

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE**

**REPORT ON**

**THE EVALUATION AND INSPECTION**

**OF THE**

**LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

**PREPARED AND SUBMITTED BY**

**CIIC STAFF**

**NOVEMBER 10, 2005**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>Inspection Profile</b> .....	7
Areas/Activities Included in Inspection	
Statutory Requirement of Attendance at Rehabilitative or Educational Program	
Statutory Requirement of Attendance at General Meal Period.....	8
 <b>Institution Overview</b>	
Mission	
History	
Cost.....	9
 <b>Staff</b>	
LECI Employees by Gender and Race as of November 29, 2003 and November 9, 2005.....	10
Monthly Awards.....	11
Employee of the Month	
Cellblock of the Month	
 <b>Inmates</b> .....	12
Inmate <b>Population</b> at Each Ohio Prison Based on Data in the DRC Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report	
Type of Leave and Number Away With Leave.....	13
Number of Inmates in <b>Segregation</b> by Status.....	14
Number of Inmates in <b>Segregation</b> from the Level One (Minimum) Camp and from the Level Three (Close) Institution by Type of Placement	
Population of Other Housing Units.....	15
 Physical Aspects Improvements	
Institution Grounds.....	16
Entry Building	
Visiting Room	
Recreation Program	
 <b>Educational Programs</b> .....	17
Academic Enrollment Data Reported on LECI Monthly Report for July 2005.....	18
Tutoring	
Academic Data from LECI Monthly Enrollment Report for July 2005.....	19
Chaplain's Literacy Program	

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Vocational Programs</b> .....	19
Career/Vocational/Technical Enrollment Data at LECI for July 2005.....	20
<b>Work Programs</b> .....	21
<b>Recovery Services Programs</b>	
Inmate Organizations.....	22
Religious Services Programs	
Community Services	
<b>Sex Offender Program</b> .....	23
<b>Mental Health Services</b> .....	29
Caseload	
Number of Inmates on the Mental Health Caseload, Psychiatric Caseload, and Number Designated as Severely Mentally Ill, with Breakdown by Institution on June 30, 2005.....	31
Mentally Ill Population at Level Three Prisons for Men with Population and Percent on the Caseload.....	32
Number on Mental Health Caseload at Level Three Prisons for Men by Institution with Number and Percent.....	33
<b>Mental Health and Segregation Data</b>	
Number of Inmates in Segregation System wide with Breakdown of Number in Segregation who are on the Mental Health Caseload by Institution on June 30, 2005.....	35
Number of Inmates on the Mental Health Caseload who were in Segregation on June 30, 2005 with Breakdown by Institution.....	37
<b>Suicides</b> .....	38
Number of Suicides by Institution from January 1, 2005 to October 25, 2005 by Date of Suicide	
Suicide Attempts	
Number of Suicide Attempts from January through August 2005 by Institution.....	39
<b>General Population Housing</b> .....	40
Commissary.....	41
Smoking Policy.....	42
<b>Segregation</b>	
Cell Isolation.....	44

	<b>PAGE</b>
L Block.....	44
R Block.....	45
Suicide Watch	
<b>Medical Services</b> .....	46
Staffing	
Actual Hours Worked by LECI <b>Civil Service Medical Staff</b> from January through August 2005 by Position.....	47
Projected Time In Hours of LECI <b>Contractual Staff</b> from January through August 2005 .....	48
LECI Primary Health Care <b>Activities</b> from January through August 2005	
Nurses Sick Call Screening.....	49
Doctor's Sick Call	
Nurses Sick Call in Segregation	
Emergency Triage.....	50
<b>Infirmary</b> .....	51
Infirmary Care with Bed Days	
<b>Dental Services</b>	
Dental Care Appointments.....	52
<b>Specialty Care</b>	
Specialty Care on Site	
<b>Pharmacy</b> .....	53
Prescriptions Filled	
<b>Lab Data</b>	
Blood Draws and EKGs	
<b>Infectious Diseases</b> .....	54
TB/HIV	
<b>Deaths</b> .....	55
Discussion with <b>Nursing Staff</b>	
<b>Food Services</b> .....	56
Birds	
Conditions.....	57
Staff/Supervision.....	58

	<b>PAGE</b>
Inmate Worker Attitude.....	59
LECI Response to Reported Concerns.....	60
Current Reported Concerns.....	61
 <b>Assaults</b>	
Assault Investigations by Investigator	
Inmate on Inmate Assault Investigations	
Inmate on Staff Assault Investigations.....	62
Sexual Assault Investigations	
Other Assault Investigations	
 <b>Use of Force</b> .....	 63
Use of Force Incidents per month at the LECI from January through July 2005 with Racial Breakdown	
Use of Force Incidents in June 2005 by Institution Grouped by Type of Facility.....	64
Number of Use of Force Incidents and Slight Force in June 2005 with Breakdown by Institution.....	65
 Disciplinary Reports.....	 66
Disciplinary Reports at LECI by Race from January through July 2005	
 <b>CIIC Database</b>	
Number of Logged <b>Concerns</b> from or Regarding LECI by Category of Concern from January 1, 2005 through October 25, 2005.....	67
Number of CIIC <b>Contacts</b> by Institution from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005.....	68
Number of Reported <b>Concerns</b> by Category at the LECI from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005.....	69
 <b>Inmate Grievance Procedure</b> .....	 70
Informal Complaints	
Informal Complaints in 2004 by Institution	
Informal Complaints with Untimely Responses in 2004 by Institution.....	71
 Filers .....	 72
Number of Inmates Who Filed One or More Grievances in 2004 by Institution	
 Grievances Filed.....	 73
Grievances Filed in 2004 by Institution	
 Grievance Appeals .....	 74
Grievance Appeals in 2004 by Institution	

**PAGE**

Original Grievances.....	75
Original Grievances Pertaining to Inspector or Warden in 2004	
July 2005 Inspector's Report.....	76
Number of Grievances in July 2005 Categorized as ' <b>Not Resolved</b> ' with Specific Reason for Disposition	
<b>Resolved</b> Grievances at LECI in July 2005 by Subject.....	77
Number of Grievances Filed at LECI in July 2005 by Subject.....	78
Number of Grievances Filed at LECI by Subject for October 2003 through November 2004. ....	79
<b>Investigator Caseload</b> .....	81
2004 Investigations Initiated by Investigators by Institution.....	82
Staff Misconduct Investigations.....	83
Staff/Inmate Relationship Investigations	
Positive Drug Urinalysis Results	
2004 Positive Drug Test Results by Institution.....	84
Inmate/Visitor Drug Investigations.....	85
Inmate/Visitor Drug Investigations in 2004 by Institution	
Staff/Inmate Drug Investigations.....	86
Staff/Inmate Drug Investigations in 2004 by Institution	
Drug Investigations Involving Staff.....	87
Drug Investigations Involving Mail	
Other Drug Investigations	
<b>Searches, Shakedown</b>	
Heroin Confiscated.....	88
Crack/Cocaine Confiscated	
Marijuana Confiscated	
Hooch Confiscated	
<b>Major Shakedowns</b> .....	89
Canine Searches	
Employee Strip/Patdowns	
Visitor Strip/Patdowns.....	90

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

**INSPECTION PROFILE**

**DATE OF INSPECTION:** May 3, 2004

**TYPE OF INSPECTION:** Unannounced

**CIIC MEMBERS  
AND STAFF PRESENT:** Senator Mark Mallory, Chairman  
Shirley Pope, Director  
Elizabeth Curtis, Inspector  
Adam Jackson, Inspector

**INSTITUTION STAFF PRESENT:**

Ernie Moore, Warden\*; Ron Hart, Deputy Warden of Administration; LeAnn Walker-Williams, Deputy Warden of Special Services; Jason T. Hall, ACA Coordinator; Richard Huggins, Unit Management Administrator; Gerald Laforge, Food Service Coordinator; Ellen Myers, Administrative Assistant.

\*The LECI Warden was at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility on the day of the LECI unannounced inspection. However, the LECI Warden returned to LECI prior to the completion of the inspection.

**AREAS/ACTIVITES INCLUDED IN INSPECTION:**

Entry Building	Mental Health/Recovery Services
Institution Grounds	General Population Housing Unit
Entry/exit meeting with LECI Staff	K-Block
Inmate Dining Hall	Medical Services
Food Services	Infirmery
Food Storage	Medical Records
Kitchen	Segregation
Community Service Room	L-Block
Ohio Penal Industries (OPI)	R-Block
Recreation Yard	Commissary
Visiting Room	

**STATUTORY REQUIREMENT OF ATTENDANCE AT REHABILITATIVE OR  
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM**

The Sex Offender Treatment Program at the Lebanon Correctional Institution (LECI) was attended, including a period of quiet observation and active discussion with Sex Offender Treatment Program Staff and participants.

## **STATUTORY REQUIREMENT OF ATTENDANCE AT GENERAL MEAL PERIOD**

Observation of the entire Food Services area, including the kitchen and dining halls, was included in the inspection. Preparation of the food trays for those in segregation was also observed. The dining halls contained a small number of inmate workers seated at the tables for their meal. The meal consisted of two bean burritos, coleslaw, Spanish rice, green beans, corn and sliced bread.

## **INSTITUTION OVERVIEW**

### **MISSION**

According to information provided on site, the institution's mission statement consists of the following:

The ODRC protects and supports Ohioans by ensuring that adult felony offenders are effectively supervised in environments that are safe, humane and appropriately secure. In partnership with communities, we will promote citizen safety and victim reparation. Through rehabilitative and restorative programming, we seek to instill in offenders an improved sense of responsibility and the capacity to become law-abiding members of society.

Per the institution's website, the facility seeks to:

- Provide felony offenders with a safe, efficient, humane and appropriately secure facility, while maintaining dedication to the protection of citizens and the local community.
- Provide employees with opportunities for professional growth and development through education, mentorship, and training.
- Instill in offenders an improved sense of responsibility and the capacity to become law-abiding members of society, consistent with ODRC initiatives of re-entry, community service and victim reparation.

### **HISTORY**

Per written information provided on site, construction of the Lebanon Correctional Institution began in the fall of 1957 at a cost of \$12 million. In the spring of 1960, the institution officially opened. On November 29, 1966, fire destroyed most of the industrial area of the prison, including the License Plate Shop, Metal Furniture Shop, and Sign Shop. However, there were no fatalities. In August of 1968, 300 inmates were involved in what was described as an "unsuccessful riot". Although there were no fatalities, the riot resulted in a large amount of property damage and many injuries.

In 1975, the first violent death occurred at LECI. The institution was converted from a medium security reformatory to a close security penitentiary on May 15, 1987. In January 1988, the facility converted to Unit Management. In April of 1997, the Lebanon Correctional Institution Minimum Security Camp was added to the Institution.

In January 2004, Ernie Moore was assigned as Warden of the Lebanon Correctional Institution.

## **COST**

From written information provided on site, the total budget for FY 2005 at the Lebanon Correctional Institution was **\$41,082,012.00**. The Madison Correctional Institution had a similar budget with \$41,067,209.00. **Six Ohio prisons had larger budgets than LECI**, ranging from the Lorain Correctional Institution with \$41,686,477.00 to the Mansfield Correctional Institution and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with budgets of \$54,077,439.00 and \$54,667,447.00, respectively. **Twenty-five Ohio prisons have costs less than that of the Lebanon Correctional Institution**. These costs range from a low of \$10,313,983.00 at the Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center, to \$41,067,209 at the Madison Correctional Institution.

In **FY 2005**, Lebanon Correctional Institution's **annual cost per inmate** was **\$19,867.31**, or **\$54.43 per inmate per day**. LECI had **one of the lowest costs per inmate of all Ohio prisons**. **Nineteen correctional facilities had higher annual costs per inmate than LECI**. The average annual and daily cost per inmate for the entire Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction was \$21,660.01 and \$59.34, respectively.

According to the website of August 29, 2005, the FY 2006 budget for LECI is **\$40,176,538**, which is **\$905,474 less than their FY 2005 budget**. In **FY 2006**, the annual cost per inmate at LECI was reported as **\$20,664.29**, an **increase of \$796.98 from FY 2005**. The daily cost per inmate in FY 2006 is reported as **\$56.61**, an **increase of \$2.18** from the FY 2005 daily cost per inmate.

## **STAFF**

According to the LECI website, as of February 2005, the staff total was **554**, including **318 security** staff. Only **11** employees are assigned to the Lebanon Correctional Camp. According to written information received on site, LECI employees represent approximately 70 occupations and professions. Services are provided at the Lebanon Correctional Institution that are similar to those required in any small community. These services include food service, education, health care, maintenance, sanitation, laundry, recreation, industry and religion.

As of the August 29, 2005 website data, LECI staff totaled **559**, with **325 security staff**, **slightly higher than the data cited above**. According to LECI staff, on the day of the inspection, they were experiencing a **shortage of 48 Correctional Officers**. According

to information provided on site, as of November 29, 2003, the facility had a total of **533 employees, with 314** security staff.

Although the total does not equal 533, as of November 29, 2003, the composition of staff by race and gender was reported to be as follows. Comparison data of November 9, 2005 is also provided below:

**LECI EMPLOYEES BY GENDER AND RACE  
AS OF NOVEMBER 29, 2003 AND NOVEMBER 9, 2005**

<b>GENDER</b>	<b>MEN 2003</b>		<b>WOMEN 2003</b>		<b>TOTAL 2003</b>	
<b>RACE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
WHITE	321	79.85%	68	58.62%	389	75.09% WHITE
BLACK	67	16.66	46	39.66	113	21.81% BLACK
OTHER	14	3.48	2	1.72	16	3.08% OTHER
<b>TOTAL November 29, 2003</b>	<b>402 MEN</b>	<b>77.61%</b>	<b>116 WOMEN</b>	<b>22.39%</b>	<b>518 TOTAL STAFF November 29, 2003</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>GENDER</b>	<b>MEN</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>WOMEN</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>TOTAL 2005</b>	<b>PERCENT 2005</b>
<b>RACE</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
WHITE	354	82.52%	75	60.48%	429	77.58% WHITE
BLACK	61	14.22%	47	37.90%	108	19.53% BLACK
OTHER	14	3.26%	2	1.61%	16	2.89% OTHER
<b>TOTAL November 9, 2005</b>	<b>429 MEN</b>	<b>77.58%</b>	<b>124 WOMEN</b>	<b>22.42%</b>	<b>553 TOTAL STAFF November 9, 2005</b>	<b>100%</b>

According to the November 29, 2003 data, 75.09 percent of the staff were White, with 21.81 percent Black, and an additional 3.08 percent "Other." Further, 77.61 percent of the staff were men, compared to 22.39 percent women. According to November 9, 2005 data, LECI had a total of 553 staff, an increase of 35 from the 2003 staff total of 518. The 2005

racial breakdown of staff shows that 77.58 percent of the staff were White, 19.53 percent were Black and 2.89 percent were classified as “Other.” The number of White staff increased by 40, while the number of Black staff declined by 10. The “Other” category totaled 16 in November 2003 and in November 2005. The number of male employees increased by 27 in the two-year period, while the number of female employees increased by eight. Of the male employees, the number of white men totaled 321 in November 2003, and increased by 33 in November 2005. The number of Black men totaled 67 in November 2003, and decreased by six to 61 in November 2005. Regarding female staff, the 68 White females in 2003 increased by seven in November 2005 to 75. The number of Black women increased by one in the two-year period, from 46 to 47.

