

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE

REPORT ON THE INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF

LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

Prepared and Submitted by CIIC Staff

March 10, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INSPECTION PROFILE.....	4
CIIC Members and Staff Present	
Facility Staff Present	
Areas and Activities Included in Inspection	
Brief Inspection Summary	
FACILITY PROFILE.....	5
Staff Data.....	6
Table 1: Male Custody and Non-Custody Staff	
Table 2: Female Custody and Non-Custody Staff	
Inmate Data	
Table 3: Inmate Racial Breakdown.....	7
STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
Attendance and General Meal Period	
Attendance at Rehabilitative or Educational Program	
INSPECTION.....	8
Entry/Exit	
Pre-Inspection Meeting.....	9
Visitation.....	11
Segregation	
Food Service	14
Kosher Meals.....	15
Housing Units.....	18
Programming/Activities.....	19
Comprehensive Sex Offenders Program	
Chaplain’s Literacy Program.....	20
Community Service	
Specific Unit Programs	
Additional Programs.....	22
Medical Services.....	24
Dental Services.....	25
Recreation	
OPI Tag Shop.....	26
Other Vocational Opportunities.....	27
Education	
Main Library.....	28
Mental Health Services.....	29
Table 4: ODRC Monthly Mental Health Caseload Snapshot at the Lebanon Correctional Institution.....	30
Table 5: ODRC Monthly Mental Health Caseload Snapshot at the Warren Correctional Institution	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table 6: Mental Health Caseload at the Lebanon Correctional Institution.....	31
Exit Meeting.....	31
CIIC DATABASE: CONTACTS AND CONCERNS	33
Table 7: Number of Contacts by Institution From January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008.....	34
Table 8: Number of Concerns by Institution From January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008.....	35
CIIC DATABASE: CONCERN CODE LIST	36
Table 9: Type of Concerns Logged from All Institutions from January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008.....	39
Table 10: Type of Concerns Logged from Lebanon Correctional Institution From January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008.....	40
INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES.....	41
Notable Responses to Adult Expectations.....	42
Notable Responses to Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Recommendations.....	48
Questions and Responses to Expectations.....	51
Environment and Relationships	
Residential Units	
Clothing and Possessions.....	53
Hygiene.....	54
Staff – Prisoner Relationships.....	55
Duty of Care.....	56
Complaint/Grievance Procedure	
Bullying and Violence Reduction.....	60
Self-Harm and Suicide.....	64
Activities.....	67
Learning and Skills and Work Activities	
Library.....	70
Good Order.....	71
Security and Rules	
Rules.....	73
Services	
Food Services	
Questions and Responses to Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force Recommendations.....	76

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE
REPORT ON THE INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF
LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

INSPECTION PROFILE

DATE OF INSPECTION January 17, 2008

TYPE OF INSPECTION Unannounced

CIIC MEMBERS AND STAFF PRESENT

Representative John White, CIIC Chair
Shirley Pope, CIIC Director
Gregory Geisler, Inspector
Adam Jackson, Inspector
Brianna Michalak, Inspector

FACILITY STAFF PRESENT

Warden
Deputy Warden of Operations
Administrative Assistants
Inspector

AREAS AND ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN INSPECTION

Entrance Meeting	Reentry Management Team	Education
Segregation	Infirmery	Library
Food Service	Recreation	Mental Health
Housing Units	OPI Plate Shop	Exit Meeting

BRIEF INSPECTION SUMMARY

On January 18, 2008, the CIIC Director provided a brief summary of the inspection to the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Assistant Director. Excerpts of that summary are provided below:

The Warden and his staff were very helpful in making the inspection truly worthwhile. Staff and inmate communication was excellent. A time cannot be recalled when an inspection of LeCI presented as well as it did on January 17, 2008. The facility was very clean and orderly and the inmates, even in segregation, were quiet and seemed content. CIIC staff believe that this can be attributed to attentive, responsive staff. The cleanliness, nearly everywhere, was truly remarkable. CIIC staff were especially impressed with the cleanliness of the medical area and the cell

blocks. The pride taken by staff and inmates in D Block was impressive. It was also a pleasant surprise to see that they now have a dog program in that block. Not one bird was seen flying around in the blocks or in the dining halls. CIIC staff were pleased to see the mesh netting in place between the dining halls, which was apparently very effective in solving the bird issue. The new cell windows truly make a visible difference in effectively stopping trash throwing from cells. Hopefully, the rest of the windows can be replaced eventually.

It was also very good to know that approval has been granted for the much needed kitchen area renovation. Some staff noted that the ceiling paint in the dishwasher area was badly peeling from the ceiling. A cockroach was observed on the ceiling over the dishwasher, though it is understood that there are regular extermination services. Some CIIC staff noted low morale among some of the inmate food service workers and suggested consideration of incentives for those workers in much the same way as is being done at Ross Correctional Institution. Other CIIC staff observed the inmate food service workers and civilian workers to be extremely positive, and upbeat.

Additionally, CIIC staff members sat in on a Reentry Management Team meeting for the first time. CIIC staff were extremely impressed with the inmate/staff interaction, as well as the motivation and willingness of the inmates to participate in the programs. It was an excellent extension of the reentry efforts underway. Based on their feedback, CIIC staff hope to sit in on such meetings during future inspections.

FACILITY PROFILE

The following information was gathered both from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction website or provided to CIIC staff on site during inspection on January 17, 2008.

As found on the ODRC website, the Lebanon Correctional Institution seeks to provide offenders of felony convictions within the State of Ohio a *safe, efficient, humane and appropriately secure* correctional institution, while maintaining dedication to the *protection of citizens* of the State of Ohio and the local community. The institution seeks to provide its employees with *opportunities for professional growth* and development through education, mentorship and training. Mindful of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's initiatives of *re-entry, community service and victim reparation*, the institution seeks to instill in offenders an *improved sense of responsibility and the capacity to become law-abiding members of society*.

STAFF DATA

According to information received from administrative staff on January 17, 2008, there were a total of 578 staff members at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. As seen below, there were 453 or 78 percent male staff members and 125 or 22 percent female staff members. Of the male staff members, 381 or 84 percent were Caucasian, 63 or 14 percent were African American and nine or two percent were classified as other. Of the female employees, 90 or 72 percent were Caucasian, 34 or 27 percent were African American and one or one percent was classified as other.

**Table 1: Male Custody and Non-Custody Staff
January 17, 2008**

Race of Male Staff	Number	Percent
<i>Caucasian</i>	381	84 %
African American	63	14 %
Other	9	2 %
TOTAL	453	100 %

**Table 2: Female Custody and Non-Custody Staff
January 17, 2008**

Race of Female Staff	Number	Percent
<i>Caucasian</i>	90	72 %
African American	34	27 %
Other	1	1 %
TOTAL	125	100 %

INMATE DATA

According to information received from administrative staff on January 17, 2008, there were a total of 2,506 male inmates. *Of those inmates, 1,331 or 53 percent were classified as Black, 1,150 or 46 percent were classified as White, 20 or .8 percent were classified as Other, three or .1 percent were classified as Asian, and two or .1 percent were classified as American Native.*

The average age of the inmates was 33.80 years old. There were 2304 inmates at the main institution, 178 inmates at the Lebanon Correctional Camp, 23 inmates out to court and one inmate out to the hospital.

**Table 3: Inmate Racial Breakdown
January 17, 2008**

Race of Inmates	Number	Percent
Black	1331	53 %
White	1150	46 %
Other	20	.8 %
Asian	3	.1 %
American Native	2	.1 %
TOTAL	2506	100 %

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

ATTENDANCE AT GENERAL MEAL PERIOD

Per statute, CIIC inspections require attendance at a general meal period of the institution’s general population. On the date of the inspection, the CIIC attended the lunchtime meal, which consisted of choice of turkey slices or veggie nuggets, sweet potato medley, green beans, two slices of wheat bread and juice, and milk or water to drink. *The nuggets were dry, but were considered to be adequate. To some, the turkey looked unappetizing, described as tough and rubbery, but the inmates seemed to like it.* In fact one of the inmates asked if he could have the uneaten turkey slice on one of the CIIC staff’s tray. No one was observed eating the turkey with the plastic combination spoon/fork that is used as the eating utensil. Instead, the inmates were observed using the bread slices to make a turkey sandwich. *All food was served at the appropriate temperature.*

The juice and milk were not in plastic bags as is the case at some other institutions. Rather, the beverages were dispensed from large plastic coolers and the milk was in the typical small cardboard carton. Institutional staff relayed that OPI can no longer produce bagged milk, so they are buying milk in cartons, which is reportedly more expensive.

Specific details regarding the food service area can be found later in this report.

ATTENDANCE AT REHABILITATIVE OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Reentry Management Team (RMT)

Two members of the CIIC staff were fortunate to sit in on a Reentry Management Team meeting. This particular meeting involved members of unit staff, the education department, recovery services and sex offender programming. The meetings are held for inmates soon after their arrival at the institution and at varying intervals during the inmate’s incarceration.

On the day of the inspection, CIIC staff observed the RMT meetings for seven inmates. These inmates varied from an inmate who was incarcerated only one month earlier, to an

inmate who was being released in less than one month. In all instances, the staff members briefly discussed the inmate's background before he was brought into the room. Staff reviewed basic details regarding the inmate's offense, release date, recommended programming and the involvement of the inmate in programming thus far.

The inmate was brought into the room and was greeted by and introduced to the staff members present. *In most cases, these staff members seemed to have already had some interaction with the inmate and therefore the inmate was already quite familiar with them.* Following introductions, the initial recommendations for the inmate were reviewed. Of the inmates observed during these meetings, the majority of inmates were recommended for some combination of the following programs; *Victim Awareness, Sex Offender Programming, Pre-GED, ABE, Narcotics Anonymous, Alcoholics Anonymous, Smoking Cessation, Anger Management, Criminal Thinking Errors, Responsible Family Skills and Vocational Programming.*

Of those recommended programs, the inmates and staff discussed which programs had already been completed and which tasks had yet to be accomplished. If an inmate had not yet enrolled in a program and desired to do so, staff advised him on what steps to take to become involved in that program, for example, kiting a certain staff member or submitting a request to be placed on the waiting list. *The inmate was also afforded the opportunity to ask any questions he may have regarding the recommendations. Staff seemed to be very helpful when responding to these questions and in the event they did not know the answer, they appeared to make a sincere commitment to either obtain the answer or to have the concerns addressed at a later time. CIIC staff were very impressed with the responsiveness of the inmates and staff members. The majority of inmates observed on this date had completed, or were in the process of completing, the majority of programs that were recommended for them. CIIC staff were grateful for the opportunity to sit in on these meetings and look forward to doing so during inspections at other facilities.*

INSPECTION

ENTRY/EXIT

On arrival, the entry officer was advised of the CIIC inspection and was requested to contact the Warden's office. The Warden's office is located to the right of the entry area, along with other administrative offices. The officer notified his supervisor who spoke to the CIIC, then notified the Warden.

All entry-building officers were pleasant, professional and efficient. The area appeared to be clean and orderly. CIIC staff found the entry security procedures to be very thorough. The procedures included the showing of photo identification, a check of all belongings, a requirement to pass through the metal detector without sounding, or otherwise determine the cause of the alarm, and issuance of a hand stamp that was checked along with the photo identification on exit as well. While prior institutions have been satisfied with the use of only the CIIC identification, each of the CIIC team was also provided with a visitor identification badge as well.

On exiting the institution, the officer initially could not locate any information on CIIC, though the Warden's office had recently provided his staff with an updated CIIC list. However, the officer eventually located the names of the CIIC members on a clipboard hanging on the wall to the officer's right. Unfortunately, the names of CIIC staff were not on the CIIC list. Therefore, in follow-up, a list of current CIIC staff has since been provided to the ODRC Assistant Director, with the suggestion that it be added to the list of CIIC members posted on entry and exit to the institutions. His response indicated that this would be communicated to the Wardens.

PRE-INSPECTION MEETING

Shortly after arrival, the CIIC met with the Warden and additional administrative staff in his office for what was an *extensive, informative and cordial pre-inspection discussion*. In addition to the Warden, the Deputy Warden of Operations, Administrative Assistant and the Inspector of Institutional Services were present. The initial discussion included issues such as *overcrowding, re-entry programming, staff and inmate concerns, and institutional improvements*. *It was one of the most meaningful pre-inspection discussions that CIIC staff can recall.*

Staff advised that crowding is throughout the department, and that crowding at the Lebanon Correctional Institution is no worse than it is at the other institutions. It was relayed that there is so far no need for triple bunking, *and some inmates are still afforded single cells*. Staff also reported that *two segregation blocks are currently closed because there is simply not the need for them, certainly an extremely positive indicator of good behavior on the part of the inmates*. *Institution staff advised that this was linked to improved inmate behavior and improved staff management practices.*

It was also said that inmate behavior and controlled inmate movement is positively impacted by the fact that the entire facility is under one roof, The institution is a celled facility, as opposed to a dorm setting, which inmates often prefer. All level three (formerly termed "close" security) prisons have cells rather than dormitories. Lastly, the fact that there are nearly 500 inmates at LeCI who are serving life sentences was cited as having a positive impact on inmate conduct overall. That is, inmates serving lengthy terms tend to view the institution as their home and therefore, take better care of their environment and surroundings. Further, staff proudly acknowledged that their inmates recently raised nearly \$1,000.00 to donate to a local food bank.

Programming was also discussed at length, mainly on reentry programming and the community's involvement in institutional programming. Discussion included the differences between reentry programs throughout the department and more specifically the comparison between the prerelease program at Lebanon Correctional Institution and the *reentry program at Chillicothe Correctional Institution*. The prerelease program includes mandatory programming as decided by Central Office, while the reentry program is voluntary and customized to the inmate. Staff added that while the CCI reentry program was not in existence at LeCI, *they do have the mandatory prerelease*

programming, as well as, non-reentry approved programs that inmates find beneficial. Positive aspects of the reentry program at CCI were discussed, as well as the possible benefits of instituting such a program at each institution in the department.

Community involvement was also a major topic of discussion, including information on various institutional programs. Discussion included the *merits of institution staff initiating contact with and going to members and groups in the community to get them involved. The positive aspects of publishing articles in the community about activities in the institutions* were noted. Staff discussed two unique programs, the first being the *Inside Out Program. This program was explained as an opportunity for inmates and college students to physically take classes in the same setting.* College students from Xavier University actually come into the institution and participate in a classroom setting with inmates. Additional details regarding this program can be found later in this report. The second program was the *Life Bible Institute*, which staff explained was made possible by the services provided by Solid Rock Church. Lastly, the staff discussed the *Kairos prison ministry program*, which is also in existence at other institutions. Staff stated that *this program is successfully bringing volunteers in from the outside and engaging inmates in a program that they greatly enjoy.*

In addition to the topics of overcrowding and programming, CIIC and institutional staff discussed their knowledge of staff and inmate concerns. According to staff, there were *no burning issues causing great concern.* In contrast, the *Warden has actually developed incentives for staff working on holidays or those staff with exemplary attendance.* Some of these incentives were said to include holiday parties, gift cards and snacks. Staff also stated that the *Warden works directly with his staff even occasionally participating in cell searches.* It was noted that he usually *makes rounds to each unit once a week including the OPI Tag Shop.*

Regarding inmate complaints, staff stated that CIIC staff might hear complaints about the size of legal services and perhaps the smoking ban. While it was stated that *inmates are not complaining much about smoking in cells, staff are aware it is happening and are doing what they can to address each instance immediately with the appropriate consequences.* It was said that there is *no waiting list for the non-smoking unit however there was a waiting list to leave.* Staff explained that some inmates are using that unit simply to get cell moves or new cellies, and then when they are not happy with their new arrangement simply state that they are now smokers and need to be moved again. Staff commented that it seems that the department is simply not winning the battle in regards to the smoking ban.

