking to have their disciplinary transfers carried out. Other inmates relayed concerns regarding the circulation of the air in the segregation unit, perceived procedural errors associated with their Rules Infraction Board hearing, and/or the validity of the conduct reports written by staff.

- One alleged gang member disputed the security threat group label and conduct report, reportedly based on the way he signed a birthday card. He reportedly was on his way to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.
- One inmate relayed that he was in segregation for fighting because “they say I owe and I don’t.” He received the conduct report for fighting but had not yet had an RIB hearing.
- One inmate complained that “staff do what they want. They’re disrespectful.” He alleged that inmates are respectful to staff and do not provoke the reported disrespect.
- One inmate complained of “the nitpicking” of staff at Grafton CI, that was reportedly not seen at Ross Correctional Institution. He relayed that he is Hispanic and “they say we’re a gang!”
- One relayed that he refused to lock in general population because he “wants a transfer to Allen.” He expressed no personal safety concerns. He appeared to be unaware of the proper way to request to be transferred through his case manager, with a possible appeal to the Warden and Bureau of Classification. The proper procedure does not require an inmate to be in segregation or to receive conduct reports which jeopardize one’s security level.
- One inmate relayed that they need soap, toilet tissue and toothpaste. Staff relayed that they receive it when they need it.
- One inmate relayed that the Rules Infraction Board never gives “time served” to the inmates.
- Many inmates complained about “that brunch!” It was alleged that they “go 20 hours without eating.” Some spoke of fear that they would get in trouble for talking to the CIIC team.

Toothbrushes

Inmates and staff relayed that they ran out of toothbrushes on Friday, and are waiting to receive a supply. Numerous inmates relayed that they have no toothbrush. Staff later located additional toothbrushes, which have little resemblance to a regular toothbrush. The tiny fingertip size plastic with soft plastic miniscule “bristles” reportedly does the job, without posing a threat to security. The senior security supervisor relayed that he makes rounds in segregation four times per week, yet inmates never told him that they have no toothbrush. The brushes were reportedly

originally made for the mentally ill in the Residential Treatment Unit, but work well in segregation, too.

Local Control

In the corridor leading to the ranges is a strip search cage for inmates being processed into segregation. The room was occupied by the Rules Infraction Board Chair.

The side of the segregation unit used for inmates assigned to Local Control seemed to be in a state of disarray. While the individual cells appeared to be in good shape, the meal trays and remnants of the lunch served to inmates were scattered on the floor in front of the cell doors. According to the porter, inmates push their trays underneath their cell doors when they are finished, some more vigorously than others. This created quite a mess for porters assigned to the range to clean. Once it was observed by the Major, he instructed his officers to have the porters begin cleaning the ranges and collecting the trays pushed out into the aisles.

In follow-up communication from facility staff, it was relayed that, "Inmates were finishing lunch and sliding out trays at the time we entered. Trays were collected up immediately and range mopped."

Porters

Staff relayed that porters are assigned from general population rather than from segregation status. Another porter in segregation who is assigned to the laundry relayed that he was at Marion Correctional Institution and wished that he was back at Marion because "there's more to do." At Marion CI, he was reportedly in recovery services and was in the dog program.

The Department relayed in follow up communication that, "Porters assigned from the segregation unit are to be used in the future."

Security Control, Disciplinary Control

The second range of the segregation unit occupied by inmates assigned to Security Control and Disciplinary Control had much better sanitary conditions in contrast to the range of segregation used to house inmates assigned to LC. The range was quiet, and the temperature was comfortable.

Segregation Recreation

The indoor and outdoor recreation areas were not in use, but were observed to be clean.

Forms Access

Routine forms such as informal complaints, health services requests, and kites were available for staff to provide inmates in either of the ranges.

Cell Logs

The DRC forms used to track the services provided to inmates such as hygiene, recreation, visits from medical staff, etc. were all current.

INMATE SERVICES AREA

Barbershop

Following food services, a walk through was conducted of the area of the institution that contains the laundry, quartermaster, barbershop, shoe shine stand, and the institution's commissary. All three areas were considered cool, well-maintained and in good order. The barbershop has four stations where inmates work as barbers cutting other inmates' hair. Staff relayed that an inmate licensed barber can cut the staff's hair and he earns a little more. It was observed to be very busy with several inmates seated outside the shop quietly waiting their turn. According to an inmate responsible for shining shoes, boots cost \$1.50, and a shoeshine costs 75 cents. Inmates sign a slip to have money for a hair cut or shoe shine deducted from his account.