## **MONTHLY AWARDS**

### **EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH**

According to the material provided on site, an **Employee of the Month Committee** was established in 1993 at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. The program is designed to recognize staff who have achieved **outstanding performance** in their respective field within the institution or their department. The Selection Committee is described as a four member multi-racial panel of male and female management and union employees appointed by the Warden. Selection is based on criteria to reflect achievement, merit, conduct and affirmative action. The panel’s mission is to recognize outstanding employees and to promote professionalism throughout the institution.

### **CELL BLOCK OF THE MONTH**

The institution also has a **Cell Block of the Month Award**. Once per month, a committee of **employees inspects all cellblocks** for sanitation, compliance with safety and other regulations, and other housing unit rules and regulations. The **committee determines which cellblock is the cleanest and closest in compliance with safety and other regulations.**

Incentives are provided to the staff and also to the inmates. **Inmates assigned to the Block are first in the meal rotation for the month. Officers assigned to the block are permitted to have their choice of good days for the month.**

**Both programs serve important good purposes. While the Employee of the Month Award is believed to exist at all Ohio prisons, not all prisons have awards comparable to the Cellblock of the Month Award. It is regarded as an excellent means to promote sanitation and pride in the housing areas. Since the environment is believed to impact attitude and behavior, attention to sanitary conditions may well prevent more serious problems, and thus serves security purposes.**

## INMATES

The DRC Chief Inspector's Annual Report for 2004 released in June 2005, lists the inmate population for each institution, with a total population of 43,982. System wide, the institutions range from 125 inmates at the Oakwood Correctional Facility to the largest population at the Chillicothe Correctional Institution with 2,690 inmates. **The population of the Lebanon Correctional Institution was reported to be 1,937.** Ten prisons had larger populations than the Lebanon Correctional Institution, while 20 prisons had smaller populations.

The breakdown of the population at each institution is provided below:

### INMATE POPULATION AT EACH OHIO PRISON BASED ON DATA IN THE DRC CHIEF INSPECTOR'S 2004 ANNUAL REPORT

INSTITUTION	INMATE POPULATION
Chillicothe CI	2,690
Mansfield CI	2,371
Richland CI	2,319
North Central CI	2,272
Ross CI	2,253
Belmont CI	2,153
Noble CI	2,084
London CI	2,071
Pickaway CI	2,038
Ohio Ref for Women	1,955
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>1,937</b>
Madison CI	1,901
Marion CI	1,847
Corr Reception C	1,649
Southeastern CI	1,560
Lorain CI	1,463
Grafton CI	1,409
Lake Erie CI	1,380
Allen CI	1,302
Trumbull CI	1,097
Warren CI	1,034
Southern Ohio CF	958
Toledo CI	791
North Coast CTF	546
Northeast PRC	530
Hocking CF	464
Franklin PRC	455
Ohio State Penitentiary	455
Dayton CI	424
Montgomery EPRC	327
Oakwood CF	125
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43,982</b>

Per the DRC website, the reported LECI inmate population in February 2005 was **1,945** with **1,063 Black** inmates or **54.65%**, **858 White** inmates or **44.11%**, **24 other** inmates or 1.23%, and reportedly no Hispanic inmates.

On the day of the inspection, LECI staff relayed that the LECI population was **1,950** and that E Block was closed. In communication received on November 9, 2005, it was reported that the **design capacity of the institution is 1,481**. According to written information provided on site, the institution has a **design capacity for 1,727**. However, the main institution can reportedly house approximately **2,150** Level 3 inmates. It is further reported that the LECI Camp houses approximately **194** inmates while the main institution maintains **1,740** in general population divided into **five units of approximately 500 beds each**, with **293** segregation beds.

In follow-up communication in August 2005, it was reported that the previously closed housing unit at LECI is now open or in the process of opening, with another 200 inmates to be added to the reported population of **2,100**. It was also noted that drugs and gang activity are down. Historically, when the LECI population exceeds 1,800, stress on support services tends to impact the overall environment.

The website of August 29, 2005 reported an August population of **2,029**, with **1,089 Black** inmates or **53.67%**, **919 White** inmates or **45.29%**, and **21 other** inmates comprising 1.03%. Inmates classified as Level One (**Minimum Security**) totaled **165**, while Level Three (**Close Security**) inmates totaled **1,864**. At the time of the inspection, the LECI website reported that **149 inmates were Level One** (Minimum), and **1,796 inmates were Level Three** (Close) security.

On the day of the inspection, the inmate population totaled **1,938**. Of that total, there were **37** inmates classified as **Away With Leave** (AWL). From written information provided on site, the reasons for the AWL status were as follows:

<u><b>TYPE OF LEAVE</b></u>	<u><b>NUMBER AWAY WITH LEAVE</b></u>
AWL Out to Court	17
AWL Furlough	12
AWL Hosp/CMC	5
AWL Hosp/OSU	2
AWL Hosp/Local	<u>1</u>
<b>Total AWL</b>	<b>37</b>

Staff relayed that segregation inmates are located in C Block, L Block, and R Block, with a total of **124 inmates in segregation**. There were 59 in C Block, 58 in R Block, and seven in L Block.

Of the 124 in segregation, the **largest group was in Local Control (LC), with 55 inmates** in LC status. Local Control placements are due to a determination that an inmate

has demonstrated a chronic inability to adjust to general population or otherwise poses a threat to the security of the institution. LC placements are authorized for up to six months, with 30-day reviews. Such reviews may result in a release from LC and return to the general population, continuance in LC, or an increase in security classification to Level Four (Maximum Security), resulting in a transfer to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Of the 124 in segregation, their status was reported as follows:

**NUMBER OF INMATES IN SEGREGATION BY STATUS**

Local Control	55
Security Control	37
Security Control/Investigation	22
Disciplinary Control	<u>10</u>
<b>Total in Segregation</b>	<b>124</b>

A breakdown of the specific segregation placements shows that four of the inmates in segregation were from the Minimum Camp, with one in Local Control and three in Security Control. The detailed breakdown of segregation placements from the Level One Minimum Camp and from the Level Three main institution is provided below.

**NUMBER OF INMATES IN SEGREGATION FROM THE LEVEL ONE  
(MINIMUM) CAMP AND FROM THE LEVEL THREE (CLOSE) INSTITUTION  
BY TYPE OF PLACEMENT**

	<u>MINIMUM CAMP</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
<b>Local Control</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>44.4%</b>
Security Control	3	34	37	29.8
Security Control/ Investigation	0	22	22	17.7
<u>Disciplinary Control</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8.1</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100%</b>

A similar breakdown was also provided on site for general population housing. E-Block was empty, and I-Block only had one inmate in the block. Other blocks ranged from 94 in D-Block to 254 in K-Block. A-Dorm and B-Dorm housed 78 and 80 respectively. The population breakdown of cellblocks and dorms is provided below:

## POPULATION OF OTHER HOUSING UNITS

K-Block	254
H-Block	232
B- Block	227
J-Block	224
A-Block	223
G-Block	219
F-Block	145
D-Block	94
B-Dorm	80
A-Dorm	78
I-Block	1
E-Block	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,901</b>

### PHYSICAL ASPECTS

The Lebanon Correctional Institution is designated as a **Level Three (close security)** facility. LECI is a single building constructed in a “Telephone Pole” configuration consisting of 11 acres under one roof. The institution is centered on a 40-acre compound on 1,925 acres. Surrounding grounds contain a 12 acre recreation yard with two baseball diamonds, three basketball courts, volleyball court, two handball courts, two horse shoe pits, and a half mile running track.

### IMPROVEMENTS

From written information provided on site, the following improvements were made at the Lebanon Correctional Institution from 2000 to February 2004:

- Replacement of all inmate housing unit cell doors and locks
- Masonry improvements to all inmate housing units
- Window replacement in inmate housing units on south side
- Fire door replacement in inmate housing units
- Seventy-three cameras installed in corridors and inmate housing units
- Seven cameras placed throughout the institution for the Investigators viewing
- Camera installation in vehicular sally port and front entrance
- Key station boxes placed in all inmate housing
- New beds in crisis cells
- Infirmary remodeling project
- Construction and implementation of the SPIDER man-down system
- Two-way intercom system throughout all corridors
- Public Address System upgrade
- Implementation of the Electronic Employee Bulletin Board
- Ten new computers with network access

- Resurfacing of the perimeter road
- Installation of a 1000KW back-up generator
- Air conditioning replacement in ADEC

As of February 2004, works in progress included a water tower addition, boiler removal in the powerhouse, bar screen replacement at the water treatment plant, and masonry improvements to institution buildings.

## **INSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS**

The grounds were observed as **well maintained**. The landscaping was basic. A flowerbed flanked each side of the sidewalk entrance, and a flagpole stood in front of the building.

Staff relayed that inmates previously were throwing trash out of the windows, which prompted communication from the Warden to the inmates. The inmates were alerted to the resulting perception of the community regarding Lebanon Correctional Institution when trash is observed from the road. Based on what was observed on the day of the inspection, the **Warden's communication to the inmates appeared to have been very effective**.

## **ENTRY BUILDING**

The entry building was **clean and orderly**. A single Correctional Officer processed the CIIC through the visitor screening procedures in a **timely, efficient, and professional manner. The Officer was courteous and processing was thorough**. Entry and exit procedures provide two check points, one check of the hand stamp, and another check of the identification card.

## **VISITING ROOM**

The visiting room was **well lit and clean**. Two Correctional Officers staffed the visiting area. Several inmates had visitors at the time of the inspection. According to LECI staff, the visiting room has a capacity of 104. It was also relayed that each inmate is permitted to have up to three visitors at a time, but reservations must be made in advance. The visitation hours for the Lebanon Correctional Institution are reported to be from 8:00 am to 12:00 pm and 12:30 pm to 3:30 pm, seven days per week, excluding holidays.

## **RECREATION PROGRAM**

In reference to the recreation yard noted above, based on the number and variety of recreation programs at the Lebanon Correctional Institution, the Recreation Department appears to have an **excellent program**. LECI recreation activities include the following:

- Softball with League Competition, Holiday Tournaments and Outside Team Play
- Basketball with League Competition, Holiday Tournaments and Outside Team Play

- Volleyball with League Competition and Special Events
- Horseshoes with League Competition and Special Events
- Handball with League Competition and Special Events
- Bowling League with League Competition and Special Events
- Flag Football with League Competition and Special Events
- Music Program
- Forty and Over Programs
- Arts and Crafts Program
- Spade Tournaments
- Chess Tournaments
- Euchre Tournaments
- Arm Wrestling Tournaments
- Umpire Training provided by outside agency
- Basketball Referee Training provided by outside agency
- Event of the Week (Weekly events including track and field events)
- Video Broadcast System

## **EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

According to the material provided on site, the facility provides the space and services for a law library, school library and main library. In addition, LECI provides a corrections education environment that allows students to choose from a variety of academic offerings including: Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Education Development (GED), and college level courses through Wilmington College. The following provides the grade levels applicable to the available academic programs:

Literacy	(Grade Level 0-6.0)
ABLE/ABE	(Grade Level 0-6.0)
Pre-GED	(Grade Level 6.1-9.0)
GED	(Grade Level 9.1+)
College Program	(Post GED/H.S.)

A review was made of the LECI monthly Enrollment Report for July 2005. According to the report, 287 inmates were enrolled in academic programs as follows:

**ACADEMIC ENROLLMENT DATA REPORTED ON LECI MONTHLY  
REPORT FOR JULY 2005**

<b>Academic Program</b>	<b>July 2005</b>	<b>Under Age 22</b>	<b>Waiting List*</b>	<b>Completers Year To Date**</b>
<b>GED</b>	<b>113</b>	17	64	42
<b>Pre-GED</b>	77	13	51	<b>111</b>
<b>Literacy</b>	64	5	0	46
<b>ABLE</b>	33	5	51	47
<b>GED Evening</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>HS OR HS Options</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	287	40	166	246

\*Waiting List refers to requests for enrollment by persons who are not yet participating.

\*\*Year To Date is the cumulative total from the fiscal start on July 1. Data was therefore extracted from the Year to Date totals from the June 2005 reports.

As shown above, LECI had **40 inmates under the age of 22 participating in educational programs**. Further, the above indicates that there is no GED Evening program or program in the High School Options category on the DRC Enrollment Form.

The above data also shows that **those enrolled in the GED/High School Equivalency Program comprise the largest group at 113 inmates**. As shown below, there were **three GED Certificates awarded in the month at LECI, and a total of 70 GED Certificates awarded in the year**. Further, 108 inmates took the GED test in the year. Based on the Certificates awarded, **nearly 65 percent of those who took the GED test passed**.

The **Pre-GED group has the largest number of completions** in the preceding year, with 111. In regard to enrollment, the Pre-GED group is the second largest with 77 enrolled, followed by the Literacy and ABLE groups.

When the Literacy and ABLE groups are combined, the 97 participants in the month comprise the second largest group. Further, the 93 Literacy and ABLE completions in the preceding year comprise the second highest group in the category. As noted above, the Literacy and ABLE groups both serve those with grade levels from 0-6.0.

## **TUTORING**

**Since the ODRC began to train and assign inmate tutors to assist other inmates, the program has been the recipient of high praise from the inmates receiving the help of tutors as well as from the tutors themselves. The positive regard for the program has been communicated over the years to the CIIC. Some have expressed a sense of pride in the assignment. In some cases, it has provided the tutor with a sense of**

**purpose that had previously been absent. The tutoring role of helping another has been reported by tutors to be rehabilitative.**

As shown below, **in just the one-month period at LECI, 1,010 hours of tutoring were logged, with nearly 12,600 hours in the preceding 12 months.** Further, the data indicates that **13 Tutors were trained in the month, with a total of 46 trained in the year. In the preceding 12-month period, LECI had 22 Literacy Tutors and six Other Tutors involved in tutoring.** There were 13 Literacy Tutors and four Other Tutors in July 2005.

As noted below, 57 children were served in the Reading Room during visits in July 2005, with a total of 1,300 children served in the preceding year. It is also reported that LECI had nine Adopt-a-School Volunteers in the preceding 12-month period.