Lastly, staff discussed a number of *institutional improvements.* First, staff explained that *netting had been installed in the food service area to prevent birds from entering.* CIIC staff were pleased to hear of this improvement as they observed a flock of birds during the prior inspection. (The success of the method was observed later in the inspection). In addition to the netting, it was stated that the *old food service preparation area is going to be replaced by a new area within the next two years.* Staff also explained that they *hope to replace the dining room floor* when money becomes available. In addition to those

improvements, the *windows on the south side blocks have been replaced and new screens have been installed. This is said to prevent trash throwing from windows, as well as, preventing birds from entering the institution.* (This was verified later on observation). *Although all of the windows were to be replaced, unfortunately that was not possible due to budgetary reasons and only the south end windows were complete, leaving the north end to be replaced when resources become available.*

After concluding the pre-inspection discussion, the CIIC and institutional staff began an inspection of the facility grounds. *The floor in the main corridor was clean. The white main corridor ceiling and walls were in excellent condition looking almost new, yet staff relayed that they are as old as the institution.* Crash gates were observed as an extra security barrier between entry and cellblocks. In addition, the CIIC passed other crash grates later through corridors that were open. Presumably they exist as a precaution, if needed.

VISITATION

On the way to the first housing unit, the CIIC observed the visiting room off of the main north corridor. The wall was lined with vending machines and there was an officer present in that area. Staff reported that visits are by appointment and there have been *no reports received regarding problems of visitors making appointments.* The visiting area has a seating capacity for approximately 200 people. The visiting yard, which is open when weather permits, can accommodate nearly 168 additional visitors and inmates.

According to the inmate handbook, it is the *policy of the institution to encourage inmates to establish, develop and maintain relationships* with family, friends and others in the community who may make a positive contribution to the social growth and well being of the inmate, both during their confinement and following their release.

All inmates, with the exception of those who are in orientation, are eligible for *two visits per month, one visit in a week from each person on their approved visiting list.* Inmate family members traveling a distance in *excess of 200 miles will, upon their request, be permitted a double visit session* on the day of their visit, which will constitute their two visits for the month.

The inmate handbook also states in detail various other policies and procedures for visitation such as approved visitor's list and applications, special visits and restrictions for those inmates under merit status, security control, disciplinary control and/or local control.

SEGREGATION

The first area visited during the inspection was the segregation area. The CIIC passed one of the isolation blocks identified as L-1. It was explained that this area is reserved for extremely assaultive and disruptive inmates.

CIIC staff then entered R-Block, which is an *isolation/segregation area*. Institutional staff relayed that this area includes *extreme mental health cases because of the crisis cells, which are located in this block*. Staff stated that this institution has a total of six crisis cells. There is an additional one in the infirmary that can be used if absolutely necessary, but staff relayed that it is not the most desirable cell to use for crisis/safe cell. The status predominately housed on the block was either security control or local control. According to staff *15-20% of the segregation inmates are on the Mental Health Caseload*.

One of the positive aspects noted was a sign posted in the block, stating that “*R Block Porters must wear gloves and hairnets when passing out food trays.*” CIIC observed the mop and sink room as well as a *clean shower area*. There are two shower areas, one on the upper range and one on the lower. The one on the lower range was *clean for the most part*. However, it was evident that someone had just received a hair cut in that area. Some of the toilets in the area had rusty orange stains. Staff explained that this is due to iron in the water.

The count on the day of the inspection was 56 inmates. *The overall atmosphere was very quiet* in comparison to segregation units in other institutions, which are often quite noisy. Inmates seemed content and there was *no tension present in the area*. Staff relayed that inmates clean their own cells and have the opportunity to do so at least once a week. CIIC staff observed the inside of some cells. The beds contain a one-piece royal blue, leather-like vinyl mattress with an elevated end to eliminate the need for a pillow. Right outside of each occupied cell was a clipboard with the “*Individual Segregation Record Sheet*” *completed*. The logs are used to ensure that inmates in these cells receive the required contacts and services. The logs appeared to be *completed on a regular basis*. These sheets can also be used to notify staff of other restrictions for the inmate. In one instance, a sign stated that the inmate was required to have *no contact recreation and was to shower alone*. Staff stated that notices such as this may be used for the inmate’s own protection. According to staff, *range checks are conducted every 30 minutes* at which time an officer looks into each cell to check on the inmate.

There were also *empty cells in this area, which were found to be very clean*. This is a significant sign of *porter attentiveness to his duties and excellent supervision by staff to ensure porters clean the cells when they are vacated*.

One inmate was housed in segregation because he was reportedly *mistakenly sent to the Correctional Camp*. It was explained that even though the inmate was a level one (minimum security), that did not mean he was necessarily appropriate for the camp. Since it was determined that he *did not meet their criteria*, he was awaiting transfer in segregation, which could take a significant amount of time. Reportedly, his transfer had been approved nearly two weeks prior to the inspection, but he must wait for a bed to become available. *It is recommended that the assessment of the extent to which a candidate meets the criteria for placement at the camp be completed prior to the transfer to prevent these unfortunate incidents, which are surely troublesome to the inmate and his visitors, and which expends staff time and travel costs.*

One inmate alleged that the institution has a new practice, which was causing concern. Reportedly, when an inmate is taken to segregation, the inmate must send all property home or have all of it destroyed. As a result, when an inmate left segregation, he reportedly had nothing. One concern was that an inmate who may need to seek safety in segregation pending a PC investigation, may actually hesitate to contact staff with the safety issue due to the expectation that he will lose all of his property.

An inquiry was made on this subject on the day following the inspection. On January 30, 2008, the Deputy Warden of Operations responded with helpful information. There was no indication that there is a new practice in the handling of property for those placed in segregation. It was noted that Administrative Rule 5120-9-33 on Packages and Property Restrictions, does not clearly address the disposal and storage of perishable commissary items, but allows for the discretion of the Warden as the Director's designee. In regard to the property room, it is an institutional *policy at Lebanon Correctional Institution to not store perishable items in the vault*. When inmates are placed in a special management unit, they are given the option of mailing *perishable items* home or having them destroyed. There are several reasons why LeCI does not store perishable items: liability, health and sanitation, and space issues. It was noted that *food must be properly stored and there is a potential risk of pests and rodents attempting to invade the packages. There is also a potential of food spoilage, which if consumed, could cause health issues. Further, the availability of space for storage of inmate property is limited*. It was noted that LeCI excludes commissary from the current standard of the limit of 2.4 cubic feet on inmate property in accord with the above referenced Administrative Rule.

It should be noted that the inmate who relayed the concern clearly was not just referring to perishable items, but to alleged new practices to mail *all* property home, or to have it destroyed. Based on the response to the inquiry, the concerns are unwarranted. However, if inmates mistakenly believe the loss of all property is the consequence for segregation placement, there still could be *negative consequences from the misinformation*.

While in the segregation area, the outside of A block was observed, including the amount of trash that inmates had thrown from their windows. *This is one of the areas in which the windows have not been replaced. There was a large amount of trash that had accumulated in just the last two days*. Staff reported that sometimes inmates simply throw their trash out of the window because they do not want to walk to the trashcan on their range. Inmates also throw contraband from the windows. On the day of the inspection there was a *significant accumulation of trash and contraband due to the assembly of the Strategic Response Team in the institution's parking lot. Staff explained that inmates assumed that the team was preparing to conduct a shakedown and tried to get rid of any contraband ranging from weapons to pornography*. However, the team was simply assembling for a shakedown at the nearby Warren Correctional Institution. According to staff, the trash had been *inspected immediately for contraband and the remaining trash is picked up regularly*.

The last area viewed during the inspection was the indoor and outdoor recreation areas. The indoor area consists of small, fenced in cubicles or cages with one piece of exercise

equipment in each. Stairs lead down to the outdoor recreation area where inmates are allowed access five hours per week. The outdoor recreation area is caged and had pull-up and sit-up benches.

FOOD SERVICE

The food preparation area as well as the serving line and dining halls were observed. There are three dining rooms with a capacity of 200 inmates. According to the inmate handbook, the dining room typically serves about 600 meals to inmates everyday. Staff reported that *blocks are rotated every meal so that no block is always last to eat*. It was also relayed that *only the honor block and block of the month eat first. The inmate servers were wearing hats and gloves and they are responsible for serving meals to the food lines of the three dining halls. The physical layout is unique in that the inmate servers are in one long common area, but walls that are open near the ceiling separate the three dining halls. On the prior inspection, a flock of birds flew back and forth through the opening. However, not one was seen during this inspection, and the opening is now covered with netting.*

The dishwasher room was observed in the food service area. A significant amount of water was on the floor, but an inmate was using a broom to sweep the water towards the drain. *A large area of peeling paint was hanging from the ceiling over the dishwasher, and a cockroach was seen in that same basic area.* It was explained that the area would be completely redone within the next two years. *However, the standing water and peeling paint, are regarded as matters that should be addressed in a more immediate fashion.*

One of the positive observations was that the inmate workers were quite busy and seemed conscientious about their tasks. Staff reported that *the number of food service workers fluctuates per shift/meal to reduce idleness.* Staff stated that they can usually tell how many workers they will need based on the popularity of the meal. Some CIIC staff observed *the morale of the food service workers to be quite low. It is suggested that consideration be given to establishing an incentive program for food service workers such as the one established at Ross Correctional Institution. Perhaps instituting a program such as this would improve the overall morale, as well as improve the quality and efficiency of work done in the food service area. This idea was discussed with institutional staff during the exit meeting and they seemed interested in learning more about the RCI program.*

In the food preparation area of the kitchen, one inmate food service worker was asked what he thinks of the food served at LECI. He responded that they serve the *“same thing every other day.”* *Several other inmates stated that they were rarely served what was on the menu.* The issue was further discussed with the food service staff. The menu to be used by the institutions from central office showed that *the menu for that day was to be a baked chicken quarter, sweet potatoes with apples, green beans, pears, wheat bread, milk and beverage, and vegetable (or vegetarian) nuggets.* Institutional staff relayed that they had no chicken, so they *substituted the chicken with turkey slices.*

Kosher Meals

Kosher meals were also discussed with the food services staff since it has been a growing area of complaint in communication from other prisons to the CIIC. Staff indicated that the *main entrée is ordered from an outside company*, and that a *Rabbi referred them to Chillicothe Correctional Institution for direction on how to accommodate kosher meals*. Other staff relayed that they received *information from Warren Correctional Institution*. Institutional staff reported that they have had from one to four Jewish inmates at a time and currently only have one inmate at LeCI receiving kosher meals. Staff relayed that based on the inmate's feedback, a greater variety is purchased so that the entrees can be alternated. Staff also noted that the *"chief complaint was substance," and now "we rotate and get variety."*

Food service staff relayed that they purchase *"My Own Meals" which were described as a shelf staple*. Although the entrees are kept in the freezer, staff noted that they could be stored on a shelf. It was relayed that the company producing these meals has been used for about six to eight months and is located in Chicago. Staff reported that they purchase 16 cases at a time, and each case contains 12 meals.

The kosher meals are stored in a plastic container in the freezer. Examples included Florentine Lasagna and Stew. Staff relayed that the entrees are provided for lunch and dinner, and range in price from a low of \$2.25 to a high of \$2.75. As for the rest of the meal, that is, the *side dishes*, staff relayed that *if the inmate wants bread, an inmate gets the bread out of the bag while wearing gloves*. Staff relayed that *breakfast is provided on the diet line*. *Reportedly, there is no written information on how to provide kosher meals, and no written information to detail how kosher meals are to be handled*. Staff relayed that one person handles the kosher sides and breakfast, but that staff person was busy at the time, so was not available for discussion. They also relayed that *they receive their guidelines from the Chaplain and Rabbi and network with other food service managers to obtain direction*.

There is a definite need for DRC Central Office staff to provide detailed written guidelines to educate the institution food service staff on kosher meals. DRC policy on Jewish Religious Services (72-REG-07) E. Dietary Requirements, only states that the Department will provide *"appropriate kosher-equivalent meals,"* but there is *no explanation or definition of "appropriate kosher-equivalent meals."* This was confirmed in June 2007 in a phone inquiry to the DRC Religious Services Administrator who relayed that there is *no DRC policy on kosher meals*. There was mutual interest and understanding of the importance and complexity of the topic, as well as the need for written guidelines for the institutions on the subject, so that wardens and food service staff can benefit by such direction. With nothing in writing, there is no assurance that appropriate kosher-equivalent meals are provided system-wide, let alone at specific institutions.

On July 9, 2008, CIIC staff provided information from the Aleph Institute to the DRC Religious Services Administrator on kosher procedures. Since 1981, the Aleph Institute

has provided services to assist chaplains and institutional staff in meeting the religious needs of Jewish men and women in their care. The Institute designed a handbook to assist prison chaplains and institutional staff. The sections pertaining to kosher food, including Levels of Observance, Jewish Religious Requirements, and Kosher Food, were provided to the DRC Religious Services Administrator, with the *hope that the information would help to develop a DRC policy with written procedures to provide definitions, requirements and guidance to the prisons, especially to the food services staff.*

According to the Institute's Handbook, there are three essential qualities of kosher food:

- *It must be derived from a religiously-acceptable source;*
- *It must be prepared and served in a religiously-acceptable way; and*
- *Meat and dairy products may not be mixed.*

To further explain the complexity of the requirements, a portion of the kosher food section from the Institute's Handbook is provided below:

All agricultural products (whole fruits and vegetables are kosher. Cut fruits and vegetables must be prepared with kosher utensils. Only certain Biblically-defined animals are kosher (e.g., no pork products or shellfish); only certain portions of those animals may be consumed. Kosher land animals generally are limited to ruminants with split hooves (generally cows, sheep, goat and deer), and poultry (generally, chicken, turkey, duck, goose and pigeon). Only fish with scales and fins are kosher. Accordingly, no shellfish are kosher. Shark, eel, catfish and whale are also forbidden. Dairy products must be derived from kosher animals. Accordingly, milk products from a pig, camel or other non-kosher animal are not kosher. Many observant Jews will not consume milk and dairy products unless they have a high level of Rabbinical supervision during processing ("Cholov Yisroel"). Eggs should be examined before using them in the preparation of food, as any blood spots found in them renders the eggs non-kosher. C.J.L.ch.46-1. Some observant Jews only eat bread made by Jews. In some communities, they do buy bread of a non-Jewish baker where the ingredients are certified as kosher. C.J.L.ch 28-1.

Animals must be slaughtered in a religiously-mandated humane way by skilled and learned Jews. Meats must be soaked and salted in a religiously-mandated way observed by skilled and learned people. Care must always be taken that kosher foods are prepared and served with appropriate utensils (e.g., utensils that have not been used for non-kosher foods or washed together with non-kosher utensils, and are not used both for meat and dairy products, see below). Glass and metal utensils bought for culinary purposes, even when new, may not be used before they are immersed in a mikvah (ritual bath) and the proper benediction made. C.J.L.ch.37-1. In order to be fit for ritual drinking, kosher wine must be certified kosher and "Mevushal" (cooked) C.J.L.ch.47-3.

Meat and dairy products may be cooked or eaten together, C.J.L.ch.46-5, nor may a Jew derive any benefit from such mixed foods, id. Dishes, cutlery or cooking utensils used for milk cannot be used for meat, and vice versa. Accordingly, two separate sets of cooking utensils, dishes and cutlery are required: one for meat products and one for dairy foods. Id.-8. It is customary to mark all utensils used for dairy foods, so that they might not be interchanged with those used for meat. C.J.L.ch.46-8.