An officer shared his opinion that Grafton CI is a "good place for a lifer. If they cooperate with the rules, there's a lot of good here." It was noted that inmates who receive barber training can receive a job in the field when they are released.

Commissary

The commissary appeared to have an adequate selection of products and ample room for storing inventory. The staff relayed that the commissary was originally built for only 500 inmates, but has managed to accommodate the larger population. Staff reported that the commissary is open from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 A.M. and from 12:30 P.M. to 3:00 P.M. five days each week. Inmates are permitted to shop twice per month, and have a spending limit of \$175 per shopping day, for a total of \$350 per month.

It was reported that mice get into the bread, but mouse traps were laid out the previous day. Although one person relayed that he has seen a rat outside the building, they do not have an infestation. One staff person relayed that they do not have much of a mice problem anymore. Reportedly, they use a sonic light sensor that plugs into the socket in the restroom. They reportedly do not have roaches either. At night, they used to come into restroom, and were getting into the pastries.

It was also relayed that money earned through commissary profits go into the I&E Fund, and that the percentage of profit can be as high as 22 percent.

INMATE LIVING AREAS

Overall, housing units were relaxed.

D-1 Housing Unit – The Bubble

There are approximately 80 inmates assigned to D-1 housing unit, which is a dormitory setting. It was clean, cool and well lit with artificial and natural light. The structure itself is a large tent-like dome or “bubble” that was added to accommodate an increasing population of inmates. These are less expensive alternatives to the construction of new buildings, but provide accommodations that are consistent with other dormitory style housing units. Due to the design of the structure, the windows cannot be opened. Reportedly it is the only general population housing unit that is equipped with an air conditioning unit, while other units use air movers and fans to circulate the air.

Inmates sleep in bunks that were tightly packed in the center of the dorm, with very little room for any personal property or private space. The area above the bunks was also crowded with the antennas of inmate’s personal televisions.

As noted above, the accommodations provided for inmates in this unit are similar to standard housing units. This includes restrooms and showers attached via a portable modular unit, washers and dryers, ice machines, and four telephones.

There are spaces for inmates to congregate in common areas to watch television, or to access books on shelves located near the televisions. Restrooms showed signs of excessive use, but they were clean and free of filth.

D-2 Housing Unit – Literacy Unit

D-2 unit is the literacy unit. Facility staff relayed that the unit houses 40 students and 20 inmate tutors. This unit is a standard open-dormitory housing unit that was built approximately ten years ago, also to accommodate the growing inmate population. The unit is split into two halves with living areas on either side of the toilet and shower facilities which are located in the center.

Exhaust System: Earlier in the inspection, inmates relayed their concerns about the living conditions of the D-2 unit. Inside the unit, the atmosphere was hot and stagnant. The lack of any fresh air was immediately noticeable. In fact the temperature inside the building was noticeably higher than the temperature outside. Inmates relayed that the HVAC system is inoperable and there is no motor in the exhaust. One inmate stated that the exhaust has not worked since 2001, and the staff allegedly refuse to repair it.

In follow-up communication from the institution, it was relayed that:

The D-2 housing HVAC/air system is and has always been working. It’s that time of year when it is difficult to regulate the proper temperature in these buildings. Most of our systems, like D-2, require the balance of outside air mixing with inside air to work. So if it is set to work with the outside temperature at 30

degrees and the outside temperature climbs to 50 degrees for a couple of days then the housing unit will be warmer than it should be for those couple days.

The exhaust system in the shower area of D-2 was looked at just recently because of a concern with too much moisture³ in that area, possibly from lack of exhaust. Maintenance found the exhaust to be free of obstruction and working properly. We concluded that multiple showers were being used when a single inmate was showering. We are working on a proposal to install push button valves for the showers to regulate and limit the moisture there. Officers will watch that area more until the new valves can be installed.

Lights: Contributing to the high temperature inside the unit, the inmates also complained that the staff left the lights on all day, which emit considerable heat. According to one inmate, the type of lights that were installed are not supposed to be used in housing areas per the manufacturer's instructions and warning labels. Facility staff relayed previously that the lights had been left off, but due to low visibility, this presented a security risk for staff working in this dorm. The lack of light reportedly clearly jeopardized their safety. Reportedly, inmates were very upset about the decision to keep the lights on.