#### **ACADEMIC DATA FROM LECI MONTHLY ENROLLMENT REPORT FOR JULY 2005**

<b>ACADEMIC</b>	<b>JULY 2005</b>	<b>YEAR TO DATE</b>
Tutor Hours	1,010	12,597
Tutors Trained	13	46
Literacy Tutors	13	22
Other Tutors	4	6
GED Administered	0	108
GED Certificates Awarded	3	70
Children Served in Reading Room	57	1,300
Ohio Reads Certificates	0	0
Narrator Hours	0	0
Adopt-a-School Volunteers	0	9

#### **CHAPLAIN'S LITERACY PROGRAM**

As noted on the LECI website, two unique programs are offered at the institution: the Sex Offender Program and Chaplain's Literacy Program. The **Chaplain's Literacy Program** is considered to be unique because 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.

#### **VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

According to the material provided on site, LECI offers a number of Vocational Programs including: **Business Information Systems, Culinary Arts, Office Systems Specialist, and Graphic Arts.** It is further reported that all vocational program teachers are fully certified. Vocational Programs are also listed as follows:

**Administrative Office/Office System Technology**  
**Baking**  
**Graphic Arts/Graphic Communication**  
**Lithograph**  
**Food Production/Management**  
**Administrative Secretarial Service**

The Monthly Enrollment Report also provides data on the number enrolled in Career/Vocational/Technical Programs. The July 2005 Enrollment Report contains the following statistics:

**CAREER/VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL ENROLLMENT DATA AT LECI FOR  
JULY 2005**

	For The Month	Under Age 22	Year To Date	Waiting List	Completers For The Month	Completers For The Year
<b>Career/Technical</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Apprenticeship</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Special Education</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Advanced Job Training	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distance Learning-Academic	0	0	0	0	0	0
DL-Advanced Job Training	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESL	0	0	0	0	0	0
Title One	0	0	0	0	0	0

According to the above data, there were **73 inmates enrolled in Career/Technical Programs** in July 2005 at LECI. Note that **32 inmates completed** such programs in the preceding year. It is also reported that **185 inmates were on a Waiting List to enroll in a Career/Technical Program.**

The above also shows that **29 inmates were in an Apprenticeship Program** in July 2005, and that **18 inmates completed an Apprenticeship** in the preceding year.

Lastly, according to the above data, **three inmates were enrolled in Special Education** in July 2005. No participants were reported in the Advanced Job Training, Distance Learning-Academic, DL-Advanced Job Training, ESL or Title One categories that appear on the ODRC Form.

## WORK PROGRAMS

According to material provided on site, LECI has a large farm operation involving 1,500 acres of tillable land, an ultra-modern dairy facility, and a pork raising operation, that provides a viable source for food and dairy products for the Lebanon Correctional Institution and other state operated institutions.

LECI work programs include the following:

- Food Services
- Advanced Data Entry Communications (ADEC)
- Ohio Penal Industries: Tag Shop, Validation Shop, Metal Furniture Shop
- Maintenance: Electric Shop, Plumbing Shop, Paint Shop, Machine Shop, Refrigeration Shop, Telecommunication Shop, Electronics Shop

Although not reflected above, Ohio Penal Industries operates four prison industries within the institution, including the Metal Furniture Shop, which involves metal fabrication for institutional furnishing, the Auto License Plate Shop, License Plate Validation Sticker Shop, and the Advanced Data Entry Communications Shop (ADEC). According to the LECI website, a Printing Shop is also cited as one of the institution's industries.

The OPI License Plate Shop was included on the inspection. Although no workers were in the shop at the time, machines were viewed, as well as basics of the operation pertaining to license plates and validation stickers for the Ohio Bureau of Motor Vehicles. According to staff on site, **278 inmates are employed as OPI workers at the Lebanon Correctional Institution.**

System wide, there are 14 prisons that have no OPI shops. Of those with OPI on site, the **Lebanon Correctional Institution employs the second largest number of OPI inmates in the prison system.** The London Correctional Institution reportedly employs 308 inmates in OPI, just slightly more than **the number employed at LECI, which has been reported to total as high as 296.**

## RECOVERY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Six substance abuse programs are available at the Lebanon Correctional Institution as follows:

Alcoholics Anonymous	Narcotics Anonymous
Substance Abuse Education Classes	Support Groups
Substance Abuse Counseling Group	Smoking Cessation Group

Narcotics Anonymous, Alcoholics Anonymous and Substance Abuse Education are also listed as Volunteer Programs, according to the material submitted on site.

## **INMATE ORGANIZATIONS**

Seven inmate organizations are available at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. One of the groups, Seventh Step Foundation, Inc. could also be considered a recovery services program. The organizations consist of the following:

Vietnam Veterans Association	Miami Valley Jaycees
Seventh Step Foundation, Inc.	Stamp Club
African Cultural Organization	Art League
Music Club	

## **RELIGIOUS SERVICES PROGRAMS**

Religious Services at the Lebanon Correctional Institution include various Christian Services as well as Muslim Services. In addition, Religious Study Classes and a Literacy Program are available. Religious Services and Programs are reported to include the following:

Various Christian Services	Muslim Services
Various Religious Study Classes	Literacy Program
Protestant Worship Volunteers	Freiheit Messengers Volunteers
Black History Program Volunteers	Martin Luther King Volunteers
Christmas Toy Program Volunteers	

Volunteer services in the religious services category include: Weekly Services, Protestant Worship Volunteers, Freiheit Messengers, Muslim Volunteers, Black History Program Volunteers, Christmas Toy Program Volunteers and Kairos Volunteers. Lebanon Correctional Institution was the first Ohio prison to host a Kairos weekend, described as a retreat for graduates of the Kairos Ministries Program.

## **COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS**

According to the LECI website, Community Service Programs include: Highway litter clean up for Ohio, Department of Transportation, flash cards for Crayons to Computers, silk screen projects for various organizations, and reading books on tape for schools. The Lebanon Correctional Institution offers community service programs and projects both inside and outside the institution.

Community services provided outside of the Lebanon Correctional Institution include the following:

Ohio Department of Transportation	Princeton Pike Church of God
Full Gospel Outreach	Middletown School Bus Garage
MRDD Middletown	Middletown Community Center
OPS	MRDD Otterbein

As indicated below, Community Services Programs inside of the Lebanon Correctional Institution include programs connected to substance abuse/recovery services programs, as well as religious services programs:

7 <sup>th</sup> Step Youth Affairs Program	Kairos
Chaplain Literacy Program	Circle Tail, Inc- Dog Training
Big Irons Club- Wood Signs	Book for School- Journals
Waynesville Recreation Department	Crayons to Computers
Books on Tape	Silk Screen Projects

The material provided on site dated February 2004 noted that plans were in progress to implement a “Happy Hats” community services project.

### **SEX OFFENDER PROGRAM**

According to the LECI website, the Sex Offender Program is one of two unique programs at the facility. It is described as a comprehensive program that lasts approximately **18 months**, and includes all ODRC required components. Prior to successful completion, participants must meet certain minimal standards, ending with completion of a written **Relapse Prevention Plan** approved by program staff. Additional requirements include the development of an **autobiography**, finalization of any homework assignments, and a minimum of **75 percent attendance**. A **working understanding of program concepts** is also required including but not limited to:

- **Offender Typology**
- **Offense Continuum**
- **Abuse Cycle**
- **Thinking Errors**
- **Risk Factors.**

The inspection included attendance of a group session of the Sex Offender Program. It was relayed that the space used for the Sex Offender Program is shared with Mental Health and Recovery Services. At the time of the inspection, empty classrooms were observed. The cleanliness of the area was extraordinary.

Staff relayed that the program is voluntary, but that since the Parole Board requires program completion, those who take the program solely to obtain parole are reportedly “not really voluntary.” Reportedly, some inmates who initially were only motivated to enroll due to the Parole Board requirement, found out through the learning process that they “have issues” previously not acknowledged.

According to staff, the group or class normally begins with 12 inmates who meet in the morning and afternoon, five days a week for 18 months. On the day of the inspection, six inmates were present. The group was in their last month of the program.

None of the inmates in the group were reported to be close to their release date. It was also reported that an inmate's length of sentence does not determine program eligibility. This alone was unique, for in recent years, proximity to release was in fact one of the eligibility criteria for placement in a Sex Offender Program. **If in fact, sex offenders are permitted to participate in a Sex Offender Program at any time in their incarceration, it is regarded as positive, and consistent with the Re-entry philosophy that provides that offenders should begin preparation for successful release from the first day of their incarceration.**

Further, in past years CIIC received reports of long waiting lists to get into sex offender programs. **It was therefore significant and extremely positive that LECI staff relayed that there is no waiting list.** Reportedly, a review is made from a list of those eligible, who are subsequently interviewed. Reportedly, if an inmate kites the Program Director, they will be added to the list for review and possible interview.

**The inmate participants were enthusiastic and attentive in the classroom.** In regard to typology, it was explained that inmates discuss their offense in detail, ask and answer questions, then determine their type. It was stated that there are three types of rapists and two types of molesters. Reportedly, the information learned from the typology can assist them in prevention methods, such as avoiding certain environments.

Written information provided to inmate program participants assists in the identification of the sex offender typology in which they are classified. It also can be used to identify behaviors that helped lead to their offense. It was reported that the information serves as an important tool for participants during and after completion of the program. The Director of the program explained the different stages required to successfully complete the program. The first step toward rehabilitation is reportedly to define oneself as either a rapist or molester, and to recognize and identify the traits that are associated with each typology.

Based on the information provided on site, there are eight varying traits that differentiate rape from molestation as follows:

<b>MOLESTATION</b>	<b>RAPE</b>
Approach is one of seduction or persuasion.	Approach is one of attack or assault.
Major parts include passive and dependent.	Aggression in the form of power and hostility are major psychological dynamics.
Offender shows a positive emotion investment in child; sees child as safe and caring.	Child is object of hostility or domination on part of offender; child is seen as “weak” and “helpless.”
Offender usually wants an ongoing sexual relationship with child for a period of time.	More typically a one-time offense with a series of different victims.
Victim is used as a prop for the fantasies and the offender projects his needs onto the victim.	Victim is depersonalized by offender, or cast into a negative symbolic role.
Offender sometimes starts with fondling and/or slowly moved towards more sexual behavior.	Offender immediately subjects child to sexual penetration and/or forces child to perform overt sexual acts/rituals.
Wants the victim to enjoy the sex and sees the sex as love and acceptance by the victim.	Usually no interests on the offender’s part in having victim enjoy the sexual acts; self-gratification is primary concern.
Sexual misuse of a child.	Sexual abuse of a child.

The meeting-style format was similar to other recovery groups, such as Alcoholics Anonymous. Each inmate participant introduced himself by stating, “I am (name, number), I am a (rapist/molester) and I belong here.” As to whether the inmate participants were sincere in their statement, “I belong here,” or if they were simply telling the Program Director what she wanted to hear, all participants responded, “yes”, that they truly believe they belong in the program and in prison.

The inmate participants relayed that the typology and the program in general has had a positive effect on their lives. One inmate stated that he initially chose to take the class to gain a positive release decision from the Parole Board. However, he said the program has been an “eye-opening” experience for him that has helped him to understand how demoralizing it can be for victims to suffer from rape and/or molestation. The inmate also stated that the program has taught him how to avoid situations and environments that provide a risk for relapse.

Another inmate participant stated that he was initially reluctant to get involved in the Sex Offender Program. He reportedly only took the class because the Parole Board requires program completion. He also relayed that he was not willing to admit he had a problem. The inmate stated that although he is still in the process of defining himself as a rapist or molester, he believes the program has played a major role in acknowledging his problem.

Material used in the program and provided on site during the attendance of the Sex Offender Program includes the following information on **Offender Typology**:

### **Molestation**

- Approach is one of seduction or persuasion; Offender gets to the victim through deception or tricks, enticement or bribes and/or manipulation.
- Major parts include being passive and dependent.
- Offender shows a positive emotional investment in the child; Sees the child as safe and caring.
- Offender usually wants an ongoing sexual relationship with the child for a period of time.
- Victim is used as a prop for fantasies and the offender projects his needs onto the victim.
- Offender sometimes starts with fondling and/or slowly moves to more sexual behavior.
- Wants the victim to enjoy the sex and sees the sex as affection, love and acceptance by the victim.
- Sexual misuse of the child.

### **Fixated**

- Main sexual attraction is to children. Offender recognizes this as a permanent state; Interest is experienced due to internal thoughts, feelings and psychological influences.
- Sexual attraction to children begins in adolescence.
- No build-up of stress and no distress.
- Continued interest and compulsive behavior
- Preplanned offenses
- Offender identifies closely with the victim and equalizes his behavior to the level of the child and/or may adopt a pseudo-parental role to the victim.
- Male (same sex) victims are primary targets.
- Little or no sexual contact with age mates; Offender is usually single or in a marriage of convenience.
- Emphasis usually focused on sexually stimulating the child and eliciting a positive erotic response from him/her.
- Usually no history of alcohol or drug abuse; offense is not usually alcohol related.
- Character immaturity; Poor socio-sexual peer relationships.
- Offense is maladaptive resolution of life development (maturation issues).

### **Regressed**

- Main sexual attraction is to adults; Sexual attraction to children is seen as temporary lapse of control and judgment due to external stress, situational influences.
- Sexual interest in children more likely to begin in adulthood.
- Build-up of stress usually seen.
- Involvement may be more sporadic and may wax and wane with stress.

- Initial offenses may be impulsive and not pre-planned.
- Substitution: Offender replaces conflicting adult relationship with involvement with a child; Victim is advanced to a pseudo adult role and in incest situations, the offender abandons his parental role.
- Female (opposite sex) victims are primary targets.
- Sexual contact with a child coexists with sexual contact with age mates; Offender is usually married or in common-law relationship.
- Emphasis is sexual interaction usually focused on offender's arousal, stimulation and sexual release; Child is cast into an adult sexual role.
- Offense is often alcohol related.
- More traditional lifestyle but underdeveloped peer relationships
- Offense is maladaptive attempt to cope with specific life stresses.

### **Rape**

- Approach is one of attack or assault; Offender gains access to victim through implied or expressed threat to the physical safety of the victim: Verbal threat, intimidation with a weapon, and/or physical force; Offender may use a position of authority to intimidate the child
- Aggression in the form of power and hostility are major psychological dynamics.
- Child is object of hostility or domination on part of offender; Child is seen as "weak" and "helpless."
- More typically a one-time offense with a series of different victims; Less likely to be on-going victimization of the same child unless the perpetrator occupies a role of authority in the life of the victim (e.g. intra-family assault.)
- Victim is depersonalized by offender, or cast into a negative symbolic role.
- Offender immediately subjects child to sexual penetration and/or forces child to perform overt sexual acts/rituals.
- Usually no interest on the offender's part in having victim enjoy the sex acts; Self-gratification is primary concern.
- Sexual abuse of the child

### **Anger**

- Aggression: More physical force used than is required to overpower the victim; Victim is battered and suffers physical trauma to all areas of the body.
- Assault is more impulsive, spontaneous, and unplanned.
- Offender's mood is one of anger and depression; A child is usually at greater risk of this type of rape in the context of his/her own family (i.e. parent-child assault.)
- Offenses are episodic.
- Language is abusive: Cursing, swearing, obscenities, degrading remarks, etc.
- Assault is of a relatively short duration.
- No weapon, or if one is employed, it is a weapon of opportunity used to hurt, not to threaten victim.
- Victim selection determined by availability: adult victim usually of same age as offender or older; Child victims sexually abused in context of battering.