Even a very small amount of meat or dairy (or their derivatives) in a product renders that product "meat" or "dairy."

Observant Jews will not eat meat at the same table at which dairy products are simultaneously consumed, or vice versa. C.J.L.ch.46-6. A loaf of bread used at a dairy meal may not be consumed at a later meat meal, or vice versa. C.J.L.c.h.46-7.

Kitchen and food service administrators should be made aware that, with respect to meal schedules, observant Jews generally will have to wait a certain period of time after consuming

meat before they will eat dairy products. The waiting period usually is determined by tradition. Jews who hail from certain Eastern European countries may wait as long as six (6) hours after eating meat products before eating, or drinking dairy products. C.J.L.ch.46.9. Other traditions dictate shorter waiting periods, e.g., three hours under German tradition. Accordingly, a late meat lunch may prevent a Jewish resident from eating a dairy dinner. Generally, only a short waiting period is required after eating dairy products before meat products may be consumed. Id.-11 (generally ½ hour; some wait as long as one hour). However, one who eats hard cheese is required to wait the same amount of time before eating meat as if he had eaten meat and now wanted to eat dairy.

Everything kosher that does not fall under the categories of meat or dairy is called “pareve” (“neutral”). Included are eggs, kosher fish and agricultural products (fruits and vegetables). Pareve products may be eaten with either meat or dairy products, with one exception: fish may not be mixed with meat in a single dish.

It is forbidden to eat fish together with meat. Observant Jews will not even roast meat and bake fish at the same time in a small oven, unless either one or the other is covered. There is no prohibition against roasting the two together in separate utensils in a large oven. C.J.L.ch.23-1.

The Institute’s Handbook further describes “Pareve” Products, “Non-Kosher” Foods, discusses ingredients that can never be Kosher, those requiring Rabbinical supervision, and foods that are not Kosher for Passover.

ACA Standard 4-4319 states, “Written policy, procedure, and practice provide for special diets for inmates whose religious beliefs require the adherence to religious dietary laws.” Their comment states, “Religious diets should be approved by the chaplain. Religious diet prescriptions should be specific and complete, furnished in writing to the food service manager, and rewritten monthly. Special diets should be kept as simple as possible, and should conform as closely as possible to the foods served other inmates.

Expectations by the British Inspectorate, which complies with international human rights and standards, states, “Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.” One of the related expectations includes, “Religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving are fully observed and communicated to prisoners.” Their inspection of this expectation includes:

- *Observation: Check menus/records for past month, and use of e.g. halal meat. Check halal certificates are displayed where prisoners can see them. Check use of appropriate serving utensils to avoid cross-contamination.*
- *Documentation: Check for impact assessment.*
- *Staff: Ask kitchen staff about special arrangements for different types of food, and special dietary requirements for e.g...specific religions...*
- *Prisoners: Ask prisoners who specify special diets if they have confidence in the preparation and content of specialist meals.*

According to information received in September 2007 from Marion Correctional Institution staff, several years ago, the Food Service Manager observed that kosher meals were expensive to the Food Service operation, and included purchasing pre-packaged

kosher meals. After discussing other options with the Jewish offenders and Rabbi, an area within the kitchen was provided for the Jewish offenders to prepare kosher food. Food items are now purchased that are kosher and also follow the ODRC diet menu. The Jewish inmates prepare the kosher food for the rest of the Jewish inmates. The Jewish inmates take responsibility to fully prepare nutritionally correct meals under the supervision of the Food Service staff. The Jewish inmates eat at the same time as other offenders at MCI but receive their food from a separate area adjacent to where the rest of the inmate population receives their meals. When possible, the Jewish inmates eat off of the regular inmate serving line if the items being served are kosher. MCI staff relayed that this practice has not only satisfied the Jewish population, but has also reduced MCI Kosher meal costs by .667%. MCI staff noted that this is their current practice, and is not a written policy and procedure.

Information dated July 3, 2007 from CCI on their Kosher meals procedure was received by CIIC through an inquiry. They are using Cohen's assorted kosher meals for lunch and dinner. They come in a variety pack, which consists of roast chicken, roast turkey, spaghetti with meatballs, salisbury steak, pot roast, and fillet of sole. Each of the entrees comes with a vegetable and another side item. They add four slices of individually wrapped bread, three each of margarine packets, one piece of fresh fruit, or a muffin and salad with dressing, as well as assorted individually packaged fruit juices. For breakfast, they order frozen pancakes, waffles, and French toast. Individually packaged dry cereal, hard boiled eggs, and peanut butter packets if they are marked as Kosher. Otherwise, they serve canned peanut butter and individual packets of assorted jelly. When waffles and French toast are served, they provide individually packaged syrup and take the wrapped bread out. They rotate the meals when possible, and serve individual variety packs of oatmeal.

At Lake Erie Correctional Institution, as described by the Inspector in his response to an inmate's grievance, the inmate is given a Kosher entrée along with bread, any vegetable sides, and fruit that is on the menu. The inmate commented in his communication to CIIC, "I cannot believe they think a true Kosher meal includes line food. I explained that veg, fruit & other items have been cooked or stored in the same pans that have held pork products."

In conclusion, it is recommended that the DRC central office staff assist the institutions in their good faith effort to provide a true Kosher meal or appropriate Kosher equivalent meal. There appears to be a wide variety of practices and interpretations in place from institution to institution. It would be an excellent opportunity to standardize practices based on the best in place that is not only most cost effective, but also meets mandatory religious requirements.

HOUSING UNITS

As stated in the inmate handbook, cell assignments are made on arrival at the facility. Staff relayed that *each group of unit staff have 500-600 inmates assigned to their unit.* At LeCI, requests for cell transfers must be made through the unit staff, usually the inmate's Correctional Counselor (Sergeant). When requesting placement in the Merit Block or D

block, eligible inmates must send a kite to the Unit Manager who will then place the inmate's name on the waiting list. The Merit Block or D block is one of several housing units visited during the inspection. According to staff, inmates must remain *six months ticket-free to be placed on the waiting list for the Merit Block or D block*. On the day of the inspection, there were 163 inmates in the block spread over three *ranges, which were very clean and quiet*. This block is one in which there are still a *number of single cells that are awarded on the basis of seniority*. Staff indicated that *racial balance in the block is maintained. As a result, the wait for an African American to be placed on this unit is under a year and the wait for a Caucasian is approximately three years*. There are several perks to inmates living in this block, some of which include use of a microwave, free use of the dayroom, and opportunities for participation in community service programs such as Circle Tail.

The non-smoking unit was also visited and was found to be very clean as well. Staff were eager to respond that they have several good porters in the unit, to which the cleanliness of the unit was attributed. One of the cells was entered, which was not only clean, but the bed was made. One cell had the window open, enabling fresh air to circulate in the block. One inmate responded that inmates can get cleaning materials easily. He also stated that he was somewhat new to the block and was pleased that he had more privacy, and the privilege of "cell visits" where inmates are allowed to go to other inmate's cells in that area. There is also a microwave in this area, which is viewed by the inmates as quite a privilege, as not all units in this institution apparently have a microwave.

It was alleged that *no area of the institution is equipped with a fire suppression system in the cells/units*. Some units also relayed that there was a *yellow film on the water, specifically the cold water, since it did not travel through the boiler*.

In the back area of one block, where unit offices are located, CIIC viewed from the outside window, the unit that has the newer windows. There was *no outside trash, except for what little had blown over on the yard. It showed that the newer windows are effective in preventing inmates from throwing trash out the windows. They are attractive in appearance, and they can still be opened from the top.*

PROGRAMMING/ACTIVITIES

The following programs were listed on the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction website for Lebanon Correctional Institution:

Comprehensive Sex Offender Program

The program lasts approximately 18 months and includes all departmental required components. Prior to successful completion, participants must meet certain minimal standards, the final of which is completion of a written relapse prevention plan that has been approved by program staff. Additional requirements include the development of an autobiography, finalization of all homework assignments, and a minimum of 75 percent

attendance. A working understanding of program concepts includes offender typology, offense continuum, abuse cycle, thinking errors and risk factors.

Chaplains' Literacy Program

The Chaplains' Literacy Program is *unique in that it is conducted with the aid of community volunteers including a retired judge*. The tutors utilize the Laubach method of "one-on-one" teaching. Participation in this program is strictly voluntary.

Community Service

Community Service projects include:

Highway litter clean up for Ohio Department of Transportation
Flash cards for Crayons to Computers
Silkscreen projects for various organizations
Reading books on tape for schools

Specific Unit Programs

Specific Unit Program details were provided on the date of the inspection. This list is dated December 31, 2007.

Unit 1: From the Inside Out (Associates/Social Interaction Domain Core Program)

This program addresses relationship issues and decisions that inmates make about how those relationships can affect their behavior and thinking. *Participants learn how to build rewarding and useful relationships and how to evaluate and identify destructive ones.*

Unit 2: Criminal Thinking Errors

Criminal Thinking Errors is a 10 to 12 session program that focuses on *identifying criminal thought patterns* used by the individual inmate, such as rationalization and minimizing. The program sessions *help inmates to identify the patterns that apply to them and to develop more productive thinking patterns.*

Unit 3: Restore Through Service Learning-Community Serv. Awareness Workshop

The workshop provides one to three sessions of training for inmates who will participate in various community service projects. The purpose of the program is to introduce inmates to the concept of *community service as a component of restorative justice*. Inmates also establish objectives they hope to attain through community service participation.

Responsible Family Life Skills Program (Marital/Family Domain Core Program)

The Responsible Family Life Skills Program is a multi-session, two phase program designed to teach *family planning and parenting* skills and knowledge. It covers topics including *communications, child development, self-esteem issues, family violence*, etc. The program is offered institution wide.

A Stitch in Time

This program is a combination of *community service activities (content depends on community requests) and restorative justice* elements. In addition to *giving back to the community by producing materials needed by community groups, inmates discuss various concepts including the impact of crime on the victim and the community*.

Unit 4: Criminal Thinking Errors

Criminal Thinking Errors is a 10 to 12 session program that focuses on *identifying criminal thought patterns* used by the individual inmate such as rationalization and minimizing. The program sessions help inmates to identify the patterns that apply to them and to develop more productive thinking patterns.

Unit 5: Cage Your Rage

Cage Your Rage is a program that uses videotaped presentations and individual workbooks, which aids inmates in understanding the *causes/sources of their anger and ways in which to manage that anger*. It is reported to be ACA accredited, and consists of six sessions, which are completed at the inmate's own pace.

Unit 6: Inside/Outside College Program (Education/Employment Domain)

The Inside/Outside College Program is one in which *10 minimum camp inmates and 10 Xavier University students participate in a joint class on Criminal Justice* that meet once weekly at the camp for 16 weeks. This provides an opportunity for an exchange of ideas and information about the criminal justice system from diverse points of view. The program is taught by Xavier University staff. College credit is awarded.

Criminal Thinking Errors (Attitude Domain Core Program)

Criminal Thinking Errors is a 10 to 12 session program that focuses on *identifying criminal thought patterns* used by the individual inmate such as rationalization, minimizing etc. The program sessions help inmates identify the patterns that apply to them and to develop more productive thinking patterns.

Circle Tails-Assistance and Shelter Dog Project

Circle Tails is a community service program in which *dogs from Circle Tails Inc. are socialized, housebroken and given obedience training. Eventually, some dogs will be trained to be assistance dogs for disabled individuals.* Inmates are the dog handlers working under the supervision of unit staff.

Music Association

The Music Association is an inmate group at the camp that meets regularly to practice instrumental music. The inmates then play at special camp functions, such as yard day, and for outside visitors from the community.

Other programs listed are:

- Interviewing Techniques
- Restorative Justice
- Community Resources: Community Functioning Domain Core Program
- Victim Awareness: Attitude Domain Core Program, and
- Miami Valley JAYCEES, which provides various activities designed to teach inmates leadership and business-related skills. Money raised from sales is used to provide gifts to needy families in the community.

All Correctional Counselors offer at least one recreation program a month in their assigned block. These include activities such as spades, hearts and other card tournaments, chess and checkers tournaments, and competitions such as fantasy football.

Additional Programming

Additional programming information dated March 19, 2007, was provided, which lists the following programs, not included on the above listings:

Employment/Education Domain

Release Preparation-Job interviewing, resume writing
Entrepreneurship Program by Greater Cincinnati Micro-enterprise Institute (run at Lebanon Correctional Camp)

Associates/Social Interactions

African Cultural Organization-Inmate Organization
Seventh Step Foundation-Inmate Organization
Stamp Club-Inmate Organization
American Red Cross Chapter

Substance Abuse

Mandatory Drug and Alcohol Education
Outpatient Counseling
Smoking Cessation, Smoking Awareness
Narcotics Anonymous, Alcoholics Anonymous, Twelve Step Counseling Group
Inmate Drug Testing

Community Functioning

Release Preparation-Community Resources, Mental Health Resources, Religious Resources

Personal/Emotional Functioning

Health and Wellness Through Walking, Medication Education, Mediation Group, Acculturation Group, Anger Management, Mental Health Support Group, Alternatives to Violence, Enhancing Self Awareness, Motivational Enhancement Group, Anxiety Management and Life Beyond.

Vietnam Veterans of America-Inmate Organization
KAIROS
Over 40 Exercise

Religious Services/Programming

The chapel at the Lebanon Correctional Institution is described as a house of prayer for all faiths. Protestant, Catholic, Islamic and Jewish services are offered. Faith Instructional Classes are also provided as counseling and various pastoral services. According to the inmate handbook there are *three full time Chaplains* in the Religious Service Department. Each inmate has access to his clergy person and the Chaplains of the institution. Staff also relayed that they have about *200 inmates who participate in the Catholic services, and 100 that are Protestant, of which approximately 40 are active participants.*

One instance of participation in religious services was viewed during the attendance of the general meal period. One inmate came to the table, bowed his head, and prayed, then introduced himself to the CIIC Director at the table. *This is the first time in the history of CIIC inspections that an inmate was observed praying before his meal. It is therefore regarded as quite significant.*

One of the unique religious programs is the *Life Bible Institute*. This program is designed to equip those who feel the call of God in their lives to minister the Gospel and who desire to further their education. According to information provided by staff, many bible colleges, seminaries and universities award *credit for Bible Institute work, and student achievement is recognized at a yearly graduation.*

MEDICAL SERVICES

According to the inmate handbook, in order to be seen during sick call, inmates must complete a *Health Services Request Form*, which may be obtained from the housing areas or infirmary. Once completed it is then to be placed in a white mailbox located inside the infirmary. *A nurse reads all requests and if the request is deemed to be an emergency, the inmate will be seen for sick call without delay. If the request is not considered to be an emergency, the inmate will be sent a pass at a later date.* It is also noted that *security staff are not involved in any manner in collecting Health Service Request forms.*

One inmate relayed during the inspection that he was *frustrated over not being able to see the Doctor.* The inmate stated that the doctor told him he did not need a pass to see medical staff, but an officer reportedly advised that medical staff are supposed to give him a pass. This appeared to be simply a case of miscommunication but the inmate was advised to document his concerns through use of the Inmate Grievance Procedure.

The Medical Services department was included in the inspection. There was also the opportunity to speak with various staff in the area. *The area was very clean with large examination rooms and a clean, well-organized medical records area. One inmate confined in the infirmary was listening to a radio. It was a reflection of positive changes that have been made in recent years. That is, staff relayed that they are trying to make the infirmary as close as possible to a general population area. In 2003 the DRC Health Care Review Team cited the system-wide problem of inmates not wanting to be confined in the infirmary because they viewed the restrictions as punishment. Clearly, even the small amenity of being able to listen to music on the radio can make a positive difference in the environment.*

Inmate porters were observed going in and out of rooms in the area.