Enforcing Cleaning by Porters: Other inmates relayed concerns about the cleaning performed by the porters. According to one inmate, the staff are reluctant to make the porters actually clean. He relayed that the bathrooms were a good example of this, as inmates urinate on the walls, floors, and the toilet seats, and the porters refuse to clean this mess up. The inmate further alleged that the staff spend most of their time enforcing petty rules such as ensuring that inmates do not wear their sunglasses on their heads. Based on the walk through the bathrooms, the allegations relayed by the inmate were observed to be true.

The toilets were observed as "disgusting," and the walls and floors in the area surrounding the urinals were observed as "filthy." It was evident that the sanitation issues in this particular area went beyond normal wear and tear. Reportedly, there is a serious pattern of failure to ensure appropriate sanitary practices are enforced. Maintenance issues such as leaking sinks and urinals were also observed prompting questions about the effectiveness of the maintenance program.

Administrative staff relayed that no such issues were raised about this area during a recent inspection by an accrediting body.

In follow-up communication from the institution concerning plumbing leaks in D-2, it was relayed that, "Our plumber (along with other maintenance staff) has been carrying other jobs outside of his field at the time of this inspection. Currently two of the three positions are filled and the third position will be posted this week." In addition, in reference to the discoloration of the ceiling in the D-2 shower area, it was relayed in follow-up communication from the institution that it appears to be stain caused by steam and impurities carried by that steam. Working with the maintenance supervisor, two options have been considered on how to correct the eye sore:

- Paint the ceiling with a stain blocking primer such as KILZ™ and then painting the ceiling with a good oil-based paint. This option would require shutting down the showers for at least a week. Several days of drying time would be required before the oil paint could be applied.
- Clean the ceiling and then cover it with fiberglass reinforced panels. These panels are the same type used in the kitchen. Although this option would cost more up front, it would last longer than just paint, and the panels can be cleaned. A couple of days would be required to completely dry the ceiling before the ceiling could be installed.

Lastly, the follow-up communication included, “Until this process is completed the porters will clean the areas twice on each shift.

B-5 Housing Unit

One inmate in the library urged the CIIC to go to B5 “to see how hot it is.” He relayed that they fans were pointed up, not down, so some did not receive any relief from the heat. B-5 unit is a regular celled housing unit that has two man cells, and is split between upper and lower ranges. In addition to the cells, there were ten, two-man bunks in one of the common areas of the unit because of overcrowding. Inmates congregated in the common area at tables playing dominoes, cards, or just talking to one another. In one of the day rooms, inmates were observed watching a previously recorded session of the Ohio House of Representatives.

The cells and showers were observed to be clean and in good condition. However, cells were full of individual inmate property. Many of the inmates who were housed on the floor of the unit in the bunks also had a significant amount of property. Staff and inmates alike relayed that they are not so concerned about their property being stolen, evident by the amount of property that appeared unsecured. The fact that inmates had so much unsecured property was a possible indication of the safety and security of the unit. Staff relayed that since the ban on tobacco in March, they could not recall any such spree of thefts.

Follow up communication from the Department relayed that they would conduct a 2.4 inspection within the next month.

Inmates relayed that the crowding did make things a bit inconvenient, but otherwise the atmosphere of the unit was quiet and calm. One inmate relayed that the only reason that it was quiet at the moment is that many were at recreation or working. In the evening, the inmate relayed that the noise gets so loud that it makes it hard to hear one think. The Officer assigned to the unit showed the CIIC team where the inmates could access informal complaints, health services requests, and other routine forms needed by inmates.

In follow up communication from the Department, it was relayed that wireless transmitters have been ordered for the televisions in the Day Rooms that should reduce ambient noise significantly.