- Dynamics: retaliatory aggression, retribution for perceived wrongs, injustices, or “put-downs” experienced by offender; Child victim is targeted as a way of “getting even” with an adult to whom the child is related, or as a way of “teaching a lesson to” (punishing) the child.
- Prior criminal record: crimes of aggression (reckless driving, assault and battery, breach of the peace, etc.)

### **Power**

- Aggression: Offender uses whatever threat or force is necessary to gain control of victim and overcome resistance; Victim may be physically unharmed; Physical injury would be inadvertent rather than intentional.
- Assault is premeditated and preceded by persistent rape fantasies.
- Offender’s mood state is one of anxiety.
- Offenses are repetitive and may show an increase in aggression over time.
- Language is instructional and inquisitive, giving orders, asking questions, inquiring as to victim’s response.
- Assault may extend over short period of time with victim held captive.
- Weapon frequently employed and brought to crime scene for purpose of threat or intimidation more than injury.
- Victim selection determined by vulnerability, trend toward persons the same age of the offender or younger; Child victim easily intimidated by adult authority.
- Dynamics: Compensatory aggression to feel powerful and deny deep-seated feelings of inadequacy to “show who is in control.”
- Prior criminal record: Crimes of exploitation (theft, breaking and entering, robbery, etc.) and/or sexual assaults.

### **Sadistic**

- Aggression: Physical force is erotic; If power is erotic, victim is subjected to ritualistic acts (bondage, spanking, enemas, etc.) If anger is erotic, victim is subjected to torture and sexual abuse.
- Assault is calculated and preplanned.
- Offender’s mood state is one of intense excitement and dissociation.
- Offenses are compulsive, structured, and ritualistic, often involving kidnapping.
- Language is commanding and degrading, alternately reassuring and threatening.
- Assault may be for an extended duration in which victim is abducted, held hostage, assaulted, and released/disposed of.
- Weapon generally employed to capture victim together with instruments for restraint and/or torture.
- Victim selection determined by specific characteristics or symbolic representation usually complete strangers; trend toward same sex child victim.
- Dynamics: Erotic aggression, symbolic control, elimination or destruction of threat or temptation in order to regain psychological equilibrium and achieve a sense of integration and wholeness.
- Prior criminal record: none or a bizarre ritualistic or violent offense.

## MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mental health services provided at the Lebanon Correctional Institution include counseling, evaluation, intervention and groups, including the following:

Adjustment Counseling	Crisis Intervention
Individual Counseling	Personal Development Groups
Psychological Evaluation	Sex Offender Group
Depression Group	Anger and Aggression Group
Violent Offenders Group	Stress Management
Self Awareness Group	Sex Offender Long Term Group
Medication Education Group	Sleep Hygiene Group
Health Awareness through Walking	

### CASELOAD

At the end of October 2004, LECI had **295 on their Mental Health Caseload, with 249 on the Psychiatric Caseload, which included 132 Seriously Mentally Ill**. At the end of February 2005, the Mental Health Caseload totaled **298, with 224 on the Psychiatric Caseload, which included 127 Seriously Mentally Ill**.

Per DRC policy, inmates who are on the Mental Health Caseload are classified as C1, C2, or C3. As indicated below, the Psychiatric Caseload consists of those classified as C1 and C2. The Mental Health Caseload includes those classified as C1, C2, and C3. The following provides a description of each category based on DRC policy:

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

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

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

ODRC data for the last day of June 2005 system-wide showed that 7,126 inmates were on the Psychiatric Caseload, with **3,936 classified as Seriously Mentally Ill (C1)**, and the remaining 3,195 classified as C2. An additional 914 inmates were classified as C3, with a **total of 8,045 inmates system wide on the Mental Health Caseload**. Based on the reported ODRC inmate population of 44,174, the total caseload comprised **18.21 percent of the population**. The **3,936 Seriously Mentally Ill** comprised **9.91 percent of the inmate population**.

Lebanon Correctional Institution was reported to have a population of **1,980** on the last day of June 2005, with **285 on the total Mental Health Caseload, including 222 on the Psychiatric Caseload**, with **110 designated as Seriously Mentally Ill**.

Comparative data from the other prisons is presented below:

**NUMBER OF INMATES ON THE MENTAL HEALTH CASELOAD, PSYCHIATRIC CASELOAD, AND  
THE NUMBER DESIGNATED AS SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL, WITH BREAKDOWN BY  
INSTITUTION ON JUNE 30, 2005**

PRISON	MENTAL HEALTH CASELOAD	PSYCHIATRIC CASELOAD	SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL	POPULATION
OHIO REF FOR WOMEN	734	643	349	1,875
<b>MANSFIELD CI</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>2,365</b>
CHILLICOTHE CI	466	448	261	2,734
BELMONT CI	427	344	215	2,184
NOBLE CI	394	335	256	2,139
NORTH CENTRAL CI	350	307	92	2,295
PICKAWAY CI	343	334	204	1,874
MADISON CI	343	308	184	1,958
RICHLAND CI	341	312	170	2,294
ALLEN CI	316	273	191	1,309
SOUTHEASTERN CI	310	300	119	1,589
LONDON CI	306	240	110	2,015
CORR RECEPTION CENTER	300	292	189	1,795
<b>ROSS CI</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>2,255</b>
<b>TRUMBULL CI</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1,204</b>
<b>LEBANON CI</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1,980</b>
SOUTHERN OHIO CF	273	256	129	982
NORTHEAST PRE- RELEASE C	252	230	118	514
<b>WARREN CI</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>1,042</b>
MARION CI	240	212	65	1,765
FRANKLIN PRE- RELEASE C	216	208	143	467
GRAFTON CI	206	190	141	1,391
LAKE ERIE CI	175	152	89	1,384
LORAIN CI (RECEPTION)	110	93	63	1,510
HOCKING CF	96	95	47	469
<b>TOLEDO CI</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>776</b>
NORTH COAST CORR TF	71	33	16	542
OAKWOOD CF (MENTAL HOSPITAL)	63	63	63	121
CORR MEDICAL CENTER	25	25	18	109
OHIO STATE PENITENTIARY	10	8	1*	468
MONTGOMERY EDUC PRE- RELEASE C	3	0	0	349
DAYTON CI	2	0	0	420
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,045</b>	<b>7,126</b>	<b>3,936</b>	<b>44,174</b>

\*Per communication with the OSP Warden's office on 9-21-05, the one inmate who is Seriously Mentally Ill is assigned to the OSP Minimum Camp, and is classified as Level One.

Based on the above data, the **Ohio Reformatory for Women has the largest number of mentally ill inmates in all categories.** The **734** women on the Mental Health Caseload comprise **39.15 percent of their population.** Women are also assigned to the Northeast Pre-Release Center (NEPRC) and Franklin Pre-Release Center (FPRC). The 252 mentally ill at **NEPRC** comprise **49.02 percent of their population** of 514. The 216 mentally ill at **FPRC** comprise **46.25 percent of their population** of 467.

Of the prisons for men, the **Mansfield** Correctional Institution currently has **the largest number on the Mental Health caseload, with 478.** However, **Chillicothe** Correctional Institution not only has the largest number of men on the **Psychiatric Caseload with 448,** but also has the **largest number of Seriously Mentally Ill at 261.**

The **Lebanon and Trumbull** Correctional Institutions **each have 285 inmates on the Mental Health Caseload.** There are 14 prisons with a larger number of inmates on the Mental Health Caseload, and 16 prisons with fewer on the Mental Health Caseload.

Since Lebanon Correctional Institution is a Level Three (Close Security) institution, a review was made of the mentally ill population at the other Level Three institutions. The results are provided below:

**MENTALLY ILL POPULATION AT LEVEL THREE PRISONS FOR MEN  
WITH POPULATION AND PERCENT ON CASELOAD**

<b>LEVEL 3 PRISONS FOR MEN</b>	<b>MH CASELOAD</b>	<b>PSYCHIATRIC CASELOAD</b>	<b>SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>PERCENT ON MH CASELOAD</b>
Trumbull CI	285	246	110	1,204	23.67
Warren CI	244	235	175	1,042	23.42
Mansfield CI	478	422	166	2,365	20.21
Correctional Reception Center	300	292	189	1,795	16.71
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1,980</b>	<b>14.39</b>
Ross CI	290	224	114	2,255	12.86
Toledo CI	91	76	28	776	11.73
Lorain C I (Reception Center)	110	93	63	1,510	7.28
<b>TOTAL MALE LEVEL 3 FACILITIES</b>	<b>2,083</b>	<b>1,810</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>12,927</b>	<b>16.11%</b>

As shown above, the percentage of inmates on the Mental Health Caseload among the Level Three prisons, ranges from 7.28 percent at the Lorain Correctional Institution, to more than 23 percent at both the Warren and Trumbull Correctional Institutions. More

than 20 percent of the inmate population at the Mansfield Correctional Institution (MANCI) is on the Mental Health Caseload. However, unlike Warren and Trumbull Correctional Institutions, MANCI does not have a Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally ill on site. As shown below, the Mental Health Caseload at the **Mansfield Correctional Institution comprises 23 percent of the inmates on the Mental Health Caseload in all Level Three prisons.** The number on the Mental Health Caseload at the Correctional Reception Center, Lebanon, Trumbull and Ross Correctional Institutions each comprise **14 percent** of the Mental Health Caseload in Level Three prisons.

The Mental Health Caseload at the Warren Correctional Institution comprises 12 percent of the total Mental Health Caseload for Level Three prisons. The **Toledo** Correctional Institution has the smallest percentage on the Mental Health Caseload of the Level Three prisons, with only **four percent** of the total Mental Health Caseload for Level Three prisons.

**NUMBER ON MENTAL HEALTH CASELOAD AT LEVEL THREE PRISONS  
FOR MEN BY INSTITUTION WITH NUMBER AND PERCENT**

<b>LEVEL 3 PRISONS FOR MEN</b>	<b>NUMBER ON MH CASELOAD</b>	<b>PERCENT OF TOTAL MH CASELOAD OF LEVEL 3 PRISONS</b>
<b>Mansfield CI</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>22.95%</b>
Correctional Reception C	300	14.40
Ross CI	290	13.92
Trumbull CI	285	13.68
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>13.68</b>
Warren CI	244	11.71
Lorain CI (Reception C)	110	5.28
<b>Toledo CI</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>4.37</b>
TOTAL Level Three Prisons	2,083	100%

**MENTAL HEALTH AND SEGREGATION DATA**

Mental Health data includes information on the number of inmates in Segregation, the number of inmates in Segregation who are on the Mental Health Caseload, and the percentage of inmates in segregation that are on the Mental Health Caseload. **System wide, at the end of June 2005, there were 1,578 inmates in Segregation, including 365 who are on the Mental Health caseload, comprising 23.13 percent of the inmates in Segregation.**

At LECI, there were **116 in segregation, including 23 inmates who are on the Mental Health Caseload, comprising 19.83 percent of the inmates in Segregation.** There are 15 prisons with a larger percentage of mentally ill in Segregation, ranging **from 20 percent at the Correctional Reception Center, to 68.5 percent at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.** Seven prisons have from 20 to 28.57 percent, and five prisons

have from 32.20 percent to 36.36 percent of their segregation population consisting of mentally ill. At the **Trumbull Correctional Institution and Hocking Correctional Facility the mentally ill comprise 50 and 57.14 percent of their inmates in Segregation, respectively.**

There are 16 prisons with a smaller percentage of mentally ill in Segregation than LECI, including six prisons with no mentally ill in segregation. The remainder ranges from 2.86 percent at the Ohio State Penitentiary, to 18.84 percent at the Pickaway Correctional Institution. Data for each institution is provided below:

**NUMBER OF INMATES IN SEGREGATION SYSTEMWIDE WITH BREAKDOWN OF  
NUMBER OF INMATES IN SEGREGATION WHO ARE ON THE MENTAL HEALTH  
CASELOAD BY INSTITUTION ON JUNE 30, 2005**

<b>PRISON</b>	<b>NUMBER IN SEGREGATION</b>	<b>NUMBER IN SEGREGATION ON MH CASELOAD</b>	<b>PERCENT OF SEGREGATION INMATES ON MH CASELOAD</b>
<b>Ohio Ref for Women</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>68.25%</b>
<b>Hocking CF</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>57.14</b>
<b>Trumbull CI</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50.00</b>
<b>Toledo CI</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>36.36</b>
<b>Allen CI</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>35.71</b>
<b>Southeastern CI</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>33.33</b>
<b>Chillicothe CI</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>32.84</b>
<b>Madison CI</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>32.20</b>
North Coast CTF	14	4	28.57
Noble CI	67	16	23.88
Southern Ohio CF	63	15	23.81
Warren CI	86	20	23.26
London CI	67	14	20.90
Ross CI	127	26	20.47
Corr Reception C	30	6	20.00
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19.83</b>
Pickaway CI	69	13	18.84
North Central CI	65	12	18.46
Marian CI	34	6	17.64
Mansfield CI	107	15	14.02
Belmont CI	89	13	14.61
Lake Erie CI	69	9	13.04
Grafton CI	26	3	11.54
Lorain CI	38	4	10.53
Richland CI	78	7	8.97
Ohio State Pen	35	1	2.86
Dayton CI	10	0	0
Franklin PRC	5	0	0
Oakwood CF	0	0	0
Corr Medical C	0	0	0
Northeast PRC	0	0	0
Montgomery EPRC	1	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,578</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>23.13</b>

Aside from the **percentage** of mentally ill in segregation noted above, it is equally important to monitor the **number** of mentally ill in segregation. Of the 32 prisons, **six**

**had no mentally ill in segregation, including the three pre-release centers, the Corrections Medical Center, the Oakwood Correctional Facility (Mental Hospital), and Dayton Correctional Institution.**

**The Ohio Reformatory for Women had the largest number in segregation at 43, comprising nearly 12 percent of the mentally ill in segregation system wide. The Ross Correctional Institution had 26 mentally ill in segregation, the largest number of the prisons for men, comprising 7.1 percent of the mentally ill in segregation system wide, followed by Southeastern and Lebanon Correctional Institutions, each with 23 mentally ill in segregation.** There were 22 mentally ill in segregation at the Chillicothe Correctional Institution. Warren and Trumbull Correctional Institutions each had 20 mentally ill in segregation.