Informational pamphlets on health-related subjects, STDs, smoking, etc. were accessible in the area.

In speaking with several medical staff, CIIC staff noted that during the last inspection at the Lebanon Correctional Institution, medical staff expressed concerns about the delays for inmates who needed to be seen by the OSU clinics. During this inspection, medical staff stated that *Fussell has addressed prior problems with delays. Further, they relayed that they now have a "Scheduler" on staff, and that all institutions have one. The position is termed a Technician/Scheduler. At LECI, they schedule from 200 to 250 inmates per month for specialty clinics.*

One of the infirmary cells housed an inmate who spoke to the CIIC Director and Warden when they stopped at his door. The inmate was in the infirmary temporarily due to the investigation of his report that he was sexually assaulted. *Staff relayed that policy is being followed to the letter.* The accused were in segregation pending outcome of the investigation, and the alleged victim was scheduled for a polygraph. It was explained that if he passes the polygraph, then the accused would be offered an opportunity to take a

polygraph. The Warden listened attentively to the inmate, and also asked questions in a non-judgmental manner. Based on what was communicated by the inmate, and in follow-up communication with staff, staff were *indeed taking his allegation seriously, following policy, and doing all they can to determine the truth. CIIC staff were impressed with the Warden's interaction with the inmate, as well as the actions of other staff regarding the inmate.*

DENTAL SERVICES

According to the inmate handbook, inmates can see a dentist by sending a kite to Dental Services or completing a Request for Health Services form. As also relayed in the discussion with dental staff, there are two dentists and *three months is normal for regular referrals.* The appointments for routine care are made on a first come, first served basis. *If the inmate feels that they have an emergency, such as bad toothache or abscess, they can sign up for sick call, let the nurse assess the problem, and it will be up to the Dental Department when they are able to see the inmate.*

CIIC staff spoke with an inmate during the lunch meal period who appeared to be having pain and difficulty eating because of it. He relayed that he has been waiting for months to see the dentist and was experiencing tooth pain, but he was scheduled to see the dentist that afternoon. The inmate's report was relayed to the dental staff in the discussion. It was verified that routine referrals can take several months. In this case, it is possible that the tooth pain had only recently occurred, and since the inmate knew that he would soon see the dentist, he did not alert the staff to his pain.

During the discussion with dental staff, it was relayed that if an inmate is in pain, he is seen by the next day. Staff also presented an Emergency Dental Log verifying prompt attention.

RECREATION

According to staff, the recreation area has *three officers per shift, but can have them overlap so that there are up to six officers.*

One inmate had complained that inmates do not get one hour of recreation, only 30 minutes. CIIC staff reviewed the recreation schedule, which showed that the *inmates get well over an hour of recreation a day.* In the discussion with recreation staff, it was explained that *inmates do in fact receive an hour of recreation. However, they may get it in two increments of 30 minutes each.*

On the day of the inspection, the inmates were using the gym for basketball. Staff relayed that *basketball is the most popular, based on its large participation compared with all other activities. A fairly large number of inmates were playing. They were playing hard and it was loud.* Staff relayed that they *have some injury incidents from the activities, but not a lot. There was no tension in the gym, and the staff person relayed that they are not preoccupied with fighting incidents; the inmates generally behave themselves.*

Outside yard recreation is also opened when weather permits. In this event, the institution is divided into two sides and each side is allowed yard recreation on a daily rotation.

The Band Room was also observed. It was reported that there are *15 bands at the institution. They schedule three groups per day, seven days per week. Staff relayed that one inmate serves as guitar instructor and another inmate is an excellent piano teacher.* Instruments include bass, guitar, piano, and keyboard. Staff also relayed that the Music Association raises money to purchase instruments.

As found in the inmate handbook, the recreation department also offers several other programs including among others, *movie videos, ping-pong, softball, handball, volleyball, kickball, horseshoes, shuffleboard, board games, flag football, "over 40" program, and dodge ball.*

CIIC was most impressed with the Recreation Administrator's apparent dedication, knowledge and pride in the Recreation Department.

OPI TAG SHOP

The OPI Tag Shop produces all the license plates in the state of Ohio. Staff reported that the shop could safely produce 24,000 license plates per day. *The area was well organized and clean with clear workspaces.* There were several workstations. *Inmates were observed wearing ear and eye protection.*

There were 112 inmates working in the area. However, *many had completed their quota and were waiting to be cleared to return to their cellblocks. Staff explained that there is currently not much work to perform because a new plate design will be introduced soon. Therefore, the volume of current plate production has been reduced. Staff reported that the new production line uses no harsh chemicals as did in the recent past. Staff also stated that all scrap metal is recycled.*

CIIC staff spoke with a number of the inmate workers. They were respectful and cordial. Most were seated in chairs, as indicated above, because they were done for the day and ready to leave. They indicated that they work from 6:30 am to 2:00 pm. Some expressed concern about the low inmate wages, and the increasing cost of items in the commissary. They acknowledged that OPI workers receive the highest wages of any other inmate.

As noted above, staff relayed that when they finish their quota for the day, they are done. Even though there was not much work for the day, the *Supervisor stated that the inmates would still be paid for a full day since the reduced production was not their fault, and therefore they should not be penalized.*

Other Vocational Opportunities

There are also several other employment/vocational opportunities for inmates. The following vocational information was gathered from the inmate handbook and the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction website:

Industries

Metal fabrication for institutional furnishing
License plate manufacturing
License plate validation sticker
Data entry
Printing shop

Vocational

Administrative secretarial service
Office system technology
Graphic Arts
Lithograph
Food production
Baking

General Work Areas

Automotive Tag Shop
Metal Furniture Shop
Carpenter Shop
Glazing
Recreation Department
Laundry
Clothing Issue
Food Service
Maintenance Crew
Janitorial Service
Paint Shop

Machine Shop
Electric Shop
Plumbing Shop
Department Barber Shop
Commissary
Library
Infirmary Janitorial Services
Validation Shop
ADEC Advanced Data Entry Center
Landscape Crew
Block Porter

EDUCATION

Several classes including GED and Pre-GED classes were observed. Institutional staff relayed that the institution had just lost a literacy teacher who retired. Staff stated that they have lost three teachers in all and are unable to hire replacements due to budgetary constraints. It was noted that there is one teacher at the Lebanon Correctional Camp.

Staff relayed that educational programs include Literacy, ABE, Pre-GED, GED and Wilmington College Classes. Staff explained that inmates must be within five years of their out date or parole eligibility date to be considered for college. In addition, inmates cannot have more than two RIB convictions in the past year. Approximately 60 inmates participate in the college program. There is a waiting list for vocational education and it is a priority for those inmates who are five years or less from their release. Therefore, inmates with the shortest amount of time remaining are often given priority for programming.

An inmate Porter in the school library explained that only students could check out books from the School Library. Staff reported that the creation of the school library came about

in response to reports that the regular library was difficult to access by inmates, due to the demand. It is noteworthy that the idea was internally suggested and implemented by staff, and was in fact an effective way to address the concern.

During the course of the inspection, some inmates expressed *concern about the availability of educational programs*. One inmate stated that he wants to attend college, but was told that he has *too much time*. Another inmate relayed that he wants to get into the GED program but was told he had *too much time* remaining on his sentence. He stated that he had been at Lebanon Correctional Institution for one year and there are reportedly “no programs” available to him right now. Another stated that the *wait list for programs is too long and that the education department had to drop over 100 inmates out of school programs due to teachers retiring and not being replaced.*

It is a serious concern that there are inmates highly motivated to earn a high school equivalency certificate, yet are reportedly excluded due to their sentence, or are otherwise placed on a waiting list that is reportedly long. It is understood that the severity of the recent budget cuts only make it more difficult than it already was for sufficient staffing to be provided to meet the programming needs, including educational programming. With the excellent concept of using volunteers to teach reading in the Chaplain’s Literacy Program, consideration should be given to the possibility of recruiting volunteers who could help tutor inmates who need and want to earn their GED. It would seem that educational staffing deserves high priority among programming staff, due to the fundamental, indisputable importance of education, and its relevance to gainful employment on release. However, programs are needed for those serving long sentences, too. It is important to allow access to such programs when the motivation is present. The availability of such self-improvement and personal achievement avenues can not only fill time in a positive way, impact conduct and adjustment in a positive way, but is also directly linked to the philosophy of reentry, to begin preparing for success on release from day one.

MAIN LIBRARY

The inmate handbook states that the library offers a wide variety of services to all inmates including: mysteries, science fiction, westerns, general fiction, and nonfiction. Reference books, telephone books on microfilm, newspapers and magazines and other publications on microfilm and microfiche are available in the library. Audio-visual items must be used in the reference department only.

In the visit to the library, *Administrative Rules and DRC Policies were found to be accessible for reference*, though a sign instructs inmates not to touch them. Rather, an inmate worker and the librarian explained that on request, they *provide the Administrative Rule or policy for the person to view in the library. They will also copy the Administrative Rule or policy at a rate of \$0.05 per page.*

The CIIC Memo is taped to a wooden countertop beside bookshelves in the back of the library. The memo provides contact information to those who wish to write the CIIC

about any matter pertaining to operations, conditions, programs or the grievance procedure. The librarian noted that they receive many inquiries about the CIIC. The inmate library worker knew exactly where the CIIC Memo was located. *Administrative staff requested that the library staff make and post laminated CIIC information in a more visible area. This was most appreciated.*

The library area includes access to six computers, which were added in February 2007. Inmates are able to do online legal research and obtain forms and documents from these computers. Some inmates in the area stated that a Central Office staff person removed some of the Administrative Rules because inmates now have access to them on the computer. However, the inmates felt that this presented a problem because some inmates do not understand how to use the computer.

One inmate was frustrated with reported limited access to the law library, which he relayed was limited to 27 hours per week. He stated that many inmates have legal obligations, and the time restrictions reportedly do not let them devote the required attention to their legal cases.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mental Health Services was the last area included in the inspection. According to information provided on site, the Mental Health Services Department provides outpatient mental health care to inmates including: Crisis Intervention, Individual Counseling/Psychotherapy, Group Mental Health Programming, Psychiatric Services and Sex Offender Programming. It is further noted that all inmates are screened upon arrival to the institution and services are provided on clinical assessment, not solely on the inmate's word. The Mental Health Services Department also provides evaluations to the Parole Board.

The overall impression of this area was good. It was quiet and appeared clean except for the inmate restroom. Staff noted that a porter would be through the area shortly to remedy that problem.

A discussion was held with institutional staff in the area. The Mental Health Administrator explained that he covers both the Lebanon Correctional Institution and Warren Correctional Institution, but his office is located at the Warren Correctional Institution. It was noted that a *plan is underway to move 25 of the inmates who, for mental health reasons, have been temporarily transferred on a frequent basis from Lebanon Correctional Institution to Warren Correctional Institution for placement in WCI's Residential Treatment Unit or Crisis Stabilization Unit. These inmates will benefit from having WCI as their parent institution, rather than experience the disruption of transfer to WCI to receive the needed level of mental health services. It is anticipated that staff will also benefit from the decision. CIIC staff were most pleased to learn of the plan, and applaud the implementation which has long been regarded as a more logical and cost effective approach which better serves the affected mentally ill and the DRC staff.*

Discussion included the reported reduction of the size of the Residential Treatment Unit at WCI, in light of what is expected to be an increasing number of RTU bed needs to correspond with the increasing prison population. Staff explained that the RTU is now contained in one pod as opposed to the two previous pods. This was reportedly done because there were empty beds in the RTU and the space was badly needed for additional general population housing. According to staff, the number of RTU beds have decreased from approximately 60 to about 49 inmates.

According to the ODRC Monthly Mental Health Caseload Snapshot dated December 2007, LeCI had a population of 2,505 inmates with a total mental health caseload of 410 inmates with 374 inmates on the psychiatric caseload. The data showed 180 inmates classified as C1 (seriously mentally ill), 194 inmates classified as C2 and 36 inmates classified as C3. The report also showed that there were 43 inmates on the mental health caseload in segregation.

Data gathered from the same report for Warren Correctional Institution, which is part of the mental health cluster with LeCI, shows that there were 248 inmates on the caseload, with 239 inmates on the psychiatric caseload (consisting of those classified as C1 and C2). That data showed an institution population of 1,403 inmates, with 145 inmates classified as C1, 94 inmates as C2 and nine inmates classified as C3. It also showed that there were 25 caseload inmates in segregation during the time the data was gathered.

**Table 4: ODRC Monthly Mental Health Caseload Snapshot
Lebanon Correctional Institution
December 2007**

Mental Health Classification	Number	Percent
C2	194	47 %
C1 (Seriously Mentally Ill)	180	44 %
C3	36	9 %
TOTAL	410	100 %

**Table 5: ODRC Monthly Mental Health Caseload Snapshot
Warren Correctional Institution
December 2007**

Mental Health Classification	Number	Percent
C1 (Seriously Mentally Ill)	145	58 %
C2	94	38 %
C3	9	4 %
TOTAL	248	100 %

According to staff, the numbers as of February 8, 2008, reflected a small decrease in caseload with 393 inmates total. Of those on the caseload, there were 176 inmates

classified as C1 (seriously mentally ill), 186 inmates classified as C2, and 28 inmates classified as C3. The data also showed that there were three mentally retarded inmates on the caseload as well.

**Table 6: Mental Health Caseload
Lebanon Correctional Institution
February 8, 2008**

Mental Health Classification	Number	Percent
C2	186	47 %
C1 (<i>Seriously Mentally Ill</i>)	176	45 %
C3	28	7 %
MR	3	1 %
TOTAL	393	100 %

Information on Mental Health Services staffing was received on February 8, 2008, which shows the following staffing breakdown:

	<u>Sex Offender Services</u>	<u>Vacancies</u>
1 Mental Health Manager		
1 Psychology Supervisor	1 Sex Offender Administrator	1 Psychology Assistant 2
1 Psychologist	1 Psychologist	1 Psychology Nurse
2 Social Workers	1 Psychology Assistant 2	1 Secretary
1 Psychology Assistant 2		
1 Psychology Nurse		
1 Secretary		

EXIT MEETING

As is the case with all inspections, CIIC ended the day with an exit session or closing, in which observations and reported concerns are summarized to ensure that the Warden is aware and to ensure his opportunity to respond or to look into such concerns. The improvements made to the facility since the last inspection, were highly praised. The facility staff were also complimented for their assistance and cooperation throughout the inspection.

CIIC staff also noted that, in spite of the increased population, no idleness was observed. Staff relayed that not all inmates have jobs, and providing activities especially in the evening hours is a challenge. However, programming helps to address the need. Again facility staff were commended on the observed improvements, especially in addressing the previous concern about the birds in the institution. It was noted that some inmates complained about roaches and mice in cells. Staff explained that as long as inmates keep commissary food in their cells, there will always be insects present. However, the institution does spray for roaches twice a month and staff report that the problem is a lot better than it used to be. In addition, staff reported that they try to be proactive about the trapping of mice, which are commonly found in rural areas.

According to information received on site, approximately 16% of the inmate population is on the Mental Health Caseload.

Also, about 18% of the inmate population is reported to be profiled as members of a Security Threat Group. In discussion with an inmate during the meal period, he explained that he had been transferred to Lebanon Correctional Institution from the Warren Correctional Institution due to serious problems with the Aryan Brotherhood. He relayed that he has had no such problems since his transfer to the Lebanon Correctional Institution. This was regarded as significant, because it is not uncommon for such problems to follow an inmate to the next institution, due to the close communication between gang members. Lebanon Correctional Institution staff seemed to credit their insistence on being in control, rather than allow any gang to be in control.