Residential Units: Expectations Questions and Responses

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, except for the decorations.**
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? **N/a**
 - 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? **Everything but the corkboard.**
 - e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks? **Yes**
 - f. Do shared cells have screened toilets? **No**
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? **No**
 - a. How are volunteers identified, trained and assigned?
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? **Signature at officer's desk and on outside of cell door.**
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? **Young adults are housed at Madison.**
- a. Are there single cell risk assessments? **Done at reception.**
 - b. What are procedures in any case where young adults are identified as posing a risk to others? **Done at reception.**
9. Do all prisoners have access to an in-cell emergency call button/bell that works and is responded to within five minutes? **No**
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? **This is addressed in the inmate handbook and unit guidelines.**
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? **RTU/ Yes**

Clothing and Possessions: Expectations Questions and Responses

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? **No, have to have medical permission.**
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? **Laundry in pods.**
3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request? **Yes, each has locker boxes.**
4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage? **N/a**
5. Is there a standard list detailing the possessions that women prisoners are allowed to keep, and used across all women's prisons? **N/a**
 - 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? **N/a**

Hygiene: Expectations Questions and Responses

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? **No**
- b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older, less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles? **Handicapped showers, no baths.**
- 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? **In medical.**
- 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

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED
INITIATIVES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

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. Mentoring, family mediation, and Re-entry initiatives have all been employed. The Faith-Based family Reintegration program at GCI is a fine example. It is run through Religious Services.

- 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?

Yes. Adding faith-based organizations (eg. Half-way housing, mentoring, etc.) to a growing phone/email directory programs like those listed above all becoming accessible to all stake holders (victims, offenders, and general public.)

- 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? **A top-down approach administratively, along with seminars, shadowing, and other such training methodology. Job descriptions are being altered to accommodate successful programming.**
- d. What methods of program evaluation are being explored to further document program success? What methods are in place? **Training/questions.**

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? How? What programs have been developed? **Yes. It is obvious that more and more collaborative work within the communities where our prisons are located is being accomplished.**

- a. Is the culture within the institution continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers? Explain. **Yes. Chaplains, Recovery Services personnel, and administrative staff are currently training staff, as well as volunteers regarding these collaborative efforts.**

- 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? **The Warden is promoting and implementing this paradigm shift.**
 - c. How is the DRC/DYS administration working with wardens/superintendents to collaboratively develop protocols that will proactively assist with changing the culture? **Providing access to training/information.**
 - d. Have such protocols been developed? **Yes**
 - e. What are they? **N/a**
 - 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? **Volunteer, mentoring, nexus by admin staff.**
 - h. What policies have been changed so that they do not inhibit use of community volunteers? **N/a**
- 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. Reentry, mentoring, educational and occupational skills training.**
 - 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. Training by one Chaplain through religious services.**
 - d. Has a marketing plan been developed to overcome the public's misperceptions of offenders? **Somewhat.**
 - 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. In-service training through Religious Services, Recovery Services; video presentations, and one on one training.**
- 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, but needs to be ongoing and predictably regular.**
5. Has Ohio law been revised to remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions that inhibit offenders' successful reentry? **N/a**
6. What improvements have been made regarding communication about programs and services between:
- Staff and volunteers? **Understanding that this is the way we operate today.**
 - Staff and the community? **Among administrative staff and Department heads, a commitment to enlist and volunteer.**
 - Other parts of the criminal justice system and the community? **n/a**
- a. What improvements have been made in effectively communicating among staff within the facilities, as well as with the community? **More training-town (styled) meetings with stakeholders (i.e. politicians, press, local community leaders, and businesses, etc.)**

- b. Has an improved communication mechanism been developed in order to ensure these efforts? **N/a**
- c. Has the system been developed collaboratively with staff and volunteers to address observed problems? **Somewhat-periodic reviews with stakeholders (i.e., volunteers, and volunteer organizations)**

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? **N/a-The Director is currently briefing the State Legislature regarding community alternatives to imprisonment for lesser offenses, changes in the O.R.C.**
 - a. Working with faith-based and community service providers, have programs been developed in the community to effectively provide treatment while protecting public safety? **Currently in process.**
 - 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? **Yes**
 - c. Have local probation departments prepared a listing of community options currently available for judicial use? **N/a**
 - 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. **Yes. Databases of existing program and residential facilities.**
- 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? **Yes**
 - a. Is DRC/DYS working with community organizations and probation departments to expand services available for offenders? How? **Yes**
 - b. Has a community model been created that will help meet the basic needs of offenders within the community? Is it being created? Explain. **Yes. Citizen's circles are just one example.**
- 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? How? **Yes. Through our state/civil service Chaplains. They provide active databases of volunteers and organizations.**