Details on the number in segregation on the mental health caseload by institution are provided below:

**NUMBER OF INMATES ON THE MENTAL HEALTH CASELOAD WHO WERE IN  
SEGREGATION ON JUNE 30, 2005 WITH BREAKDOWN BY INSTITUTION**

<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>NUMBER IN SEGREGATION ON THE MH CASELOAD</b>	<b>PERCENT OF MENTALLY ILL IN SEGREGATION SYSTEM WIDE</b>
<b>OHIO REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>11.78%</b>
<b>ROSS CI</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>7.1</b>
<b>SOUTHEASTERN CI</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6.3</b>
<b>LEBANON CI</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6.3</b>
<b>CHILlicoTHE CI</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6.0</b>
<b>WARREN CI</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5.5</b>
<b>TRUMBULL CI</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5.5</b>
<b>MADISON CI</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5.2</b>
NOBLE CI	16	4.4
SOUTHERN OHIO CF	15	4.1
MANSFIELD CI	15	4.1
ALLEN CI	15	4.1
LONDON CI	14	3.8
PICKAWAY CI	13	3.6
BELMONT CI	13	3.6
NORTH CENTRAL CI	12	3.3
TOLEDO CI	12	3.3
LAKE ERIE CI	9	2.5
RICHLAND CI	7	1.9
CORR RECEPTION C	6	1.6
MARION CI	6	1.6
HOCKING CF	4	1.1
NORTH COAST CTF	4	1.1
LORAIN CI	4	1.1
GRAFTON CI	3	.8
OHIO STATE PEN	1	.3
DAYTON CI	0	0
FRANKLIN PRC	0	0
OAKWOOD CF	0	0
CORR MEDICAL CENTER	0	0
NORTHEAST PRC	0	0
MONTGOMERY EDUCATION PRC	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>100%</b>

## SUICIDES

From October 25, 2003 through December 31, 2004, there were 12 inmate suicides in Ohio prisons, including **one at the Lebanon Correctional Institution**. From one to two suicides occurred at each of nine prisons. One suicide each occurred at the Ohio Reformatory for Women, as well as the Chillicothe, Dayton, Lebanon, London, and Warren Correctional Institutions. Two suicides each occurred at the Correctional Reception Center, Lorain Correctional Institution (also a reception center), and Ross Correctional Institution.

From January 1, 2005 through October 25, 2005, there have been six suicides, including one at the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center, a private correctional facility. Three of the six suicides occurred in May 2005. There was one suicide each at the Correctional Reception Center, Mansfield and Warren Correctional Institutions, all level three (close) security institutions. The level four (maximum) security Southern Ohio Correctional Facility had two suicides, both in June 2005. **No suicide has occurred at the Lebanon Correctional Institution thus far in 2005.**

### NUMBER OF SUICIDES BY INSTITUTION FROM JANUARY 1, 2005 TO OCTOBER 25, 2005

<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>SUICIDES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
SOCF	2	6-4-05, 6-7-05
WCI	1	2-11-05
MANCI	1	5-7-05
CRC	1	5-19-05
NEOCC*	1	5-1-05
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	

\*Private prison

## SUICIDE ATTEMPTS

Monthly data on the number of suicide attempts at each institution was reviewed. At the LECI, there were **four suicide attempts in the eight-month period** from January 2005 through August 2005, with one attempt in January, February, May and August. Lebanon and Madison Correctional Institutions, as well as the Ohio State Penitentiary and Oakwood Correctional Facility (a mental hospital), each had four suicide attempts in the period.

There were 101 suicide attempts system wide in the period, from none at seven of the prisons, to 18 at the Correctional Reception Center. Lorain Correctional Institution, also a reception center, had no suicide attempts in the period. The second highest number of suicide attempts occurred at the Ohio Reformatory for Women, with 13 attempts. The Chillicothe Correctional Institution ranked third with 11 attempts in the period. The

Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and the Southeastern Correctional Institution each had seven attempts.

The number of suicide attempts at each institution from January through August 2005 is provided below:

**NUMBER OF SUICIDE ATTEMPTS  
FROM JANUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2005 BY INSTITUTION**

INSTITUTION	NUMBER	PERCENT
<b>Corr Reception Center</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17.82</b>
<b>Ohio Ref for Women</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12.87</b>
<b>Chillicothe CI</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10.89</b>
Southeastern CI	7	6.93
Southern Ohio CF	7	6.93
Toledo CI	5	4.95
Ohio State Penitentiary	4	3.96
Oakwood CF	4	3.96
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.96</b>
Madison CI	4	3.96
Mansfield CI	3	2.97
Trumbull CI	3	2.97
London CI	2	1.98
Noble CI	2	1.98
North Central CI	2	1.98
Richland CI	2	1.98
Ross CI	2	1.98
Allen CI	1	.99
Belmont CI	1	.99
Dayton Ci	1	.99
Franklin PRC	1	.99
Grafton CI	1	.99
Lake Erie CI	1	.99
Northeast PRC	1	.99
Pickaway CI	1	.99
<b>Corr Medical C</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Lorain CI</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Hocking CF</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Marion CI</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Montgomery EPRC</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>North Coast CTF</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Warren CI</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
TOTAL	101	100%

## GENERAL POPULATION HOUSING

The Lebanon Correctional Institution houses General Population inmates in Blocks A-G and H-K. **The halls outside the blocks were extremely clean.** Each cell contained a television with a wire antenna that stretched across the block for each cell to receive reception. The fire exit was located in the back of the block.

The dayroom, which provides inmates with a place to gather, consisted of seven tables with chairs and a capacity for 28 inmates. Staff relayed that inmates have access to the dayroom on a rotating basis. Reportedly, the dayroom is available in the morning from 7:30 am to 11:00 am, in the afternoon from 12:00 pm to 12:30 pm, and in the evening from 6:00 pm to 8:45 pm.

K-Block, the largest of the General Population blocks, housed **254 inmates in double bunks.** Two Correctional Officers were present in the block. **The block was clean, and the inmates were calm and orderly. The noise level was moderate, with light conversation** as the inmates filed in from recreation and work assignments.

The temperature in the cellblock was **cool.** Inmates complained that K-Block has only **three shower stalls, with only two showerheads in functioning order. Staff relayed that it only takes 24 hours to repair the showers. The shower ceiling was cracked, but the floor appeared to be in good condition.** A sign was posted outside the showers stating “three in-three out.” **Of the three showerheads, only one worked. One of the two worked only after banging on it. It was relayed that inmates in the 96 cells on the bottom range use the three showers. However, according to information provided on November 9, 2005, there are 50 cells on the bottom range which could house a maximum of 100 inmates.**

Some inmates complained of **roaches** in the block. One inmate stated that he killed five roaches in the last three days. LECI staff relayed that the block had **just been sprayed. One added, “It’s 100 times better than in the last five years.” Staff relayed that an outside contractor is used for exterminating services. However, they were uncertain of the frequency of such services. Different staff cited receipt of exterminating services in the block every two months, every three months, and every six months. In follow-up communication received on November 9, 2005, it was clarified that housing areas are sprayed once per month.**

**It was significantly positive to hear inmates comment that Officers at LECI are “respectful.”**

**Some inmates relayed that there is too much idleness within the blocks, and that “They’re slow on programs here.”** Detailed information on the programs available at LECI is provided in this report, based on the information made available on the subject. Historically, LECI has been known as the **“program prison.” It is a place where many innovative programs have been initiated or implemented for possible duplication elsewhere.** Based on the information provided, LECI does not appear to be lacking in

programs. However, the extent to which they have more or less than in the past, in terms of number of programs and in actual enrollment is not known. **Idleness has rarely been a reported problem at LECI.** With budget cuts system wide in recent years, programs may have had to be reduced in order to maintain what has been regarded as indisputably essential. However, **a strong case can be made that idleness breeds security problems. Because programs alleviate idleness, they serve fundamental safety and security purposes.** Some years ago at one particular prison, in which many programs were suddenly eliminated, Correctional Officers approached the CIIC on inspections, advocating the “need” for the return of programs. Officers, who previously were highly skeptical if not critical of programming, had clearly become program advocates after experiencing the prison environment without programs.

Inmates also commented on food services. Some stated that too often the **same foods are served for lunch and dinner.** The most frequently cited and serious concern pertained to birds in Food Services. One stated, “The **dining room is like an aviary,**” with birds flying around. Inmates stated that they have used the inmate **grievance procedure** to relay the problem. The responses have reportedly stated that they will “look into it.” Inmates relayed their belief that **“They’re required to have screens. It’s a health issue. Check out the third dining hall. Windows are broken. They blame the inmates, but they have cameras in there. Use the cameras, and if an inmate breaks a window, hold them accountable.”**

Inmates also relayed the serious **allegation that “Staff don’t answer kites.” Responsiveness to kite communication is of fundamental importance.** Kite communication is a means by which inmates may seek information or assistance from staff. When concerns are addressed by kite communication, there is no need for inmates to turn to the grievance procedure to seek assistance. **Kite responsiveness can reduce the burden on the grievance procedure and also prevent problems from becoming crises.**

## COMMISSARY

Some inmates complained of a reduced allotment of state issued underwear, alleging that it is now sold in the Commissary. In the subsequent discussion with Commissary staff, it was relayed that their profit goes to the I & E fund, and that they are prohibited from taking more than a 15 percent mark up. The staff relayed that socks, for example, sell for only 99 cents. The actual Commissary Product list includes a four pack of toilet paper for \$1.50, socks for \$1.14, T-shirt for \$3.24, and jock straps for \$5.49. No item that could be defined as underwear is contained on the list.

The LECI Commissary list includes **Nicoderm Patches** for \$45.10. With the ODRC policy change in November 2005, which bans indoor smoking, **some staff at other institutions have discussed the possibility of selling the patches in the commissary, but have expressed concerns regarding possible misuse. Since LECI has been selling the patches for at least a year and a half, they have the benefit of their experience,**

**which may be helpful information to other institutions that may be considering stocking patches in their Commissary for the first time.**

### **SMOKING POLICY**

Smoking was permitted in all the blocks, except F-Block. However, the indoor smoking ban for all prisons goes into effective in November 2005. LECI staff have noted the expected difficulties with implementing the new policy at LECI due to the physical aspects of the facility, in which neither inmates nor staff have frequent opportunities for outdoor breaks. Recent discussions with LECI staff on the subject reflect a seriousness and sensitivity to the policy's impact on inmates. **The positive attitude and approach to implementation of the new DRC policy, coupled with an increase in outdoor opportunities, are believed to be factors that will help to minimize if not totally prevent potential problems.**

### **SEGREGATION**

According to written information provided on site, the Segregation Unit consists of **293 beds**, which are spread over three blocks: C-Block, L-Block and R-Block.

According to LECI staff on site, **assaultive inmates** are placed in L-Block. LECI staff also relayed that segregation blocks contain a **mixture of Security Control, Disciplinary Control and Local Control statuses, except for R block, which is reportedly for those who failed a drug test, and for those on Suicide Watch.** As noted below, at least one inmate in L Block was on Suicide Watch.

In follow-up communication on November 9, 2005, it was reported that LECI has **always attempted to separate the three classifications in designated areas. C Block serves as the primary block housing LC inmates, while R Block serves as the primary block housing SC and DC inmates. L-1 is used for inmates pending transfer to a higher security level.** It was further noted that there are times when it is necessary to mix statuses to accommodate separations. **From a management and functional perspective, it would seem to be easier for staff to house SC, PC investigation, DC and LC in separate areas. From a security perspective, and with what was learned from past incidents, cellies in segregation should be of the same status.**

Over the years, more than one tragedy has occurred in close security (level three) prisons, in which an inmate has been killed by his cellie in segregation. Such a death at the Lebanon Correctional Institution years ago prompted a change to single cell inmates in segregation at LECI. According to information provided on November 9, 2005, **all inmates in LECI Isolation Units are single celled and have been since the Warden's arrival in January 2004.** It was further reported that the only time that they would ever double cell inmates in isolation is if an emergency situation arose and they needed to place inmates in a secured environment quickly. **While some close (level three) institutions still double cell inmates in isolation, Lebanon Correctional Institution is reportedly not one of them.**

While single celling is regarded as the best means to prevent inmate/inmate violence in segregation, the incidents that have occurred revealed the **importance of immediate responsiveness of staff to inmate reports of problems with their cellies. They also reveal the importance of good judgment in the assignment of two specific individuals to share a cell in segregation. It is as important as the same decision in the assignment of cellies in general population.**

On the day of the inspection, the count sheet documented that **124 inmates were in segregation**, with 59 inmates in C-Block, 58 inmates in R-Block, and seven inmates in L-Block. Of the number in segregation, 59 inmates were in Security Control, 55 inmates were in Local Control, and 10 inmates were in Disciplinary Control.

**Security Control** is a short-term segregation placement that lasts up to 21 days, with reviews at seven-day intervals for those under investigation, or those accused of rule infractions pending receipt of a conduct report or Rules Infraction Board hearing (R.I.B). Security Control is also the term used for persons in Protective Control Investigation status.

**Disciplinary Control** is a short-term segregation placement for up to 15 days, as a penalty for an R.I.B. conviction.

**Local Control** is an indefinite segregation placement for up to 180 days, with reviews at 30-day intervals. Local Control was first established by Administrative Rule in September 1984, and continues to be used for inmates who have demonstrated a “chronic inability to adjust” to the general population, or whose presence in the general population would likely disrupt the orderly operation of the institution. Local Control was created by the ODRC in part to serve as an additional consequence for rule violations beyond the 15-day Disciplinary Control placement issued by the Rules Infraction Board. It was also created in part as an alternative to transferring an inmate to a higher security institution. It was believed that such transfers had contributed to overcrowding at the higher security institutions which received inmates who many believed could have and should have been more appropriately retained at a lower level institution. Local Control was also created to provide a strong disincentive to rule violations. The concept paper introducing Local Control likened it to a “harsh,” and “bare bones existence,” providing only the essentials in order to serve as an effective disincentive for misconduct that would result in a return to LC. According to the current Administrative Rule on LC, restrictions and privileges are the same as those in Security Control and Disciplinary Control status.

In discussions with institutional staff over the years, LC is typically not viewed as particularly successful as an alternative to disciplinary transfer. However, it is generally viewed as effective in delaying disciplinary transfers. That is, LC placements are viewed as a prerequisite to such transfers.

With the CIIC’s inspection and evaluation of operations and conditions of the Ohio Department of Youth Services’ facilities beginning in April 2005, the contrast between DYS and ODRC in their perspective of and use of segregation and isolation became quite

apparent, not only as a response to rule violations, but also to suicidal persons. The extent to which the adult prison systems nationwide use isolation/segregation is the subject of inquiry of at least one national organization. It is anticipated that the CIIC will look further into the use of isolation/segregation in ODYS and/or ODRC due to their totally contrasting policies.