CIIC staff noted that the CIIC is receiving an increasing number of complaints from a number of prisons seeking racial cell separations, but no such complaints were received regarding the Lebanon Correctional Institution. Institutional staff relayed that *LECI does not grant racial cell separations. However, CIIC staff noted that historically, Lebanon Correctional Institution has been unique in that staff seemed to be more willing than some others to work with inmates who reported having problems with their cellies. It is believed that such responsiveness helps to prevent such conflicts from escalating to violence.*

CIIC staff relayed some of the complaints received while on site. One inmate alleged that officers retaliate against inmates for using the inmate grievance procedure, and that an officer in segregation allegedly attacked an inmate. Two inmates alleged that the “majority of staff do not respect you, talk to us bad, nasty.” Another inmate spoke about a verbal exchange that reportedly resulted in an officer throwing him up against the wall. Facility staff relayed that one of the officers noted in the above complaints was no longer working at the institution.

CIIC DATABASE: CONTACTS AND CONCERNS 1/1/07 to 1/14/08

The information below shows the number of contacts, and the types of concerns reflected by those who have communicated with the CIIC during the 127th General Assembly. From January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008. The CIIC documented 1,915 system-wide contacts and 7,127 concerns. *Of those, 74 or about four percent of the contacts were regarding Lebanon Correctional Institution, and 230 or three percent of the concerns were regarding Lebanon Correctional Institution. LeCI ranked 12th among contacts received and 11th among concerns received by institution.*

The greatest number of reported concerns fell into the category of “Force/Supervision.” The subcategories included in this section are included below in the Concern Code List. According to the CIIC database, *33 or 14% of the reported concerns relayed to the CIIC were regarding this category.*

The second highest number of reported concerns fell under the category “*Non-Grievable Matters*” with *26 concerns or 11%*. As noted below, this category contains the subcategories of RIB/Hearing Officer, APA, Court, Legislative action, Separate appeal process and Other.

The third highest number of documented concerns was *24 or 10% pertaining the Inmate Grievance Procedure*. This category includes subcategories Informal Complaint, Inspector and Chief Inspector.

**Table 7: Number of Contacts by Institution
From January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008**

INSTITUTION	CONTACTS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (SoCF)	326
Marion Correctional Institution (MCI)	131
North Central Correctional Institution (NCCI)	126
Warren Correctional Institution (WCI)	124
Mansfield Correctional Institution (ManCI)	88
Ohio State Penitentiary (OSP)	87
Grafton Correctional Institution (GCI)	86
Chillicothe Correctional Institution (CCI)	80
Lake Erie Correctional Institution (LaECI)	77
Pickaway Correctional Institution (PCI)	77
Ross Correctional Institution (RCI)	77
Lebanon Correctional Institution (LeCI)	74
Allen Correctional Institution (ACI)	69
London Correctional Institution (LoCI)	57
Madison Correctional Institution (MaCI)	50
Toledo Correctional Institution (ToCI)	47
Other	44
Noble Correctional Institution (NCI)	42
Richland Correctional Institution (RiCI)	34
Trumbull Correctional Institution (TCI)	33
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center (NEOCC)	28
Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW)	27
Hocking Correctional Facility (HCF)	25
Belmont Correctional Institution (BeCI)	20
Oakwood Correctional Facility (OCF)	18
Correctional Reception Center (CRC)	17
Lorain Correctional Institution (LorCI)	15
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility (NCCTF)	13
Southeastern Correctional Institution (SCI)	9
Corrections Medical Center (CMC)	4
Northeast Pre Release Center (NEPRC)	4
Dayton Correctional Institution (DCI)	3
Franklin Pre Release Center (FPRC)	3
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center (MEPRC)	0
TOTAL	1,915

**Table 8: Number of Concerns by Institution
From January 1, 2007 to January 14, 2008**

INSTITUTION	CONCERNS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (SoCF)	1304
North Central Correctional Institution (NCCI)	559
Marion Correctional Institution (MCI)	468
Warren Correctional Institution (WCI)	433
Ohio State Penitentiary (OSP)	350
Grafton Correctional Institution (GCI)	329
Pickaway Correctional Institution (PCI)	296
Mansfield Correctional Institution (ManCI)	282
Chillicothe Correctional Institution (CCI)	269
Allen Correctional Institution (ACI)	268
Lebanon Correctional Institution (LeCI)	230
Lake Erie Correctional Institution (LaECI)	227
Noble Correctional Institution (NCI)	215
Ross Correctional Institution (RCI)	214
London Correctional Institution (LoCI)	191
Madison Correctional Institution (MaCI)	175
Toledo Correctional Institution (ToCI)	161
Other	156
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center (NEOCC)	145
Trumbull Correctional Institution (TCI)	131
Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW)	104
Hocking Correctional Facility (HCF)	95
Richland Correctional Institution (RiCI)	88
Belmont Correctional Institution (BeCI)	83
Correctional Reception Center (CRC)	69
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility (NCCTF)	69
Lorain Correctional Institution (LorCI)	68
Oakwood Correctional Facility (OCF)	68
Corrections Medical Center (CMC)	31
Southeastern Correctional Institution (SCI)	26
Northeast Pre Release Center (NEPRC)	11
Franklin Pre Release Center (FPRC)	7
Dayton Correctional Institution (DCI)	5
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center (MEPRC)	0
TOTAL	7127

CIIC DATABASE: CONCERN CODE LIST

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

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

I. INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

Health Care

- Access/Delay in receiving medical care
- Improper/inadequate medical care
- Delay/denial of medication
- Medical records
- Eye glasses
- Forced medical testing
- Medical transfer
- Prosthetic device
- Medical co-pay
- Medical restriction
- Medical aide/device
- Other

Dental Care

- Access/delay in receiving dental care
- Improper/inadequate dental care
- Delay/denial of dentures
- Dental co-pay
- Other

Psychological/Psychiatric

- Denial/inadequate treatment
- Forced treatment
- RTU assignment
- Psychiatric medication
- Psych co-pay
- Mental health files
- Other

Safety and Sanitation

- Fire safety measures
- Dirty living quarters/work areas
- Cleaning supplies
- Vermin
- Unsafe living area
- Smoking/Non-smoking
- Unsafe work areas
- Unsafe work practices
- Handicapped facilities
- Air-water quality
- Other

Facilities Maintenance

- Toilets
- Sewers
- Showers or sinks
- Water temperature
- Painting/repair
- Windows
- Privacy screens
- Other
- Building temperature
- Lighting
- Ventilation
- Ceilings

Food Services

- Food temperature
- Food not properly prepared
- Poor quality
- Deviation from menu
- Inadequate substitute
- Foreign object in food
- Food portions
- Medical diet
- Religious diet
- Unsanitary cooking conditions
- Denial
- Other

Laundry/Quartermaster (state clothing/bedding)

- Clothing lost/ not returned
- Clothing damaged
- Improperly charged for damaged clothing
- Received soiled/damaged linen
- Denied exchange
- Does not fit
- Refusal to alter/repair clothing
- Denied item
- Other

Commissary

- Charged for item not received
- Denied commissary privileges
- Inadequate selection
- Insufficient quantities
- Pricing
- Poor quality
- Exchange/refund
- Warranty
- Other

Inmate Account

- Funds lost/not posted
- Funds improperly refused
- Account balance
- State pay
- Court ordered collection (AR 5120-5-03)
- Other

Personal Property

- Lost, damaged, confiscated by staff
- Stolen or damaged by inmate
- Denied permission to receive/possess
- Other

II. INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS**Education/Vocational Training**

- Educational programs
- Vocational programs
- Other

Inmate Groups

- Denial of permission to start
- Staff interference
- Other

Job Assignments

- Job assignment
- Job removal
- Preferential treatment
- Racial balance
- Evaluations
- Other

Library

- Library materials
- Library hours
- Other

Recovery Services

- Recovery services programs
- Earned credit
- Other

Recreation

- Recreation facilities/equipment
- Selection of activities
- Recreation hours
- Other

Religious Services

- Prevented from worship
- Religious materials
- Services for particular faith
- Other

III. COMMUNICATIONS**Mail/Package**

- Delay/failure in delivery
- Delay/failure in sending
- Publication screening
- Handling of legal mail
- Handling of packages
- Damaged or missing
- Denial
- Postage charges
- Other

Visitation

- Visitor not approved/removed from list
- Visitor denied access
- Visit cut short
- Hours
- Rules
- Special visit
- Other

Telephone

- Inadequate access
- Denial of phone privileges
- Other

IV. ADMINISTRATION**Records**

- Good time credit
- Jail time credit
- Inaccurate calculation
- Release of information
- Earned credit
- Other

Legal Services

- Law library hours
- Legal reference materials
- Legal assistance
- Typewriters
- Legal Kit
- Copy services
- Notary services
- Legal service in special management
- Access to legal property
- Other

V. STAFF/INMATE RELATIONS

Force/Supervision

- Use of force with no report
- Abusive language
- Racial or ethnic slurs
- Conduct report for no reason
- Intimidation/threats
- Retaliation for filing grievance
- Retaliation for filing lawsuit
- Retaliation for voicing complaints
- Privacy violations
- Other

Discrimination

- Programs
- Jobs
- Benefits
- Disciplinary action
- Transfer
- Other

Staff Accountability

- Access to staff
- Failure to perform job duties
- Failure to respond to communication
- Failure to follow policies
- Other

VI. CUSTODY AND HOUSING STATUS

Security Classification

- Instrument overdue
- Instrument incorrect
- Instrument overridden
- Procedural issues
- Other

Institution Assignment

- Transfer or denial
- Other

Housing Assignment

- Unit assignment
- Cell/bed assignment
- Racial bunching
- Other

Special Management Housing

- Placement
- Release
- Privileges
- Other

Protective Control

- Placement
- Release
- Privileges
- Other

VII. INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

- Informal Complaint
- Inspector
- Chief Inspector

VIII. NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS

- RIB/Hearing Officer
- APA
- Court
- Legislative action
- Separate appeal process
- Other

**TABLE 9: TYPE OF CONCERN LOGGED FOR ALL INSTITUTIONS
FROM JANUARY 1, 2007 TO JANUARY 14, 2008**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	1040
Staff Accountability	843
Health Care	742
Inmate Grievance Procedure	692
Non-Grievable Matters	490
Institution Assignment	277
Other	255
Protective Control	224
Safety and Sanitation	221
Personal Property	219
Special Management Housing	199
Facilities Maintenance	199
Food Services	197
Discrimination	161
Mail/Packages	118
Security Classification	116
Psychological/Psychiatric	112
Legal Services	110
Housing Assignment	106
Inmate Account	106
Job Assignment	101
Visiting	99
Commissary	96
Education/Vocational Training	73
Laundry/Quartermaster	59
Recreation	57
Library	37
Dental Care	36
Records	34
Religious Services	33
Recovery Services	28
Telephone	28
Inmate Groups	19
TOTAL	7127

**TABLE 10: LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
TYPE OF CONCERNS LOGGED
FROM JANUARY 1, 2007 TO JANUARY 14, 2008**

CONCERNS	# of CONCERNS
Force/Supervision	33
Non-Grievable Matters	26
Inmate Grievance Procedure	24
Health Care	19
Staff Accountability	18
Special Management Housing	16
Other	11
Housing Assignment	9
Job Assignment	9
Institution Assignment	8
Personal Property	8
Security Classification	8
Legal Services	7
Protective Control	5
Inmate Account	4
Library	4
Safety and Sanitation	4
Commissary	3
Food Services	3
Mail/Packages	3
Psychological/Psychiatric	3
Education/Vocational Training	1
Facilities Maintenance	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	1
Telephone	1
Visiting	1
<i>Dental Care</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Discrimination</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Inmate Groups</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Records</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Recovery Services</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Recreation</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Religious Services</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	230

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Two questionnaires were developed by CIIC for use on 2007-2008 inspections. One of the questionnaires 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. The purpose of gathering information on the extent to which Ohio correctional institutions are similar or different from selected sections of Expectations is twofold: To identify possible areas in need of improvement, and to identify possible means of addressing reported areas of concern.

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

To avoid burdening any one staff person at the facility with the task of responding to the entire questionnaire, sections and subsections identified by topics were separated and stapled, ranging from one to three pages each. The Warden could choose to give each section or subsection to a different staff person who is knowledgeable in the particular area. Very brief responses, such as “yes”, “no” and/or explanation, indicating the extent to which the facility’s practices are similar or different from Expectations, were requested. Completed questionnaires were requested to be returned to the CIIC office within ten days of the inspection.

ADULT EXPECTATIONS

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

- **Safety**
- **Respect**
- **Purposeful activity and**
- **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 has 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 Clothing and Possessions Hygiene Staff – Prisoner Relationships
Duty of Care:	Complaint/Grievance Procedure Bullying and Violence Reduction Self-Harm and Suicide
Activities:	Learning and Skills and Work Activities Library
Good Order:	Security and Rules Rules
Services:	Food Services

NOTABLE RESPONSES TO EXPECTATIONS

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

Environment and Relationships: Residential Units

- There are no *cell sharing risk assessments*.
- Older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds are not given priority for *lower bunks*.
- There is no system whereby nominated *volunteer prisoners on each unit are trained to help less able prisoners* and are paid for the work.
- All prisoners do not have access to an *in-cell emergency call button/bell* that works and is responded to within five minutes.

Clothing and Possessions

- Prisoners do *not have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs*. The inmates do *not have laundry facilities to wash their own clothes*, so they need additional clothing to be able to wear each day.
- Older prisoners are *not provided with additional clothing and bedding* if required without the need for medical permission. Each inmate receives a certain amount of clothes regardless of age or other issues.
- Inmates do *not have access to laundry/exchange facilities outside the weekly rotation*.

Hygiene

- Prisoners do *not have ready access* to both communal and in-cell toilets and showers. The staff respondent relayed that only toilets are in the cell.
- Prisoners are *not able to shower during the day*.

Staff-Prisoner Relationships

- Staff do *not routinely knock* before entering cells. It is not required.

DUTY OF CARE: Complaint/Grievance Procedure

- Information about the grievance procedure is *not reinforced through notices and posters in English and other languages and they are not displayed across the prison*. There are *no posters in prominent places in 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*. However, it is available in the library and the inmate manual. Plus, all incoming inmates are given a pamphlet about the grievance procedure. The response was “*No*” to the question, “*Is information on the units/blocks always displayed and do prisoners understand it?*” When asked for the procedures for blind prisoners, the response was, “They can contact the Inspector’s Office for assistance.”
- As to whether forms and at least one kite box are on each block, the staff respondent relayed that the forms are available, but the kite box is in the main corridor.
- As to whether *complaints are answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances*, the staff respondent relayed that six percent of the informal complaint responses were untimely in 2007.
- As to whether *forms are sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure*, the staff respondent relayed that, “Sometimes and inmates were given instructions on how to properly utilize the grievance procedure and complete the form.”
- As to whether such complaints are *referred to the relevant staff member, not sent back to the prisoner*, the staff responded, “Urgent complaints and medical complaints are forwarded to the correct departments. Other complaints are returned to the inmate with instructions on who to send the complaint to.”
- As to whether the *staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly prints their name on the response*, the staff respondent relayed, “No. The Inspector’s signature is legible.”
- It was positively noted that the staff person responded “*Yes*” to whether *prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners are protected from possible recrimination*. Further, as to *what protection measures are in place and put into practice*, the staff person relayed, “*Staff are aware retaliation and harassment is not permitted and will not be tolerated. Inmates are sometimes segregated for certain allegations.*”
- While the staff responded that prisoners know how to appeal grievance decisions, the staff person relayed, “Unknown” to the question about *how many have*

- appealed in the last six months, what the outcome was, and how promptly the grievance appeals were answered.*
- The staff person also responded with “Unknown” to the questions, “In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals (those about the Inspector or Warden) were sent to the Chief Inspector?”, “What do they tend to be about,” and “What proportion are generally resolved?”