- 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**
 - 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? **N/a**
 - 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? **Yes**
- 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-One Stop, and faith partners in the business community.**
- a. Has a job placement program been implemented? **Yes**
 - b. Does it provide:
 - Information on job fairs to ex-offenders? **Yes**
 - Education of businesses/employers on the benefits of hiring ex-offenders? **Yes**
 - 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. Through Citizens Circle and Re-entry programs run through one institution.**
 - 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? **N/a**
 - e. Has the DRC Omnibus Reentry legislation been enacted to reduce unnecessary sanctions in the law and thus made training more relevant? **N/a**

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-Marriage and Family Life skills and mediation skills.**
- Financial management and budgeting? **Yes**
- Personal hygiene? **Yes**
- Family programs including: **Yes**
 - o Family and community-based orientation? **Yes**
 - o Family mediation? **Yes**
 - o Family education and orientation program? **Yes**
 - o Transportation and video conferencing for visitation? **Yes**
 - o Parenting? **Yes**
- b. Dynamic risk factors that impact offender behavior and risk of reoffending 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-Less “Service-styled ministry” emphasis (although it is ongoing) and greater emphasis on mentoring and “placement-styled ministry.”**

- c. Have specific life skills programs been developed in the following areas?
 - Budgeting? **Yes**
 - Parenting? **Yes**
 - Job searches? **Yes**
 - Anger management? **Yes**
 - Appropriate leisure-time activities? **Not so much.**
- 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.? **N/a**

- f. Have video-conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders, been expanded? Are they used as an incentive program? **N/a**
 - g. Do volunteers facilitate the improvement of family relations through coaching in basic relational skills or involvement in family mediation programs? **N/a**
- 12.** Has DRC/DYS expanded partnerships with national organizations including faith-based and community organizations to provide programming in state institutions? Explain. **N/a**
- 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? **N/a**
- 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. **Yes. Referrals are made and in individuals/organizations are inserted into an inmate's reentry path.**
- a. Are community actors and organizations a part of reentry planning for those offenders who will shortly be returning home? Explain. **Yes. From S.C.O.R.E. to volunteers working through OBB**
 - 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? **Not in most cases-only those that have been pursued by all agencies, organizations, and volunteers previously listed.**
 - c. Is there a mentorship program for offenders at your facility? **Yes**
 - d. Are faith-based and community volunteer groups actively developing such a program for participation by offenders at your facility? Explain. **Yes**

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? **Yes. Through the years the Religious Services administrator, along with a host of other administrators and chaplains have toured various communities promoting the work of reentry and volunteerism.**
- a. What has been done to make the faith community aware of programs and training for the faith community's involvement? **Churches, synagogues, and mosques**

have been invited to symposiums, seminars and working luncheons to discuss their role as a stakeholder.

- b. What has been done to create awareness among the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and the avenues to get involved? **Same as above.**
 - c. What effort has been made to inform the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and volunteer opportunities available? **Chaplains actively recruit volunteers.**
 - d. Have leaders among the faith community been identified? How? When? **Yes, at meetings, in-service, and programming through religious services.**
 - e. Have staff been used to accomplish this, using existing organizations, groups and established relationships? Explain. **Yes. Those that are affiliated with faith-based organizations often volunteer their time by informing others of the opportunity to volunteer.**
 - f. Has this educational opportunity been extended to faith groups of all kinds? **Yes.**
 - 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, as a Department-no so directly through religious services.**
 - 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? **N/a**
- 15. Are offenders informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release? How is this done? Yes. Through pre-release/re-entry style training, but also through volunteers that come in to do religious services programming.**
- 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, OBB and mentoring, citizens circle and volunteers from NAACP to SCORE offers such (just to name a few).**
 - b. Is legal advice in these situations available? Have partnerships been formed with local law schools to achieve this end? **Somewhat**
 - 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? **N/a**

- d. How has DRC/DYS made better use of existing federal programs that aim to address the issue of housing? **The Ohio Benefit Bank (OBB) deals with, among other concerns, housing (with electric, gas, budgets, etc.)**
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 as to recidivism, what works and what doesn't, and how to participate or receive information about our work.**
- a. What educational efforts have been made to:
- (1) 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: **Continuing communication/information generally given through public offerings such as Faith and Family Days, press opportunities via special events and Best Practices.**
 - (2) Inform the public of the many needs of ex-offenders to help them transition successfully back into society? **Not too much to the general public.**
- 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-Through all of the above contacts, but something more intentional can be done through the Chaplains to solicit quarter awareness/involvement.**