## **CELL ISOLATION**

LECI is believed to be the first and remains one of a very few institutions to use “cell isolation,” (termed “cell ice” by inmates), which involves confinement to one’s general population cell. Some have described cell isolation as confinement to one’s cell at times other than work, school or meals while remaining in general population housing and status. Others have indicated that cell isolation can include confinement to one’s cell without release for work or school. In an October 2005 letter, an SOCF inmate wrote about LECI:

The cells are too small, two man cells, and that’s where your trouble really starts. You get a ticket and get put on **cell ice. 15 days or 30 days you can’t come out of your cell unless you have a visit, chow, pass or shower. Your cellie is on ice as well, even if he don’t have nothing to do with it. He is stuck in the cell. A fight can break out at any moment.** Using the toilet, (that’s a) big problem because you have to use it while he is in there. We give each other respect by leaving the cell, but if you’re on cell ice, no way...I’ve met some C.O.s that say they hate all inmates. When asked why, they say – just do.

**Cell isolation has positive aspects as an alternative to segregation placement**, while serving as a negative consequence and penalty for a rule violation. However, **no written ODRC policy or procedure exists on cell isolation**. Practices regarding cell isolation have been the subject of complaint in prior years. **ODRC policy and administrative rules regarding disciplinary procedures and penalties should acknowledge the existence of cell isolation and provide clear guidelines for those institutions which have adopted such practices.**

## **L-BLOCK**

The inspection included both L-Block and R-Block. **The hall or corridor outside of the blocks was extremely clean. The entry and exit area of L-block was also clean.**

An Officer demonstrated how overhead lights and showers are turned off and on. It was noted that inmates have the ability to pull a chain in their cell to turn the cell light off and on.

A small bookcase stocked with books was observed in the front of the block.

Toilets observed in two empty cells were in need of cleaning. The toilet in a third empty cell would not flush.

## **R-BLOCK**

Although double bunks were observed and/or reported to be in R block on the day of the inspection, according subsequent clarification, R block and all segregation blocks are reportedly single celled. As noted previously, on November 9, 2005, it was reported that all segregation inmates are single celled and that at least since January 2004, no inmate in R, L or C Block has ever been double celled.

On the day of the inspection, inside recreation cages were observed, consisting of four fenced in areas containing exercise equipment. In R-Block, **the noise level was moderate to loud. Inmates appeared to be restless. Although the shower was in need of cleaning, the block itself was clean and cool.**

**One inmate stated that it is either extremely cold or extremely hot in the block, depending on the weather.** A sign reading "Hard of hearing," was posted at one cell. Inmates relayed difficulties with the **plumbing and sanitation. One inmate noted that his toilet had been leaking for two days** and he reportedly received no assurance when it would be repaired. Another inmate alleged that **roaches and rats** are an issue in the segregation unit.

## **SUICIDE WATCH**

L-Block housed seven inmates, including one inmate on Close Suicide Watch. The inmate on Close Suicide Watch requested a CIIC business card but was denied the request by an Officer. A Sergeant subsequently advised the inmate that he would place the card in the inmate's pack up so that he would have access to it after release from Suicide Watch.

As noted in the CIIC Biennial Report, page 104, **changes are recommended in policy and practice regarding suicide watch.** That is, according to the "Technical Assistance Report on Suicide Prevention Practices within the ODRC" by Lindsay M. Hayes, Project Director of the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, which provides Suicide Prevention and Liability Reduction Services, housing is one of the critical components of a suicide prevention policy. The Hayes' report includes the following:

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

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

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

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

## MEDICAL SERVICES

### STAFFING

The Medical Monthly Institutional Statistical Summary Reports for the Lebanon Correctional Institution from January through August 2005 were reviewed.

The inmate population reported for each month increased from a low of **1,936** in January 2005 to the high of **2,079** in August 2005, an increase of 143 inmates.

Civil Service Medical staff include a Health Care Administrator, Nurses (both R.N. and LPN.s), Clerical staff, and a Pharmacy Technician. There is **one vacancy for an RN** reported in each month from **May through August 2005.** No RN vacancy is reported from January through April 2005. No LPN vacancies are reported from January through August 2005. R.N. overtime hours per month ranged from zero to 232 hours per month, while L.P.N. overtime hours ranged from zero to nine hours per month.

The following summarizes the monthly data on actual hours worked per month by civil service medical staff in the period:

**ACTUAL HOURS WORKED BY LECI CIVIL SERVICE MEDICAL STAFF  
FROM JANUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2005 BY POSITION**

<b>CIVIL SERVICE STAFF</b>	<b>LOW</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>AUGUST 2005</b>
RN	0	1864	1640
Health Care Administrator	0	156	144
LPN	0	160	136
Clerical	0	160	120
Pharmacy Technician	0	160	0
<b>RN OVERTIME</b>	0	232	136
<b>LPN OVERTIME</b>	0	9	9

**No information is reported on the LECI monthly medical reports on the “Actual Time” worked by contractual staff.** That is, the sections for “Actual Time” are blank. **This renders it impossible to monitor actual time, and to compare actual time with projected time for planning purposes, using the standard medical form.** Only the “Projected Time” in hours is reported.

Ancillary Dental Staff’s projected time includes one month in which the hours are either 40 or 90. **Due to the handwritten forms, which are distributed by copy, the data is not always legible.**

Staff relayed that the LECI **Physician is available five days a week.** Reportedly, the Physician sees inmates **one to two days after signing up for sick call.** However, a member of the medical staff relayed that some inmates may have to wait longer, depending on their specific needs. According to the monthly reports, contractual **Physician hours ranged from 58 hours per month to 80 hours per month.** Contractual L.P.N. hours ranged from zero to 48 hours per month from January through August 2005.

In addition to the Physician and L.P.N. hours, Contractual Staff include a Dentist, Ancillary Dental Staff, Pharmacist and Pharmacy Technician, and Lab and X-Ray Technicians.

The following data is based on the report of the number of hours projected per month by LECI Medical Contractual Staff, with the monthly range and hours projected for August 2005:

**PROJECTED TIME (IN HOURS) OF LECI CONTRACTUAL STAFF  
FROM JANUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2005**

<b>CONTRACTUAL STAFF</b>	<b>LOW</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>AUGUST 2005</b>
Dentist	68	200	200
Ancillary Dental Staff	72	120	120
Pharmacy Technician	24	184	184
Pharmacist	120	120	120
<b>Physician</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>
LPN	0	48	0
Lab Technician	24	64	64
X-Ray Technician	24	24	24

As shown above, the Dentist and Dental Ancillary staff have more hours than other types of contractual staff, followed by the Pharmacist and Pharmacy Technician. As noted above, projected time for a Physician ranged from only 58 to 80 hours per month.

Regarding primary health care activities, there were from 67 to 163 intake nurse's screenings per month, with 163 screenings in August 2005. A smaller number were **screened by a Physician, from 23 to 80 per month**, with 39 Physician's screenings in August 2005 as shown below:

**LECI PRIMARY HEALTH CARE ACTIVITIES  
FROM JANUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2005**

<b>SCREENINGS</b>	<b>LOW</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>AUGUST 2005</b>
Parent Institution Screening	67	163	163
Intake Nurses Screening	67	163	163
<b>Physician Screening</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>39</b>

According to the monthly medical reports, Nurse's Sick Call in general population is conducted on first and second shifts. From 168 to 318 inmates were seen on first shift sick call from January through July 2005, with 200 seen in July 2005. A smaller number were seen on sick call on second shift, from zero to 40 seen per month, with 40 seen in July 2005. In all, from 190 to 315 inmates in general population were seen on Nurse's Sick Call in the period, with 240 seen in July 2005.

Of the number seen on Nurse's Sick Call, from **128 to 275 were referred to a Physician**, with 210 such referrals in July 2005 as shown below:

### NURSES SICK CALL SCREENING

NURSES SCREENING (GENERAL POPULATION)	LOW	HIGH	JULY 2005
First Shift	168	318	200
Second Shift	0	40	40
<b>Nurses Sick Call Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>240</b>
Referred to Physician	128	275	210

The data on Doctor's Sick Call shows that from 176 to 360 visits were scheduled per month from January through July 2005. Further, there were from five to 20 "No Shows," with 45 in July 2005. With from zero to six emergency add on appointments per month, from **176 to 360 inmates were seen on Doctor's Sick Call** in the period. In July 2005, a total of 297 inmates were seen on Doctor's Sick Call.

### DOCTORS SICK CALL

DOCTORS SICK CALL	LOW	HIGH	JULY 2005
Scheduled Visits	176	360	297
No Shows	5	50	45
Emergent Add On Appointments	0	6	0
<b>Doctors Sick Call Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>297</b>

According to the monthly reports, Nurse's Sick Call in Segregation was conducted on First and Third Shifts, with from **zero to four seen on First Shift, and from 19 to 28 seen on Third Shift**. In all, from 19 to 29 inmates per month were seen on Nurse's Sick Call in segregation. According to the reports, the **Physician made no on site visits to segregation** during the entire period from January through July 2005.

### NURSES SICK CALL IN SEGREGATION

SEGREGATION SCREENINGS (NURSES SICK CALL)	LOW	HIGH	JULY 2005
First Shift	0	4	4
Third Shift	19	28	25
<b>Nurses Sick Call Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>
On Site Seg. Visits by Physician	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

The monthly reports provide data on “Emergency Triage.” **From zero to 113 inmates were screened by the nurse for emergencies, and from zero to 11 were treated on site by a Physician.**

According to the reports, there were from **three to 40 trips per month to emergency rooms**, with up to 26 per month sent to the Local Hospital Emergency Room, and from zero to 14 per month sent to OSU Hospital Emergency Room. From zero to four per month who were sent to the Local Hospital Emergency Room, were subsequently sent to OSU Hospital Emergency Room.

From zero to nine inmates were admitted to the Corrections Medical Center, and from one to nine per month were admitted to OSU Hospital. From zero to one per month were admitted to a Local Hospital. In all, there were from one to nine emergency admissions per month.

According to the reports, from **five to 18 staff were provided with emergency treatment per month, but from zero to only one visitor was provided with emergency treatment.** The following presents the data on Emergency Triage as provided in the monthly reports.

#### EMERGENCY TRIAGE

EMERGENCY TRIAGE	LOW	HIGH	AUGUST 2005
Screened by Nurse	0	113	110
<b>Treated by Physician on Site</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>
Sent to Local Emergency D	2	26	26
Sent to OSU Emergency D	0	14	14
<b>Total Emergency D Trips</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>
Sent to OSU Emergency D from Local Ed	0	4	4
Admitted to Local Hospital	0	1	1
Admitted to CMC	0	9	9
Admitted to OSU Hospital	1	9	9
<b>Total Emergency Admissions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
Emergency Treatment of Staff	5	18	12
Emergency Treatment of Visitor	0	1	0

## INFIRMARY

The LECI infirmary had three beds in one room, and one infirmary cell, all occupied. Although the infirmary has **a small number of beds, staff relayed that the space has always been adequate.** The infirmary is reportedly used overnight when an inmate has a test at the Correctional Medical Center the next day, and when the inmate is instructed not to eat or drink prior to the test.

LECI staff relayed that the institution is considering installing a bathroom in the back of the medical ward to eliminate the need for inmates to be cuffed and escorted to the restroom by a Correctional Officer.

The infirmary was **very clean.** One inmate porter was cleaning the examination room at the time of the inspection. **The porter was complimented on his work, and seemed very proud of the condition of his area.**

According to the monthly reports, the infirmary recorded 90 bed days each month from January through August 2005. Further, from zero to 14 inmates were in the infirmary for purely medical reasons. From zero to eight inmates were in the infirmary for mental health reasons. In no case was the infirmary used for security reasons. The data is presented below:

### INFIRMARY CARE WITH BED DAYS

Infirmary Care	Low	High	August 2005
Bed Days	90	90	90
Used for Medical	0	14	0
Used for Mental Health	0	8	0
Used for Security	0	0	0

## DENTAL SERVICES

The LECI Dentist was not on site on the day of the inspection. Staff relayed that the **Dentist is on contract and is available 25 hours per week.** However, in follow-up communication received on November 9, 2005, it was reported that the **Dental Contract calls for 40 hours of Dental Services per week at LECI.** Three dental chairs were observed.

A LECI staff member relayed that a four-year backlog had been created due to a lapse in availability of a Dentist, and that the new contract Dentist was actively trying to close the prior gap in services. However, according to follow-up communication of November 9, 2005, there has never been a four-year backlog in dental services at LECI.

According to the medical monthly reports, projected time for a Dentist ranged from 68 to 200 hours per month, with 200 hours in August 2005. Projected hours per month for

Ancillary Dental Staff ranged from 72 to 120 hours per month, with 120 hours in August 2005.

From 66 to 271 inmates were seen for Dental Care per month from January through August 2005, with 271 inmates seen in August 2005. The number seen includes from zero to 30 per month seen for emergency appointments.

### DENTAL CARE APPOINTMENTS

DENTAL CARE	LOW	HIGH	AUGUST 2005
Number Seen by Appointment	66	244	244
Number of Emergent Appts.	0	30	27
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	271	271

### SPECIALTY CARE

The monthly medical reports indicate that from three to 20 inmates per month were seen for specialty care on site via telemedicine during the period from January through August 2005.

In regard to **Optometry**, 24 to 56 inmates were seen per month, and an Optometrist was on site from 16 to 45 hours per month. From 11 to 60 inmates per month were seen by a Podiatrist, who was on site from eight to 24 hours per month in the period.

### SPECIALTY CARE ON SITE

SPECIALTY CARE ON SITE: TELEMEDICINE	LOW	HIGH	AUGUST 2005
Surgery	0	4	0
Pulmonary	0	2	1
Cardiovascular	0	3	0
Infectious Disease	1	5	2
Internal Medicine	0	7	3
Nutrition	0	1	1
Other	1	9	3
<b>TOTALS</b>	3	20	10
<b>OPTOMETRY</b>			
Number of Inmates Seen	24	56	25
Hours on Site	16	45	16
<b>PODIATRY</b>			
Number of Inmates Seen	11	60	11
Hours on Site	8	24	8

**PHARMACY**

From January through August 2005, from 2,353 to 2,900 prescriptions were filled at the LECI Pharmacy. Of that number, from 17 to 43 prescriptions were controlled medication, and from zero to 820 prescriptions were for psychotropic medications.

**PRESCRIPTIONS FILLED**

<b>PHARMACY</b>	<b>LOW</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>AUGUST 2005</b>
Refills	1194	1650	1416
New Prescriptions	1106	1484	1484
<b>TOTAL PRESCRIPTIONS</b>	2353	2900	2900
Controlled Med Scripts	17	43	43
Psychotropic Prescriptions	0	820	820

**LAB DATA**

From 134 to 218 **blood draws** were taken for medical purposes from January through August 2005, and from three to 28 **blood draws** were taken for mental health purposes. From four to 24 **EKGs** were taken for medical purposes, and from three to 28 **EKGs** were taken for mental health purposes from January through August 2005 at LECI. There were from 12 to 58 **X-Rays** taken during the period.