Bullying and Violence Reduction

- The staff responded “No,” to the question, “Does everyone feel safe from bullying and victimization (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault?”
- Although the staff responded that the prison has 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, the staff person relayed that *prisoners are not consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance.*
- Similarly, the staff response indicates that *prisoners are not 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.*
- Regarding the above point, the response was “No” to the question as to whether there has been any such consultation in the last six months, “No” to whether an annual confidential survey to all prisoners about bullying has been undertaken, and “No” to whether there are “wing representatives.”
- On positive aspects, the respondent relayed that *staff supervise and protect prisoners throughout the prison from bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence, that staff are consistent in challenging these behaviors, that only two alleged sexual assaults were reported in the past six months, and two inmates were administratively charged with sexual assault.*
- As to whether there are particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying, the staff respondent cited housing units.
- While the staff respondent cited the DRC sexual assault policies as the policies that provide protection of vulnerable prisoners, when asked, “What are the arrangements for movement, exercise, mealtimes and discharge, especially for those who are considered vulnerable?” the staff person responded, “They are sent to a more appropriate institution.” Further, when asked if *particular attention is given to prisoners who have asked for protection from other prisoners or those who may be victimized* because of their offense or other individual circumstance, the staff person replied, “If warranted, they are placed in protective custody.”
- While the staff person relayed that *prisoners’ families and friends are 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,* the staff person relayed that a *visitors’ survey is not distributed systematically.*

- Further, although it was relayed that visiting families know about reporting procedures and they think that visiting staff are approachable and sympathetic, the staff person responded that *there are no posters in the visiting rooms.*
- No response was provided to the question, “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?” Further, the staff person responded, “*No*” to whether a strategy has been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison, and “*No*” to whether a central log of bullying is kept, and whether incidents of bullying are reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee.
- As a positive, the staff respondent relayed that *staff are alert to potential bullying* and they confront all forms of victimization, that all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. are used for *evidence of bullying/intimidation*, and that, “*Unit staff and officers assigned to the housing areas monitor inmates and watch their behaviors to determine if there is a problem or potential problem.*” Although this was the response to the question regarding how staff contribute to the strategy, the staff person responded “*No*” to whether there is a coordinated approach by all departments.
- Although the staff person relayed that appropriate interventions are in place to deal with bullies and to support victims regarding sexual assault, the *interventions available were cited as conduct reports to inmates, and “victims can speak to the victim coordinator.”* Further, as to whether interventions are aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior, the response was “*No.*” The staff person also responded with “*No*” to the question whether prisoner records contain comprehensive updates on how bullied and bullying prisoners have been supported and/or challenged.

Self-Harm and Suicide

- In response to the question, “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,” the staff person responded, “*No formal strategy regarding early days of incarceration as LeCI is a parent institution.*”
- While there were many positive aspects cited in the responses to the questions in this section, one example was the response to the question, “*Does the protocol in place recognize the need for continued interaction, and avoid an over reliance on the safer cell as a preventative measure?*” The response was, “*Yes. LeCI staff work hard to keep stay in safe cell short and are engaged with the offender during their safe cell stay.*”
- To the question whether 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, the response was, “*Regular reviews occur with mental health staff for inmates identified with ongoing mental health needs. That does not involve families.*”

- To the question whether unit officers have knowledge of policy and support plans, the response was, “*Unit officers do not have knowledge of treatment plans but are consulted with regarding daily (illegible) of offenders.*”
- As to whether prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm are held in a *supportive and caring environment with unhindered access to sources of help including peer supports*, the staff person relayed that inmates do *not have peer supporters* at this time. As to whether a “care suite” is available to support the work of “Listeners,” the staff person relayed that there is *no identified “care suite” but offenders are seen in a clean private office or in the segregation area.*
- As to whether there is *access to counselors, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times*, the staff person responded, “*No. Inmates have access to mental health staff Monday-Friday and will be seen on weekends if on watch.*”
- As to whether appropriate *free telephone help lines/interventions are available, in particular to address specific aspects of prior victimization*, the staff person responded, “*No.*”
- It was particularly positive to note that the staff responded, “*Yes*” to whether prisoners are *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.* The staff person added, “*Inmates are encouraged to report thoughts of self-harm and their treatment plan encourages them to be involved in institutional activities to the extent that it is safe for them to do so.*”

ACTIVITIES

Learning Skills and Work Activities

- *Sufficient purposeful activity is not available for the total prisoner population.*
- There are *insufficient activity places to occupy the population purposefully during the core working day.*
- Although the staff person responded that only those in isolation are “locked up during the day,” in response to the question, “How many are *formally registered as unassigned*,” the staff person relayed that, “*A significant number are Porter 4- basically a do nothing assignment.*”
- As to the rated capacity compared with the current population, the response was, “*Extremely overcrowded.*”
- As to *how easy it is for a prisoner to get a job*, the staff responded, “*Difficult in most areas, not enough jobs for the number of inmates.*”
- On a positive note, the staff responded that the *HOPE Literacy Program by education is an example of an activity that is purposeful and designed to enhance self-esteem and chances of successful reentry.*
- As to whether there is a *full schedule of activities available to all prisoners*, the staff responded, “*Limited due to overcrowding.*”
- As to how unit-based jobs are allocated, as they often bypass formal procedures, the staff person did *not know*. The staff person also did *not know* whether prisoners who do not work receive sufficient weekly pay.

Library

- As to whether the prison has an effective strategy for maximizing access to and use of a properly equipped, organized library, managed by trained staff, the response was “*We need a library assistant!!!*”

GOOD ORDER: Security and Rules

- As to whether there are *enough staff in the block areas* to facilitate good officer work, the staff respondent relayed that, “*Staffing can always be improved, however the current staffing methods/ratios work quite well.*”
- On strip/squat searches, staff responded that, “*Strip searches are always conducted in a private area and may be done by one or more officers of the same sex. It is encouraged but not mandated by policy.*” As to whether the incidence and authorization need to be *logged and regularly checked*, the staff respondent relayed, “*No. These searches are only noted if it is a search other than normal circumstances. Shift supervisor may authorize search in these cases.*” As to whether *squat searches are only used in exceptional circumstances*, the response was, “*Yes. Strip searches other than the above are conducted in exceptional circumstances.*”

Rules

- As to whether *rules and routines are posted/distributed on units and blocks*, the staff relayed, “*They are not posted. However, inmate manuals are available in the blocks.*”
- Staff relayed that “*sometimes*” when rules are breached, staff take time to explain *how and why to the prisoner concerned.*

SERVICES: Food Services

- As to whether prisoners are offered varied meals to meet individual requirements, staff responded that, “*Inmates are all offered the new heart healthy diet. We also offer special diets needed for inmates with the health conditions (i.e.diabetics, etc.)*”
- As to whether food is *prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations*, staff relayed, “*We are sympathetic to religious concerns such as special kosher meals for the Jewish faith and we offer a meat substitute every meal for vegetarians. We also focus on seasonal holidays for Christian, Muslim and Jewish, etc. such as Christmas, Easter, Ramadan and Passover.*”
- As to whether all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to the relevant food safety and hygiene regulations, the staff relayed, “*The kitchen is constantly monitored using active managerial contract system as well as internal and external audits to maintain accountability. Our kitchen is in ACA compliance and follows standard operating procedures. Our F/S staff are all ServSafe*

- certified in food safety and sanitation. This training is an attempt to ensure that an ongoing training program is in place.”*
- *As to whether religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving, are fully observed and communicated to prisoners, the staff responded, “ I am not familiar with how the kitchen communicates its operating procedures with inmates.” As to whether Halal certificates are displayed where prisoners can see them, the staff person responded, “These items have not been requested.” As to whether appropriate serving utensils are used to avoid cross-contamination, the staff responded, “ Yes. The appropriate physical barriers are in place (i.e. serving utensils, gloves, hats, sneeze guards, etc.).” The staff relayed that kitchen staff make special arrangements for different types of food, and special dietary requirements for specific religions.*
 - *As to whether prisoners who are on special diets have confidence in the preparation and content of the meals, the staff person replied, “I guess we should ask them. I will not answer for another person.”*
 - *As to whether all areas where food is stored, prepared and served are properly equipped and well managed, staff relayed, “All areas along the flow of food are monitored daily by our staff. (i.e. proper temperatures are maintained on and in serving lines, refrigeration units.)*
 - *As to whether prisoner and staff who work with food, are health screened and trained, wear proper clothing, and prisoners are able to gain relevant qualifications, the staff person replied, “I am not familiar with the screening process entrance into the kitchen. However, all food staff are trained in the ServeSafe’s manager level certification. They are qualified to train the inmates they supervise in whatever area they are in. Inmates are also offered the Department of Labor “Cook Apprenticeship Program.”*
 - *As to whether prisoners have a choice of meals including an option for vegetarian, religious, cultural and medical diets, the staff replied, “Inmates are not given a choice on special diets. They are given upon availability using the master menu.” It was added that all menu choices are provided to the same standard.*
 - *As to whether options for religious or cultural groups are open to all, and not just those who practice their religion officially, the staff responded, “No. All special religious diets are verified by the Chaplain.”*

NOTABLE RESPONSES TO CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES RECOMMENDATIONS

INFRASTRUCTURE

- *DRC is encouraged whenever practical to use faith based and community programs that address documented criminogenic needs. This is done by Religious Services Administrator, Reverend Gary Sims out of the DRC Central Office.*
- *The staff person responded that, “At the institution level, I am unaware of any Faith-Based and Community initiative, making available to the faith community.”*

- “At the institution level I am unaware if the information is being used and disseminated to the faith based and community organizations.” Regarding implementation of recommendations and evaluation of programs, the staff person responded, “At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.”*
- The DRC Director is working with wardens to develop programs that will facilitate cultural change in the institution. *An example of the cultural change is the public forum regarding the faith-based community.*
 - *The culture within the institution is continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers. This is evident by the new number of volunteers allowed to come into work with the offender’s reentry mentors.*
 - The warden is supporting and encouraging a cultural shift and institutional change as a day-to-day practice by *making the institution more acceptable to the community to bring in various programs.*
 - The staff person responded, “At the institution level I am not involved in this process,” to the question on how the administration is working with wardens to develop protocols to proactively assist with changing the culture, what the protocols are, whether policies have been reviewed to determine if they inhibit use of volunteers, if changes have been made, and what policies were reviewed by whom.
 - *Various reentry policies have been changed so that the community volunteers are not inhibited from coming inside the institution.*
 - The staff person responded, “At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process,” to questions on the plan to recruit volunteers, educate volunteers, to overcome the public’s misperceptions of offenders, to educate and motivate volunteers, regarding information on how persons can volunteer, and information on the needs of offenders, how the justice system works, and information on the different ways to volunteer.
 - At the institution level, *volunteers are encouraged to provide programs and services to assist the offender in the institution and the community by making the institution open to new programs.*
 - The staff person responded, “At the institution level I am not aware of a standard training program for staff, volunteers and community to facilitate working in the institution together.”
 - The staff responded, “At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process,” referring to the training and orientation program for volunteers.
 - As to what improvements have been made regarding communication about programs and services, the staff responded, *“Staff and communities are communicating during programs but there are no ongoing conversations, limited communication between staff and communities and other parts of the criminal justice system.” The staff person also relayed that, “Some improvements are multiple staff being involved in reentry attempts. I am not aware of improvements in the community.”*
 - As to whether an improved communication mechanism has been developed to ensure these efforts, and if the system has been developed with staff and volunteers to address observed problems, the staff responded, *“At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.”*

ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION

- The entire section of questions received the same response, *“At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.”*

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMMING

- DRC is working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions.
- Current programs include the list of items (life skills, financial management and budgeting, personal hygiene, family programs). Yearly we look at the program offered and tailor the program to fit the need of the institution.
- Current programs address the list items: Budgeting, parenting, job searches, anger management, appropriate leisure-time activities.
- As to whether emphasis is centered on using a mentor-type relationship for training, the response was, *“Yes, we have a reentry mentor at LeCI.”*
- As to whether video-conferencing opportunities for families and children of offenders has been expanded and used as an incentive program, the staff person responded, *“I am not aware of any video conferencing opportunities, particularly children of offenders.”*
- As to whether volunteers facilitate the improvement of family relations through coaching or involvement in family mediation, whether DRC has expanded partnerships with national organizations to provide programming in the institutions, whether DRC involves the faith community in the development of release plans for the offender that flow from the institution to community reentry, and other questions about reentry planning, the response was, *“At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.”*
- *There is a mentorship program for offenders called reentry mentors.*

REENTRY PROGRAMMING

- Nearly the entire section of questions on reentry programming were responded by, *“At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.”*
- Offenders are informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release by their case manager.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO EXPECTATIONS

ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS

Residential Units

1. Do prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions?
Yes.
2. Are cells and communal areas (blocks, dorms, dayrooms) light, well decorated and in a good state of repair?
Yes.
3. Do all prisoners occupy accommodation that is suitable for the purpose and for their individual needs?
 - a. Are there cell sharing risk assessments?
No.
 - b. Are cells sufficiently warm in winter and cool in summer?
Yes.
 - c. Are cells ventilated and do they have sufficient daylight?
Yes.
 - d. Do prisoners have their own bed, corkboard, lockable cupboard/locker box, and use of a table and chair?
Yes.
 - e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks?
No.
 - 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?
Medical emergency called.
7. Do prisoners have access to drinking water, toilet and washing facilities at all times?
Yes.
- a. Is water in the cells certified as drinking water, if used in this way for prisoners?
Yes.
8. Are age-appropriate risk assessments in place to ensure the safety of young adults from any other prisoners?
Yes.
- a. Are there single cell risk assessments?
Yes.
 - b. What are procedures in any case where young adults are identified as posing a risk to others?
Initial assessment upon transfer.
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?
Yes.
12. Are prisoners' communal areas (activity and shower areas) clean, safe, meet the needs of the prisoner population, and effectively supervised by staff?
Yes.
- a. Are there adaptations for older, infirm and disabled prisoners?
Yes.
13. Do prisoners feel safe in their cells and in communal areas of the residential units?
Yes.

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

Clothing and Possessions

1. Do prisoners have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs?
No. Inmates at LeCI don't have laundry facilities to wash their own clothes so they need additional clothing to be able to wear each day.
- a. Are older prisoners provided with additional clothing and bedding, if required, without the need for medical permission?
No. I am only aware of each inmate receiving a certain amount of clothes, regardless of age or other issues.
2. Do prisoners have at least weekly access to laundry facilities to wash and iron their personal clothing?
Inmates do have a laundry exchange process where they turn their clothes in to be washed. They do have daily access to an iron.
- a. Do they have access to laundry/exchange facilities outside the weekly rotation?
No.
3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request?
Yes. We have a property room inmates can access their property by request to unit staff.
4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage?
There is a process established for claims of mishandled or lost possessions.
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. DRC has a standardized form for male inmates.

6. Are suitable clothes and bags available to discharged prisoners who do not have them?
Inmates that get released do receive appropriate clothing to wear when they leave. I am not aware of them being given “bags.”
7. Are facilities available before discharge to launder clothes that have been in storage for long periods?
Inmates are not permitted to have “street clothing” here. They receive clothing from the institution when they leave.