**BLOOD DRAWS AND EKGs**

<b>LAB DATA</b>	<b>LOW</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>AUGUST 2005</b>
<b>Blood Draws</b> for Medical	134	218	134
<b>Blood Draws</b> for Mental Health	0	47	47
DNA <b>Blood Draws</b>	0	0	0
Number of <b>X-Rays</b>	12	58	58
<b>EKGs</b> for Medical	4	24	18
<b>EKGs</b> for Mental Health	3	28	5
Other Lab Procedures	0	4	0

## INFECTIOUS DISEASES

From January through August 2005, there were no PPD (TB) tests given to inmates. However, from zero to 15 per month were given to staff. The monthly medical reports also show that **no inmates had TB in the period**, but from one to three inmates were on INH Prophylaxis medication, and from zero to one inmate completed INH Prophylaxis. There were no reported refusals of INH.

From 22 to 28 inmates per month were **HIV+**, and from zero to one inmate were **newly diagnosed as HIV+**.

### TB AND HIV

INFECTIOUS DISEASE DATA	LOW	HIGH	AUGUST 2005
Number of Inmate PPDs	0	0	0
Number of Staff PPDs	0	15	0
Number of Inmates on INH	1	3	3
INH Prophylaxis Completions	0	1	0
INH Refusals	0	0	0
Inmates with TB	0	0	0
Inmates with HIV+	22	28	28
Newly diagnosed HIV	0	1	0
Protease Inhibitors	18	23	23

In 2003 system wide, there were 266 cases of MRSA, Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, a staphylococcus bacteria that has become resistant to antibiotics. **LECI had only two such cases.** Five prisons had no cases, while three prisons had more than 50 cases each. In 2004 system wide, there were 263 cases, but **LECI was one of 15 prisons with no cases of MRSA.** The Noble Correctional Institution had as many as 86 cases in 2004.

In the first and second quarter of 2005, there were 237 cases of MRSA system wide. **LECI had five cases.** There were seven prisons with no cases. MRSA cases ranged from one case each at the London, Madison, and Warren Correctional Institution and Northeast Pre-Release Center, to 31 cases at the Noble Correctional Institution.

According to system wide data of May 2005, there are 387 inmates who are HIV positive, ranging from zero at four prisons, to 29 at the Lorain Correctional Institution. **Lebanon Correctional Institution had 24 inmates who were HIV positive.** For the same period, there were reported to be 31 inmates with TB system wide, with 11 at the

London Correctional Institution, and 19 at the Belmont Correctional Institution. **Lebanon Correctional Institution had no cases of TB.**

## **DEATHS**

According to the monthly reports, **no LECI deaths occurred within the institution, at a local hospital, or at the Corrections Medical Center from January through August 2005.** However, there was **one LECI inmate death at the OSU Hospital in March, April and May of 2005.**

## **DISCUSSION WITH NURSING STAFF**

As to whether any changes have occurred since the release in the fall of 2003 of the **ODRC Health Care Review Team Report**, LECI nursing staff relayed that they are **more aware of ODRC policy, and ODRC forms are more accessible.** It was also noted that, “When we say we need something, they pay more attention.” That is, the **focus has helped to raise the priority of medical services Department wide.** The nursing staff also noted that they began using the ODRC Health Care Service Request Form for Sick Call about five months prior to the inspection.

In the discussion with medical staff, concerns were expressed regarding reported **delays in receipt of specialty consults at the Corrections Medical Center**, including **one six week wait on a biopsy, and other referrals that reportedly took from five to nine months.** One inmate reportedly waited nine months to receive a biopsy, though it was reportedly to be conducted in six weeks. Other concerns were also expressed regarding CMC. In one case, an inmate was reportedly transported to CMC for an endoscopy. He was reportedly returned to LECI after 14 days with a referral to have an endoscopy, the same procedure that should have been provided while at CMC on the first transport.

**As to whether such concerns are communicated to the Central Office medical staff, it was relayed that nurses are supposed to communicate any such concerns through the LECI Health Care Administrator, who may then communicate the concerns to the Central Office medical staff.** Nurses have reportedly communicated concerns regarding such delays to CMC staff when presented with such opportunities during scheduling contacts. **Communication between the medical staff at the institutions and Central Office was cited in the Health Care Review Team Report as an area in need of improvement.**

The LECI nursing staff left an extremely positive impression. **The caring attitude of the nursing staff was apparent. Such an attitude is regarded as a strength and certainly a positive aspect of the medical staff that should be encouraged.** Where such an attitude particularly among medical staff has been lacking in an institution, problems have inevitably developed.

**Their willingness to communicate problems and concerns in the medical services delivery system to persons believed to be in a position to assist should be**

**encouraged. Such communication makes it possible for such problems and concerns regarding individual cases to be resolved before they become extremely serious. Such communication is regarded as a necessary part of the solution to improve the medical services delivery system Department wide.**

## **FOOD SERVICES**

Following the initial discussion with administrative staff on arrival, inspection of the cellblocks, and attendance of the Sex Offender Program, the Food Services area was observed. There was ample time to alert Food Services staff and inmate workers to the imminent inspection of the Food Services area. The CIIC is statutorily required to attend a general meal period as part of its inspection and evaluation of operations and conditions. The requirement reflects the fundamental importance of food services within the prison system.

## **BIRDS**

In Dining Room One and Dining Room Two, inmate Food Service Workers were seated at a table quietly eating their meal. In Dining Room Three, at least a dozen birds were flying around the top front end of the dining hall, above the serving line. On entry to the dining hall, the birds flew to the other dining halls through an opening or breezeway that connects all three Dining Rooms. Birds flew freely throughout the inmate dining areas. With the possibility if not likelihood of bird feces falling into food, including in the kitchen where the meals are prepared, the presence of the birds constitutes a health issue. One staff person relayed that the birds enter both the staff and inmate dining halls. Droppings reportedly get on the windowsills, which are reportedly washed each quarter with a pressure washer.

LECI staff relayed that they have “all different kinds” of birds, including Doves and Pigeons. Inmates in the cellblocks referred to the birds as Swallows and referred to the Dining Room as an “aviary.” LECI staff relayed that birds enter the facility through several broken windows that flank the top of the dining room walls. Reportedly, the birds had been a problem for several months due to the broken windows, which had not been repaired due to budget constraints. One staff person commented that when the windows “get broken” it only takes a week to get them repaired. Another relayed that they had been trying to obtain an outside contractor to get rid of the birds. One staff person stated that they need a sonar-like device used in stadiums to get rid of the birds.

**The LECI Health and Safety Committee reportedly obtained quotes of the cost to net the birds. Reportedly, LECI staff had cited the birds and the 40 year-old floor as vulnerable areas.**

In follow-up communication received in September 2004, it was reported that on May 20, 2004 LECI **purchased two nets** to trap birds at an approximate cost of \$1,000. It was reported that the nets are mounted in the dining room areas and are invisible, which allows the birds to be captured. Once a bird is trapped in the net, the net is lowered to the

ground level where the bird is removed and then released outside of the building. In the first day that the nets were in place, two birds were reportedly caught and released. Although these nets were expected to help to control the birds in the Food Services area, it was noted that this is **not a new problem for LECI, and the netting purchased is not expected to stop the problem from reoccurring.** It was reported to be “**nearly impossible to stop birds from entering the facility**” due to the following:

- LECI has approximately **3,377 windows, of which 704 do not have screens.**
- **Birds also enter the facility at the various loading docks including Food Services, OPI and Maintenance.**

Reportedly, once the birds enter the prison, they will ultimately make their way to the Food Services area where the LECI staff hoped to be able to trap them in the nets. As to the birds not being a new problem, birds have been observed in the cellblocks on prior CIIC inspections as far back as 1993 when SOCF inmates held in Administrative Control at LECI reportedly enjoyed feeding the birds that flew in the open, unscreened windows.

What was new was the receipt of unsolicited concerns from inmates in the cellblocks that the dining room was an “aviary,” and the subsequent observation of at least a dozen birds flying above the tables in the dining room where food is served and eaten. While the presence of birds may be an old problem, the extent to which their presence had either increased in volume or otherwise became problematic as voiced by inmates and staff, was new to the CIIC.

Based on what is reported above, it should be considered a top priority to:

- Repair broken windows, and as the inmates suggest, use available cameras to identify and hold accountable those who break windows.
- Acquire screens for the windows that need them.
- Address the reported problem of open docks in Food Services, OPI and Maintenance. Docks have (or should have) lockable doors and gates. Complaints have been received in 2005 that LECI staff reportedly have left the Food Services dock unlocked and gate open, cited as a security issue. Keeping the dock doors and gates closed and locked except when absolutely necessary, would stop or severely restrict the entrance of birds through the docks.

## **CONDITIONS**

In the kitchen/food preparation area, the floor was wet reportedly due to a leaking dishwasher in the kitchen. Food was on the wet floor in the dish room. According to staff, the maintenance workers assigned to address the problem had worked on the machine for an entire day to no avail. The dishwasher had also developed electrical problems, which prevented it from being used.

Vegetables were on the floor and table in the kitchen. Trash and vegetables were clogging the floor drain. The floor was in need of a major cleaning. LECI staff relayed that the running water from one faucet was due to a leaking pipe that is reportedly unable to be repaired.

Standing water was observed on the floor by a urinal in the inmate restroom off of the kitchen. The same inmate restroom contained a microwave oven.

Empty cups and assorted trash items were observed in the dining and kitchen areas. The sinks in the dining and kitchen area were stained and in need of cleaning. Two open cups under a leaking sink contained an unidentified green solution. According to LECI staff, the substance was cleaning solution that does not normally sit out uncovered. Reportedly, an inmate worker had not yet transferred the solution to a spray bottle.

The freezer/food storage area was observed. The storage area was adequate in size. The food in the storage area was covered by a black tarp, with paint chips lying on top of the tarp. Two bags of unsealed garbage were lying in the corner near the dock. According to the Food Services staff, the garbage stemmed from the previous night's meal period and it would be taken out after the upcoming evening dinner meal.

Although locked, the freezer door was ajar by an inch or more. The freezer was also adequate in size. The temperature gauge of the freezer read 50 degrees. The freezer contained bags of chicken that according to LECI staff, were frozen and now thawing. However, several bags of chicken were lying on crates, and fresh blood drippings were observed on the floor.

At least four half filled coffee cups were observed at various locations, including inside a raw meat cooler, beside a soiled cloth glove covering a butter tray. The cooler contained uncovered tubs of raw ground beef and other meat. A soiled metal rail was anchored over the tubs of meat. LECI staff relayed that the meat needed to marinate and then be prepared for a meal later that day.

In the main food services area, a tub of cloth gloves for workers was observed. It could not be determined if the gloves were clean or dirty. However, Food Services staff relayed that the gloves were clean. One staff person added, "They go down every morning to get clean."

In the tool room, an Officer demonstrated how they use "chits" for tool accountability.

## **STAFF/SUPERVISION**

One Officer stood at a podium in the back of the Food Services area. He relayed that staffing for the Food Services area consists of two Officers, three Food Services Coordinators, and a Food Services Manager. The Officer was standing far from any inmate activity or presence, and could see no inmates from his post.

Cigarette butts were on the floor, and one inmate worker was smoking in the kitchen while the CIIC inspected his immediate area. Another inmate was sitting on a tray reading a book, while two other inmates were observed sitting idle at a desk in an office. The two inmates relayed that their job is to unload the trucks. In reference to two large pans of lettuce salad sitting out by the dock area, the inmates responded that they would be throwing the salad out “in a bit.” The salad was reportedly left over from the previous meal, and they reportedly had not yet “got around to it.”

Two Food Services staff entered a nearby room with a glass window, where they laughed together for an extended period. In subsequent discussion with Food Services staff, they relayed that they have “no particular needs.”

Inmates were preparing the dinner meal. Inmate workers appeared to have little or no supervision. The inmate workers wore hats and plastic gloves. Inmates were preparing meals for inmates in segregation with no supervision. One of the inmates preparing segregation trays stated that the inmates receive three bread slices, a burrito and slaw. However, he was observed consistently placing only two bread slices on the trays. Another inmate scooped the coleslaw out of a container with his hand onto the tray. The result was less than appetizing.

Much work obviously needed to be done in the Food Services area, yet most of the inmates were just standing around or sitting idle. The need for staff supervision of the inmate workers was apparent, as well as the need to raise the standards for acceptable conditions in Food Services. According to one Officer, inmates assigned to Food Services at LECI “consider it to be a punishment.”

### **INMATE WORKER ATTITUDE**

Many years ago, Marion Correctional Institution resolved such a problem by designating a special housing area for inmate Food Service workers and creating an environment in that housing area, that made it a highly desirable job assignment. As a result, every inmate assigned to Food Services had requested to work there, and was motivated to do a good job in order to retain the privileges connected to the assignment. The results were visible in the quality of the Food Services area, operation and meals. While Marion Correctional Institution no longer has such a special housing area reportedly due to the increased size of their inmate population, they report that their inmate Food Services workers do not consider the assignment as a punishment because there is an automatic 90-day rotation of any inmate Food Service worker who no longer wants to remain in Food Services.

Some institutions, including LECI, have a vocational program related to Food Services, such as Culinary Arts. In terms of vocational programs such as Culinary Arts, the Marion Correctional Institution reportedly recruits graduates of their Culinary Arts program for selected job assignments in Food Services. The leadership of the graduates reportedly helps to instill pride among the inmate workers in the Food Services assignments. LECI has a vocational program related to food services, which similarly provides them with a

number of highly motivated graduates who could take great pride in making the food services operation the best that it can be. It is hoped that consideration will be given to the numerous ways to address the reported inmate view of food services as a punishment.

### **LECI RESPONSE TO REPORTED CONCERNS**

In follow-up communication on May 4, 2004, ODRC Central Office staff relayed that LECI has always done well on their internal ODRC audits and inspections. It was also reported that the LECI Warden immediately began the process of addressing the reported concerns, and that the Warden was requested to determine a plan to eliminate the birds, including identifying their means of entry. Continued monitoring of the above, and follow-up with CIIC staff on what corrective actions occurred were assured.