Hygiene

1. Are prisoners encouraged, enabled and expected to keep themselves, their cells and communal areas clean?
Yes.
 - a. Are older and disabled prisoners enabled to keep themselves and their cells clean?
Yes.
2. Do prisoners have ready access to both communal and in-cell toilets, baths and showers in private?
N/A only toilets are in cell.
 - a. Are screened toilets in shared cells?
N/A No.
 - b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older, less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles?
N/A.
3. Are prisoners able to shower or bathe daily, and immediately following physical activity, before court appearances and before visits?
Yes.
 - c. Is there access at any time during the day?
No.
 - d. Are older, less able or disabled prisoners helped to have a bath or shower every day?
N/A
4. Do prisoners have access to necessary supplies of their own personal hygiene items and sanitary products?
Yes.
5. Is fresh laundered bedding provided for each new prisoner on arrival and then on at least a weekly basis?
Yes.
 - a. Is there a system for the replacement of mattresses in operation?
Yes.
 - b. Are clean pillows available for new prisoners as well as other bedding?
Yes.

6. Is a prisoner's valuable property routinely security marked before it is issued?
Yes.

Staff-Prisoner Relationships

1. Are prisoners treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions?
Yes.
2. Is there a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness?
Yes.
3. Are all prisoners treated with humanity, and with respect for the inherent dignity of the person?
Yes.
- a. Is staff aware that the prison has a duty of care for all prisoners, to ensure no prisoners are at risk of physical or emotional abuse by staff or prisoners, and that prisoners are to be held in decent and humane conditions?
Yes.
4. Are staff aware that they should set a personal example in the way they carry out their duties at all times?
Yes.
5. Are staff always fair and courteous in their day-to-day working with prisoners?
Yes.
6. Do staff positively engage with prisoners at all times?
Yes, unless force is necessary to control a situation.
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?
No, it is not required.
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?
Posters on bulletin boards, announcements on the television system, reentry team meetings.

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.

DUTY OF CARE

Complaint/Grievance Procedure

1. Are there effective complaint procedures in place that are easy to access, easy to use, and provide timely responses?

Yes.

2. Do prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are they aware of an appeal procedure?

Yes.

3. Is information about the grievance procedure reinforced through notices and posters that are produced in English and other languages and displayed across the prison?

No.

- 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?

No. It is available in the library and the inmate manual. All incoming inmates are given a pamphlet about the grievance procedure.

- 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?

Inspector's Office

- c. Is information on the units/blocks always displayed and do prisoners understand it?

No.

- d. What are the procedures for blind prisoners?

They can contact the Inspector's Office for assistance.

4. Are prisoners encouraged to solve areas of dispute informally, before making official complaints?

Yes.

5. Can prisoners easily and confidentially access and submit complaint forms?

Yes.

- a. Are forms required to access complaint forms?

No.

- b. Are there forms, and at least one kite box on each block/dorm?
The forms are available but the kite box is in the main corridor.
 - c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer?
Yes.
 - d. Are form dispensers always stocked with forms?
Yes.
 - e. Are informal complaints and grievance files secured on a limited access basis?
Yes.
6. Do prisoners make use of the procedures, and are they free of pressure to withdraw any complaints or grievances?
Yes.
- a. What are the procedures for prisoners with learning or other disabilities?
They can request assistance from unit staff, Inspector or 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? No, administrative rules provide for 14 days to respond to formal complaints, seven days for informal complaints.
Yes.
- a. Are complaints resolved?
Yes. When possible.
 - b. Are complaints answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances?
6% of the informal complaint responses were untimely in 2007.
 - c. Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure?
Sometimes and inmates were given instructions on how to properly utilize the grievance procedure and complete the form.
 - d. Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner?
Urgent complaints and medical complaints are forwarded to the correct departments. Other complaints are returned to the inmate with instructions on who to send the complaint to.
 - e. Are target return times recorded?
Yes.
 - f. Are letters of complaint/concern from third parties, such as legal representatives, family or voluntary organizations, logged and answered?
Yes.
8. Do prisoners receive responses to their complaints/grievances that are respectful, legible, and address the issues raised?
Yes.

9. Are formal grievances signed and dated by the respondent?
Yes.
- a. Regarding the quality of responses, is there a quality assurance system in place?
Yes.
 - b. Does the staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly print their name on the response?
No. The Inspector's signature is legible.
 - c. Are staff responses to confidential complaints returned in sealed envelopes?
Yes.
10. Do prisoners feel able to ask for help in completing their complaint or grievance form and in copying relevant documentation?
Yes.
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for help with forms?
Yes.
 - b. Are translation services provided for those who need them?
Yes.
 - c. What are the arrangements for prisoners with literacy problems, and for those who are blind?
Assistance is provided in the inmate library or the Inspector's Office.
11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered?
Yes.
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for urgent help?
Yes.
12. Are prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners protected from possible recrimination?
Yes.
- a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice?
Staff are aware retaliation and harassment is not permitted and will not be tolerated. Inmates are sometimes segregated for certain allegations.
 - b. Are responses objective and factual, and conclusions based on evidence rather than supposition?
Yes.
 - c. What are the adverse effects of filing complaints?
Inmates feel they create work for staff and report harassment but it has not been proven.

- d. Do prisoners know that there are protection measures if they complain about staff or other prisoners?
Yes.
13. Do prisoners know how to appeal grievance decisions?
Yes.
- a. Are appeals dealt with fairly, and responded to within seven days?
A.R. 5120-9-31 states 30 days for appeal responses.
 - b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms?
Yes.
 - c. How many have appealed in the last six months?
Unknown.
 - d. What was the outcome, and how promptly were they answered?
Unknown.
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?
Info is available.
- a. Is CIIC contact information posted in dorms, blocks, library and other areas to ensure that staff and inmates are aware of how to contact CIIC?
Yes.
 - b. Are there any difficulties with access to the CIIC?
Unknown.
15. Do prisoners receive help to pursue complaints and grievances with unit managers, prison administrators, or other central office staff, if they need to?
Yes.
16. Do all prisoners know how to contact the Inspector and Chief Inspector?
Yes.
- a. Do blocks/dorms have contact details and information?
Yes.
17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need to?
They will be provided instructions on how to do so.
- a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisers or making direct applications to the courts?
They can use the inmate phone system and information is available in the inmate library.
 - b. In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector?
Unknown.

- c. What do they tend to be about?
Unknown.
 - d. What proportion are generally resolved?
Unknown.
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?
Yes.
- a. Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge?
Yes.

Bullying and Violence Reduction

- 1. Does everyone feel safe from bullying and victimization (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault)?
No.
- 2. Are active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation known to staff, prisoners and visitors?
Yes.
- 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?
 - a. Is the violence reduction strategy widely publicized?
Yes.
 - b. Is monitoring part of the strategy and as a minimum, does it cover feelings of safety among prisoners, incidents of bullying (verbal and physical), number of assaults, number of racist incidents, location of incidents and action taken?
Yes.
 - c. Do staff understand their duty to maintain a safe environment and what they do to promote this?
Yes.
 - d. Are staff alert to threats to a safe environment, and do they confront all forms of victimization?
Yes.
 - e. Are prisoners consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance?
No.
 - f. How effective is the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction?

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?
No.
- a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months?
No.
 - b. Has an annual confidential survey to all prisoners about bullying been undertaken?
No.
 - c. Are there wing representatives?
No.
5. Do staff supervise and protect prisoners throughout the prison from bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence?
Yes.
6. Are staff consistent in challenging these behaviors?
Yes.
- a. How many incidents occurred in the last six months?
Two alleged sexual assaults were reported. Two inmates were administratively charged with sexual assault.
 - b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying?
Housing units.
 - c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners?
Sexual assault policies.
 - 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?
They are sent to a more appropriate institution.
 - 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?
If warranted, they are placed in protective custody.
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?
Yes.

- 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?
No.
 - c. Do visiting families know about reporting procedures and do they think that visiting staff are approachable and sympathetic?
Yes.
 - d. Are there posters in visiting rooms?
No.
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?
- a. Has a strategy been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison?
No.
 - b. Is a central log of bullying kept, and are incidents of bullying reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee?
No.
 - c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization?
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?
Unit staff and officers assigned to the housing areas monitor inmates and watch their behaviors to determine if there is a problem or potential problem.
 - f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments?
No.
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. We don't use the term bullying. We use records for requests for protective control and sexual assault.

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. Extortion and sexual assaults.

11. Is inappropriate behavior consistently challenged?

Yes.

a. Are there bullying posters throughout the prison?

No. We have posters for sexual assaults.

b. What information is distributed to new arrivals?

We have sexual assault pamphlets we give them.

c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners?

We use the terms extortion and sexual assault.

d. Are staff aware of both direct and indirect forms of bullying?

Yes.

12. Do anti-bullying measures support the victim and take the victim's views about their location into account?

Yes.

a. Do staff understand the link between bullying and aggressive and disruptive behavior generally?

Yes.

13. Are appropriate interventions in place to deal with bullies and support victims?

Yes. Sexual Assault.

a. What interventions are available to challenge bullies and to support victims of bullying?

We will issue conduct reports to inmates and victims can speak to the victim coordinator.

b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior?

No.

c. Do prisoner records contain comprehensive updates on how bullied and bullying prisoners have been supported and/or challenged?

No.

Self-Harm and Suicide

1. Does the prison work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach?
Yes. Suicide prevention is annual in-service emphasis with all staff informed how to keep offenders safe and involve mental health ASAP.
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?
All offenders entering LeCI receive two screenings within 24 hours and two weeks. Inmates identified with emotional needs are seen for formal assessment and treatment planning.
3. Are prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity?
Mental health staff advocate all offenders be given access to all appropriate programs/jobs etc.
4. Are all staff aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, appropriately trained, and have access to proper equipment and support?
All staff, including contractors receive suicide prevention training including location of cut down tool and first aid kits with materials for CPR.
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?
No formal strategy regarding early days of incarceration as LeCI is a parent institution.
 - a. Are the specific needs of different prisoner groups recognized, as are the levels of risk in different areas of the facility?
Yes. Our segregation unit is seen as an area of greater risk.
 - 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. See above.
 - c. Is staff training appropriate?
Segregation officers and relief officers are identified/required to attend specialized mental health two day training that strongly emphasizes prevention tools.
 - d. What is the availability and use of safer cells, particularly in areas of the prison where risks of self-harm are higher?
LeCI has safe cells in two different areas of our segregation. Typically, those cells are available and are inspected quarterly regarding physical status.
 - 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. LeCI staff work hard to keep stay in safe cell short and are engaged with the offender during their safe cell stay.

6. Does a multi-disciplinary committee effectively monitor the prison's suicide prevention policy and procedures?
Yes. Continuous Quality Improvement Committee meets monthly.
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?
It is chaired by the (illegible) Clinical Director has multiple disciplines but does not have a member of the local community mental health providers attending.
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. Inmates identified as mentally retarded are linked with community mental health retardation agencies and families are encouraged via recent efforts in visiting.
- 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. Posters are in the visiting room.
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?
Crisis treatment plans are created for inmates who need a safe cell for more than 24 hours.
10. Are personal factors or significant events that may be a trigger to self-harm identified?
Efforts are made via engagement with the offender, unit staff and correctional officers.
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 with mental health staff for inmates identified with ongoing mental health needs. That does not involve families.
12. Are arrangements in place for following up after a care and support plan has been closed?
Yes. Some inmates are identified for extended follow up monitoring.
- a. Do unit officers have knowledge of policy and support plans?
Unit officers do not have knowledge of treatment plans but are consulted with regarding daily (illegible) of offenders.
- b. What level of training have they received?
All officers receive two hours annually of suicide prevention training. All segregation, medical and relief officers attend a two-day specialized 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?
Inmates do not have peer supporters at this time.
- a. Is a care suite available to support the work of Listeners?
There is no identified "care suite" but offenders are seen in a clean private office or in the segregation area.

- b. Is there access to counselors, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times?
No. Inmates have access to mental health staff Monday-Friday and will be seen on weekends if on watch.
 - 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?
No.
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. Inmates are encouraged to report thoughts of self-harm and their treatment plan encourages them to be involved in institutional activities to the extent that it is safe for them to do so.
- a. Are prisoners given the opportunity and assistance to make a written contribution to their review?
Yes but inmates typically have not made written responses/contributions.
 - b. Are prisoners encouraged to identify their own support needs and are they able to draw on opportunities for informal support from other prisoners if they wish?
Yes.
15. Are all staff, including night staff, fully trained in suicide prevention and clear on what to do in an emergency?
Yes.
- a. Is there a program of refresher training in place?
Annual in-service training as well as monthly suicide drills per shift.
 - b. Do staff have access to first aid kits and shears?
Yes. LeCI uses safety scissors or their cut down tool.
 - c. If facility does not have a first night center, do night staff know where first night prisoners and those at risk are located?
Staff are aware of location of safe cells and practice to place inmate on watch after hours.
16. Are incidents of self-harm closely monitored and analyzed at regular intervals to establish any trends and to implement preventive measures?
Yes, via SPART and CQI.
17. Are serious incidents properly investigated to establish what lessons could be learned and to promote good practice?
Yes, via CQI.
18. Where appropriate, are family or friends of the prisoner informed through a family liaison officer?
Yes.

19. Is an action plan devised and acted upon promptly as a result of an investigation into an apparent self-inflicted death?

Yes, via CQI and Central Office CQI review.

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?

No.

ACTIVITIES

Learning Skills and Work Activities

1. Are prisoners encouraged and enabled to learn, and do they have access to good library facilities?

Yes.

2. Is sufficient purposeful activity available for the total prisoner population?

No.

3. Are all prisoners assessed to provide a clear understanding and record of their learning and skills needs including literacy, math, and language support, employability and vocational training, and social and life skills?

Yes.

4. Is the learning and skills and work provision in the prison informed by and based on the diverse needs of prisoners and provides prisoners with both the opportunity of and access to activities that are likely to benefit them?

Yes.

a. Does provision meet the needs of older, younger adult, and disabled?

Yes.

5. Are there sufficient activity places to occupy the population purposefully during the core working day?

No.

a. How many prisoners are locked up during the day?

Only those in isolation.

b. How many are formally registered as unassigned?

A significant number are Porter 4 - basically a do nothing assignment.

- c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population?
Extremely overcrowded.
 - d. How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job?
Difficult in most areas, not enough jobs for the number of inmates.
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. One example is the HOPE Literacy Program done by education.
7. Are facilities and resources for learning and skills and work appropriate, sufficient and suitable for purpose?
Yes.
8. Are all prisoners able to access activity areas?
Yes.
- a. Is there access for older and disabled prisoners?
Yes.
 - b. Are there any inaccessible areas because of poor mobility and insufficient help to get to them?
No.
9. Is every prisoner who wishes to able to engage fully with all prison activities offered, and is no one excluded from participation, other than as a result of a disciplinary punishment?
Yes.
- a. Is a full schedule of activities available to all prisoners?
Limited due to overcrowding.
10. Is allocation to activity places equitable, transparent, and based on identified reentry planning needs?
Yes.
11. Can prisoners apply for job transfers and are they given written reasons for any decisions?
Yes.
- a. Does case management link with the reentry planning process?
Yes.
 - b. Do prisoners with identified learning needs work in low-skilled, production line work, rather than relevant classes?
No.
 - c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures?
I do not know.

- d. Is there any favoritism or line jumping?
Not in education. We adhere strictly to waiting list policies.
12. Do local pay schedules provide disincentives for prisoners to engage in education or training activities?
No.
- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities?
No. OPI jobs require proof of high school diploma or GED as verified by the education department.
13. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay?
I do not know.
14. Do prisoners who are unemployed through no fault of their own or who are exempt from working unlocked during the day, provided with access to the library and other activities?
Yes.
15. Does the prison have an effective strategy to ensure that learners are able to regularly and punctually attend those activities that meet their needs and aspirations?
Yes.
- a. What systems are in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities?
We try to provide positive reinforcements such as special movies also punishment for tardiness.
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, through orientation and RMT.
17. Does the assessment and provision of individual learning and skills form an effective part of prisoners' reentry plans and are they used effectively to record and review overall progress and achievement?
Yes.
18. Do work placements provide purposeful and structured training for prisoners?
Yes.
- a. Wherever possible, can vocational qualifications be obtained alongside their work?
Yes.
- b. In the absence of such qualifications, are developed skills recognized and recorded?
Yes.
19. Are prisoners helped to continue on their courses when transferred or to progress to further education, training or employment on release?
Yes.

20. Does the prison accurately record the purposeful activity hours that prisoners engage in, excluding non-purposeful activities in their calculations?
Work history is kept on each inmate.

Library

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

We need a library assistant!!!

- a. How do prisoners with mobility problems get access?
The library is accessible to all inmates.
2. Are the library materials broadly reflective of the different cultures and needs of the prison population, including Braille, talking books, and foreign language books?
Yes.
3. Do all prisoners have access to a range of library materials, which reflect the population's needs and support learning and skills?
Yes.
4. Does this include:
- a. Literacy? **Yes.**
 - b. Math? **Yes.**
 - c. Language? **Yes.**
 - d. Employability? **Yes.**
 - e. Vocational training? **Yes.**
 - f. Social and life skills? **Yes.**
5. Do library materials include a comprehensive selection of up-to-date legal textbooks and DRC Administrative Rules and DRC Policies?
Yes. This institution provides a school library in addition to the regular library available to all inmates!

GOOD ORDER

Security and Rules

1. Are security and good order maintained through positive staff- prisoner relationships based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters?
Yes. Inmates are treated with respect in a firm, fair and professional manner. Policy and procedure are followed and in most cases have an avenue for the inmate to grieve to correct institution.
2. Are rules and routines well publicized, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behavior?
Yes. Bulletin boards regularly disseminate material to inmates. Major changes are delivered to every inmate through a memo. Policies and rules always encourage responsible behavior on both parties and endeavor to keep this facility clean, safe and secure.
3. Are categorization and allocation procedures based on assessment of a prisoner's risks and needs?
Inmate's needs and security risks are taken into account when assigning them to programming, jobs, institution, etc.
4. Are they clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed?
Yes. Security reviews conducted annually and RAP Reentry Accountability Plans are done at least annually.
5. Are there any obvious weaknesses or anomalies in the physical and procedural security of the facility?
Physical structure of facility is very strong security wise. Procedural security policies are continually reviewed by back to basics committees to strengthen and look for weakness, both are very strong.
6. Are the elements of "dynamic security" in place?
Yes. Policies mandate overall consideration of risk factors in the facility through a risk assessment. Administrative Rules govern ODRC state security policies that local facility post orders must adhere to. Post orders and security policies reviewed annually.
 - a. Are staff-prisoner relationships positive?
Yes. Officers are instructed in policy and through annual in-services.
 - b. Do prisoners receive personal attention from staff?
Yes. Whenever possible inmate needs are met and staff are encouraged to make themselves available for inmates.
 - c. Is there constructive activity to occupy prisoners?
Yes. Many programs are offered as well as vocational programs, jobs, recreational and religious programming.
 - 1) Do staff cluster during association?
No. Staff are to be spread out, except during their lunch period.

- 2) Are there enough staff in dorm/block areas to facilitate good officer work?
Staffing can always be improved, however the current staffing methods/ratios work quite well.
7. Does effective security intelligence safeguard prisoners' well-being?
Yes. Staff are in-serviced each year on confidentiality.
- a. Do staff comply with security requirements in terms of filing reports?
Yes. It is mandated.
- b. Are there recent incidents where security reports have led to action?
Yes. All incident reports are investigated and if needed changes in local policy is looked into, or individuals are held accountable and the disciplinary process is started.
8. Is prisoners' access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessarily restrictive approach to security?
No. Programming is encouraged and not impeded except for extraordinary cases of imminent danger.
9. Is strip and squat-searching of prisoners carried out only for sound security reasons?
Yes. Strip searches are conducted after visits and anytime an inmate leaves or reenters the facility or is placed into security control.
10. Are prisoners strip or squat searched only in the presence of more than one member of staff, of their own gender?
Strip searches are always conducted in a private area and may be done by one or more officers of the same sex. It is encouraged but not mandated by policy.
- a. If squat searches are used, does their incidence and authorization need to be logged and regularly checked?
No. These searches are only noted if it is a search other than normal circumstances. Shift supervisor may authorize search in these cases.
- b. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances?
Yes. Strip searches other than the above are conducted in exceptional circumstances.
11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available?
Yes. Visit rules are readily posted and understood.
- a. Are the visitors subject to bans or restrictions reviewed every month?
Yes, with the exception of permanent restrictions that are reviewed by the warden upon request.

Rules

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas?
 - a. Are rules and routines posted/distributed on units/blocks/dorms?
They are not posted. However, inmate manuals are available in the blocks.
 - b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs?
They are available upon request (Spanish).
2. Are rules and routines applied openly, fairly and consistently, with no discrimination?
For the most part.
3. Does staff use only the level of authority necessary to ensure a prisoner's compliance with the rules?
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned?
Sometimes.
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoners, are appeal arrangements explained and made available?
Yes.

SERVICES

Food Services

1. Are prisoners offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements?
Inmates are all offered the new heart healthy diet. We also offer special diets needed for inmates with the health conditions (i.e. diabetics, etc.)
2. Is food prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations?
We are sympathetic to religious concerns such as special kosher meals for the Jewish faith and we offer a meat substitute every meal for vegetarians. We also focus on seasonal holidays for Christian, Muslim and Jewish etc. such as Christmas, Easter, Ramadan and Passover.
3. Do all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to the relevant food safety and hygiene regulations?
The kitchen is constantly monitored using active managerial contract system as well as internal and external audits to maintain accountability. Our kitchen is in ACA compliance and follows standard operating procedures. Our F/S staff are all ServSafe certified in food safety and sanitation. This training is an attempt to ensure that an ongoing training program is in place.

4. Are religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving, fully observed and communicated to prisoners?
I am not familiar with how the kitchen communicates its operating procedures with inmates.
 - a. Are Halal certificates displayed where prisoners can see them?
These items have not been requested.
 - b. Are appropriate serving utensils used to avoid cross-contamination?
Yes. The appropriate physical barriers are in place (i.e. serving utensils, gloves, hats, sneeze guards, etc.).
 - c. Do kitchen staff make special arrangements for different types of food, and special dietary requirements for e.g.
 - 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?
I guess we should ask them. I will not answer for another person.
5. Are all areas where food is stored, prepared and served properly equipped and well managed?
All areas along the flow of food are monitored daily by our staff. (i.e. proper temperatures are maintained on and in serving lines, refrigeration units.
6. Are prisoners and staff who work with food, health screened and trained, wear proper clothing, and prisoners are able to gain relevant qualifications?
I am not familiar with the screening process entrance into the kitchen. However, all food staff are trained in the ServSafe's manager level certification. They are qualified to train the inmates they supervise in whatever area they are in. Inmates are also offered the Departments of Labors "Cook Apprenticeship Program."
7. Do medical clearance forms exist on food service workers, and are training courses offered?
8. Are prisoners' meals healthy, varied and balanced and always include one substantial meal each day?
Our meals are prepared using a master menu and a five-week cycle. The menu is prepared by a state certified dietician.
 - a. Are prisoners encouraged to eat healthily and are they able to eat five portions of fruit or vegetables a day?
(Illegible) four portions are offered on rare occasion five are offered.
 - b. Do prisoners on transfer miss out on their main meal?
Inmates when asked about their experience with this matter stated that on most occasions they miss the main meal but are offered a sack meal.
9. Do prisoners have a choice of meals including an option for vegetarian, religious, cultural and medical diets?

Inmates are not given a choice on special diets. They are given upon availability using the master menu.

- 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. All special religious diets are verified by the Chaplain.
10. Are prisoners consulted about the menu, and can they make comments about the food?
Yes. There is a complaint system in place. Inmates may use the kite system to share their opinion.
- a. If logs of comments are kept, how frequently are they consulted?
Daily.
 - b. Is there a food comments book?
Unknown. Manager said there is a (illegible) comments book.
11. Is the breakfast meal prepared on the morning it is eaten?
How else would they get it if it were not served?
12. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm?
L/M 11:45-1:30 D/M 4:45-6:15
13. Do prisoners have access to drinking water (including at night time), and the means of making a hot drink after evening lock-up?
Inmates are able to get a hot beverage if they purchase a crock pot.
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. F/S supervisors are present at all times during the meal serving time.
16. Where prisoners are required to eat their meals in their cells, are they able to sit at a table?
Yes. Table and built in stool is available.
17. Do pregnant prisoners and nursing mothers receive appropriate extra food?
N/A.

**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?
DRC is encouraged whenever practical to use faith based and community programs that address documented criminogenic needs. This is done by Religious Services Administrator, Reverend Gary Sims out of DRC Central Office.
 - 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?
At the institution level, I am unaware of any Faith-Based and Community Initiative, making available to the faith community.
 - 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?
At the institution level I am unaware if the information is being used and disseminated to the faith based and community organizations.
 - c. What is in place to ensure that the recommendation is implemented?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
 - d. What methods of program evaluation are being explored to further document program success? What methods are in place?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
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?
The DRC Director is working with wardens to develop programs that will facilitate cultural change in the institution. An example of the cultural change is the public forum regarding the faith-based community.
 - a. Is the culture within the institution continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers? Explain.
Yes, the culture within the institution is continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers. This is evident by the new number of volunteers allowed to come into work with the offender's reentry mentors.
 - 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 supporting and encouraging a cultural shift and institution change as a day-to-day practice by making the institution more acceptable to the community to bring in various programs.

- c. How is the DRC/DYS administration working with wardens/superintendents to collaboratively develop protocols that will proactively assist with changing the culture?
At the institution level I am not involved in this process.
- a. Have such protocols been developed?
Yes. At the institution level I am not involved in this process.
- e. What are they?
At the institution level I am not involved in this process.
- f. Have policies been reviewed to determine if they might inhibit use of community volunteers, and have necessary changes been made accordingly?
At the institution level I am not involved in this process.
- g. What policies have been reviewed? By whom?
At the institution level I am not involved in this process.
- h. What policies have been changed so that they do not inhibit use of community volunteers?
The various reentry policies have been changed so that the community volunteers are not inhibited from coming inside the institution.
3. Has DRC/DYS developed a marketing plan to assist in recruiting volunteers from the community and faith-based institutions?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- a. Does the plan discuss educating volunteers about the justice system?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- 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?
There is a need to increase programming for incarcerated offenders to improve the likelihood they will be reintegrated into the community successfully. Citizen circles are an example of existing programming but more community involvement is needed.
- c. Is the faith community being encouraged to volunteer to provide programs and services to assist offenders in both the institutions and the community?
At the institution level we encourage volunteers to provide programs and services to assist the offender in both the institution and the community by making the institution open to new programs.
- d. Has a marketing plan been developed to overcome the public's misperceptions of offenders?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- f. Is information provided on how individuals and groups can volunteer in the prisons?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
4. Has DRC/DYS developed a standard training program for staff, volunteers, and the community to facilitate working in institutions together?
At the institution level I am not aware of a standard training program for staff, volunteers and community to facilitate working in the institution together.
- a. Does the program include information on:
- Ethics of working with offenders?
 - Confidentiality issues?
 - Ensuring safety and security of volunteers?
 - Working with volunteers?
 - Rules and regulations for volunteers?
- At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- c. Has a standardized training program been developed for volunteers to facilitate their work in institutions?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
5. Has Ohio law been revised to remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions that inhibit offenders' successful reentry?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

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

Staff and communities are communicating during programs but there are no ongoing conversations, limited communication between staff and communities and other parts of the criminal justice system.

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

Some improvements are multiple staff being involved in reentry attempts. I am not aware of improvements in the community.

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

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

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

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

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?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- a. Working with faith-based and community service providers, have programs been developed in the community to effectively provide treatment while protecting public safety?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the 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?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- c. Have local probation departments prepared a listing of community options currently available for judicial use?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- 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.

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

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?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- a. Is DRC/DYS working with community organizations and probation departments to expand services available for offenders? How?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- b. Has a community model been created that will help meet the basic needs of offenders within the community? Is it being created? Explain.
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- 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?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
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.
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- a. Has a job placement program been implemented?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- b. Does it provide:
- Information on job fairs to ex-offenders?
 - Education of businesses/employers on the benefits of hiring ex-offenders?
 - Incentives for employers to hire ex-offenders (i.e., tax breaks)?
 - Increased involvement of faith-based and community groups?
- At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- c. Is there collaboration between the DYS, DRC and Job and Family Services who started the employment centers in Ohio? In what way?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- 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?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- e. Has the DRC Omnibus Reentry legislation been enacted to reduce unnecessary sanctions in the law and thus made training more relevant?

At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMMING

11. Is DRC/DYS working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions?

DRC is working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions.

- a. Do current programs include the following? Are they being developed? Are they being expanded?

- Life skills?
- Financial management and budgeting?
- Personal hygiene?
- Family programs including:
 - Family and community-based orientation?
 - Family mediation?
 - Family education and orientation program?
 - Transportation and video conferencing for visitation?
 - Parenting?

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

- b. Dynamic risk factors that impact offender behavior and risk of 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?

Current programs address the list items.

- c. Have specific life skills programs been developed in the following areas?
- Budgeting?
 - Parenting?
 - Job searches?
 - Anger management?
 - Appropriate leisure-time activities?

Current programs address the list items.

- d. Is emphasis centered on using a mentor-type relationship for such training?
Yes, we have a reentry mentor at LeCI.
- 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.?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.
- f. Have video-conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders, been expanded? Are they used as an incentive program?
I am not aware of any video conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders.
- g. Do volunteers facilitate the improvement of family relations through coaching in basic relational skills or involvement in family mediation programs?
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

12. Has DRC/DYS expanded partnerships with national organizations including faith-based and community organizations to provide programming in state institutions? Explain.
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- 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?
DRC has policies regarding reentry.

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.
At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.

- a. Are community actors and organizations a part of reentry planning for those offenders who will shortly be returning home? Explain.
At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.
- 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?
At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.
- c. Is there a mentorship program for offenders at your facility?
Yes, there is a mentorship program for offenders called reentry mentors.

- d. Are faith-based and community volunteer groups actively developing such a program for participation by offenders at your facility? Explain.
At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- a. What has been done to make the faith community aware of programs and training for the faith community's involvement?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- b. What has been done to create awareness among the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and the avenues to get involved?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- c. What effort has been made to inform the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and volunteer opportunities available?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- d. Have leaders among the faith community been identified? How? When?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- e. Have staff been used to accomplish this, using existing organizations, groups and established relationships? Explain.

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- f. Has this educational opportunity been extended to faith groups of all kinds?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- 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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- 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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- 15. Are offenders informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release? How is this done?

Offenders are informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release by their case manager.

- 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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- b. Is legal advice in these situations available? Have partnerships been formed with local law schools to achieve this end?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- 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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- d. How has DRC/DYS made better use of existing federal programs that aim to address the issue of housing?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- a. What educational efforts have been made to:

- Assure the public that their best interest is at hand, that public safety is not at risk, but will improve with these efforts, and to
- Inform the public of the many needs of ex-offenders to help them transition successfully back into society?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.

- 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?

At the institution level I am not aware of this part of the process.