In follow-up communication dated June 2, 2004, the Warden relayed that LECI staff took immediate steps to correct the expressed concerns. From the time of the initial inspection of May 3, 2004, to the follow up communication of June 2, 2004, the ODRC Assistant Director and ODRC South Regional Director each conducted on-site visits to LECI. In addition, the CIIC Chairman conducted a follow-up inspection. The Food Service Plan of Action provided to CIIC staff on September 7, 2004 included the following:

- The Hobart Corporation fixed all leaks and broken parts on the dishwasher. The task was completed on May 14, 2004 at an approximate cost of \$4,000.
- A food service inspection program was initiated and began on May 20, 2004. A five-page inspection form was created and is completed by the LECI Administrative Manager seven days per week. It takes approximately one hour to complete the inspection. Monday through Friday the inspection is conducted between 12:00 Noon and 9:00 pm. Also, a Shift Supervisor is required to conduct a food service inspection using the same form between 6:00 a.m. and 12:00 Noon. The new inspection process allows LECI to have two thorough inspections completed daily. When the inspection is being conducted, one of the Food Service Managers is required to accompany the Inspector through the area.
- The LECI Maintenance Supervisor and Food Service Manager completed a walk-through of the kitchen, identifying all maintenance issues that need to be resolved.
- The LECI Deputy Warden of Administration met with Food Service Managers and laid out clear expectations for the conditions of the kitchen at all times. It was noted that the state of the Food Service Department on the date of the CIIC inspection was not reflective of how it is the majority of the time.
- Since the inspection, two Food Service Coordinators have been hired. As of the date of the Action Plan of June 2, 2004, another three vacant Food Service Coordinator positions were posted. As of April 19, 2005, only one Food Service position remained unfilled. Voluntary overtime in Food Service was offered to all AFSCME employees due the shortage of food service staff.

## CURRENT REPORTED CONCERNS

In August and September of 2005 communication was received from a number of LECI Food Services staff who described the Food Services Department as a “hostile work environment,” reportedly due to actions and inactions of Food Services supervisory/management staff. If valid, the Food Services Department continues to merit attention, direction and assistance.

### ASSAULTS

Based on data provided by the DRC Central Office, **inmate-on-inmate** assaults at the Lebanon Correctional Institution increased slightly increase from 2003 to 2004. However, there were only **seven inmate-on-inmate assaults at LECI in 2003**, and **eight such assaults reported in 2004**. System-wide in 2003, the total number of inmate-on-inmate assaults was 482, with LECI accounting for only **1.5%**. Similarly, in 2004, the system-wide total for inmate-on-inmate assaults was 411, with LECI accounting for only **1.9%**.

Regarding **inmate on staff** assaults, LECI ranked **ninth** system-wide in **2003, with 22 inmate-on-staff assaults**. The Ohio prisons with more inmate-on-staff assaults than LECI were the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (130), Ohio Reformatory for Women (51), Oakwood Correctional Facility (38), Chillicothe Correctional Institution (37), Mansfield Correctional Institution (36), Lorain Correctional Institution (28), Ohio State Penitentiary (24), and Toledo Correctional Institution (24). System-wide 544 inmate-on-staff assaults were reported, with LECI comprising **four percent**.

**In 2004, there was a decrease in the number of inmate-on-staff assaults** at LECI with only **15**. The Toledo Correctional Institution also reported 15 inmate-on-staff assaults. LECI and Toledo Correctional Institution ranked **seventh** system wide, with only the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (133), Ohio Reformatory for Women (40), Mansfield Correctional Institution (31), Oakwood Correctional Facility (25), Ohio State Penitentiary (24), and the Trumbull Correctional Institution (19) with more inmate-on-staff assaults reported. System-wide, 432 inmate-on-staff assaults were reported, with LECI comprising **3.5%**.

## ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS BY INVESTIGATOR

### INMATE ON INMATE ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS

Data contained in the Chief Inspector’s Annual Reports for 2003 and 2004, includes information on the number of inmate on inmate assault investigations conducted by the Investigator. In 2004, there were 254 such investigations system wide, ranging from no such investigations at four prisons, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, to 41 such investigations at the Noble Correctional Institution. **The Lebanon Correctional Institution was one of eight prisons that had only two such investigations in 2004.**

System wide, there were 258 inmate on inmate assault investigations in 2003, ranging from none at five prisons, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and North Correctional Institution, to the high of 29 at the Madison Correctional Institution. Five prisons had from 20 to 29 inmate on inmate assault investigations in 2003. **There were four such investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution in 2003, with a decrease to two in 2004.**

### **INMATE ON STAFF ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS**

In 2004 there were 188 inmate on staff assault investigations system wide, with no such investigation reported from seven prisons, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The remaining prisons range from one such investigation at the Mansfield Correctional Institution to a high of 22 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. Six prisons had from 10 to 22 such investigations. The Lebanon Correctional Institution reported **eight such investigations in 2004.**

There were only 146 such investigations in 2003 system wide, with an increase of 42 in 2004, when there were 188 inmate on staff assault investigations. In 2003, eight prisons reported no such investigations, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The remaining prisons ranged from one at five prisons including the Mansfield Correctional Institution, to a high of 26 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. **The Lebanon Correctional Institution and Pickaway Correctional Institution each reported 11 inmate on staff assault investigations in 2003. Such investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution reduced from 11 in 2003 to eight in 2004.**

### **SEXUAL ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS**

According to the Chief Inspector's Annual Report, there were 124 sexual assault investigations system wide in **2004**, with 10 prisons reporting no such investigations (including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility), to 21 such investigations at the Lake Erie Correctional Institution. Madison and Richland Correctional Institutions ranked second and third, with 13 and 10 such investigations, respectively. There was only **one such investigation at the Lebanon Correctional Institution.** Four other prisons also reported one such investigation in 2004.

According to the Chief Inspector's Annual Report, there were only 39 sexual assault investigations in **2003** system wide, with 18 prisons reporting no such investigations, and five prisons reporting one such investigation in the year. The Lebanon Correctional Institution reported **two such investigations in 2003.** The Ross Correctional Institution reported six such investigations, the highest of all prisons in 2003. The number of sexual assault investigations increased from 39 in 2003 to 124 in 2004, an increase of 85.

### **OTHER INVESTIGATIONS**

There were 3,160 "Other Investigations" conducted by Investigators system wide in **2004**, which include background checks. There were no such investigations at the

Grafton Correctional Institution and Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. The remaining institutions reported from two such investigations at the Dayton Correctional Institution to 555 at the Ohio State Penitentiary. There are seven prisons with more than 200 such investigations in the category. The **Lebanon Correctional Institution reported 73 such investigations in 2004.** Such investigations system wide increased from 2,948 in 2003 to 3,160 in 2004, an increase of 212. The **Lebanon Correctional Institution reported 40 such investigations in 2003, and increased by 33 in 2004 with a total of 73.**

## USE OF FORCE

Use of force data from monthly reports from LECI from January 2005 through July 2005 were reviewed.

### USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS PER MONTH AT LECI FROM JANUARY THROUGH JULY 2005 WITH RACIAL BREAKDOWN

USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS INCLUDING "SLIGHT FORCE"					USE OF FORCE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS			
MONTH	Black	White	Other	Total	Black	White	Other	Total
January	18	17	1	<b>36</b>	8	10	0	<b>18</b>
February	21	6	0	<b>27</b>	9	5	0	<b>14</b>
March	21	7	0	<b>28</b>	5	1	0	<b>6</b>
April	21	7	0	<b>28</b>	7	4	0	<b>11</b>
May	29	2	0	<b>31</b>	10	1	0	<b>11</b>
June	19	5	0	<b>24</b>	6	1	0	<b>7</b>
July	9	4	0	<b>13</b>	0	2	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>72.8%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>65.2%</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average Per Month</b>	20	7	0	<b>27</b>	6	3	0	<b>10</b>
<b>Monthly Range</b>	9-29	2-17	0-1	<b>13-36</b>	0-10	1-10	0	<b>2-18</b>

Use of force data from January through July 2005 at LECI shows that in all, there were **187 use of force incidents** in the seven month period, ranging from **13 to 36 incidents per month, with an average of 27 per month.** Of the 187 use of force incidents, **69 incidents (36.9%) were referred to the Use of Force Investigating Committee** to determine if the force was authorized and not excessive. **An average of 10 per month, with a monthly range of from two to 18 such incidents** were referred to the Use of Force Committee for investigation.

As of February 2005, the LECI population consisted of **54.65% Black inmates, 44.11% White inmates, and 1.23% Other inmates.** As of August 2005, the racial breakdown of

LECI was **53.67% Black, 45.29% White, and 1.03% Other**. Use of force incidents involving **Black inmates averaged 20 per month, ranged from nine to 29 per month, and involved 138 of the 187 incidents, or 72.8% of all incidents**. Incidents involving **White inmates totaled 48, comprising 25.7% of the use of force incidents, averaged seven per month, and ranged from a low of two to a high of 17 per month in the seven-month period**.

Of the 69 use of force incidents referred to a Use of Force Investigating Committee, **45 involved Black inmates comprising 65.2% of the referrals**, while 24 incidents or 34.7% of those referred to the Use of Force Investigating Committee involved White inmates. An average of **six incidents per month involving Black inmates** were referred to the Use of Force Investigating Committee. An average of **three incidents per month involving White inmates** were referred to the Use of Force Committee for investigation.

A review was made of use of force data from all Ohio prisons for the month of **June 2005**. A total of 311 incidents occurred system wide in the month, with an **average of ten incidents per institution in the month**. The number of incidents ranged from zero at the Marion and Dayton Correctional Institutions, as well as at the Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center, to a high of 38 incidents at the Oakwood Correctional Facility, the mental hospital for inmates in the Ohio prison system. The incidents at Oakwood Correctional Facility comprised 12.2 percent of the incidents system wide. The second highest number of incidents occurred at the Mansfield Correctional Institution, with 26 incidents, comprising 8.4 percent of the incidents system wide. **Lebanon Correctional Institution had 24 incidents in the month, the third largest in the system, and comprising 7.7 percent of the incidents system wide**.

**USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS IN JUNE 2005 BY INSTITUTION GROUPED BY TYPE OF FACILITY**

<b>PRISON</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENT OF ODRC INCIDENTS</b>
<b>Level Three (Close) Security Prisons for Men:</b>		
Mansfield CI	26	8.4
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7.7</b>
Trumbull CI	8	2.6
Ross CI	8	2.6
Warren CI	6	1.9
Toledo CI	5	1.6
<b>SUBTOTAL LEVEL THREE (CLOSE)</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>24.8</b>
<b>OAKWOOD CF:</b>		
<b>Mental Hospital for Male and Female ODRC Inmates</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>12.2</b>
<b>SOUTHERN OHIO CF: Level Four (Maximum)</b>	19	6.1
<b>OHIO STATE PEN: Level Five (High Max/Supermax) and Level Four (Maximum)</b>	17	5.5
Correctional Reception Cntr	14	4.5
Lorain CI	5	1.6
<b>SUBTOTAL MALE RECEPTION CENTERS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6.1</b>
<b>OHIO REF FOR WOMEN: Reception and Parent Institution (All Security Levels)</b>	9	2.9

**NUMBER OF USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS INCLUDING SLIGHT FORCE IN JUNE  
2005 WITH BREAKDOWN BY INSTITUTION**

<b>PRISON</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
Oakwood CF	38	12.2
Mansfield CI	26	8.4
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7.7</b>
Belmont CI	20	6.4
Southern Ohio CF	19	6.1
Ohio State Pen	17	5.5
Pickaway CI	15	4.8
North Central CI	15	4.8
Noble CI	15	4.8
Corr Reception C	14	4.5
Madison CI	11	3.5
London CI	10	3.2
Richland CI	10	3.2
Ohio Reform for Women	9	2.9
Trumbull CI	8	2.6
Ross CI	8	2.6
Corr Medical C	6	1.9
Southeastern CI	6	1.9
Warren CI	6	1.9
Toledo CI	5	1.6
Grafton CI	5	1.6
Chillicothe CI	5	1.6
Lorain CI	5	1.6
Northeast PRC	4	1.3
Allen CI	4	1.3
North Coast CTF	2	.6
Lake Erie CI	2	.6
Hocking CF	1	.3
Franklin PRC	1	.3
Dayton CI	0	0
Montgomery EPRC	0	0
Marion CI	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>100%</b>

## DISCIPLINARY REPORTS

The LECI monthly use of force data includes the number of disciplinary reports with a breakdown by race of the inmate who received the disciplinary report. A review of data from the reports for January through July 2005 was made with the following results:

### DISCIPLINARY REPORTS AT LECI BY RACE FROM JANUARY THROUGH JULY 2005

Month	Black	White	Total
January	185	88	273
February	279	127	406
March	203	131	334
April	163	87	250
May	200	100	300
June	216	77	293
July	187	105	292
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,433</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>2,148</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>66.71%</b>	<b>33.29%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Monthly Average</b>	205	102	<b>307</b>
<b>Monthly Range</b>	163-279	77-131	<b>250-406</b>

## CIIC DATABASE

From **January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005**, the CIIC received 1,803 contacts system-wide, including **58 from the Lebanon Correctional Institution**. During the same time period, the CIIC logged 5,038 concerns system-wide, including **128 concerns/problems from LECI**. LECI comprised 3.2% of all contacts, and 2.5% of all concerns system-wide.

From **January 1, 2005 to September 28, 2005**, the CIIC received 1,345 contacts system wide, from one contact from the Northeast Pre Release Center to 189 contacts from the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. **Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked 11<sup>th</sup> with 54 contacts**. System wide, a total of 4,393 concerns were logged in the period. System wide, the largest number of concerns pertains to Use of Force/Supervision, with 578 reported concerns, followed by Staff Accountability with 557 reported concerns. The third and fourth largest complaint groups are the Inmate Grievance Procedure with 428 complaints, and Non-Grievable Matters with 389 reported concerns.

From January 1, 2005 to October 25, 2005, the CIIC received 58 contacts from or regarding the Lebanon Correctional Institution, relaying 219 problems or concerns in the following categories:

**NUMBER OF LOGGED CONCERNS FROM OR REGARDING LECI BY  
CATEGORY OF CONCERN  
FROM JANUARY 1, 2005 THROUGH OCTOBER 25, 2005**

CATEGORY	NUMBER
Inmate Grievance Procedure	46
Staff Accountability	24
Non-Grievable Matters	19
Use of Force/Inappropriate Supervision	16
Other	12
Safety/Sanitation	10
Mail/Packages	10
Institution Assignment	9
Facility Maintenance	8
Job Assignment	8
Health Care	8
Discrimination	7
Personal Property	6
Security Classification	6
Inmate Account	5
Visiting	5
Special Management Housing	4
Religious Services	3
Protective Control	2
Housing Assignment	2
Records	2
Commissary	2
Food Services	1
Psychiatric/Psychological Services	1
Laundry/Quartermaster	1
Recreation	1
Telephone	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>219</b>

**NUMBER OF CIIC CONTACTS BY INSTITUTION  
FROM JANUARY 6, 2004 TO JANUARY 12, 2005**

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF CONTACTS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	292
Mansfield Correctional Institution	146
Pickaway Correctional Institution	122
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	85
Ohio State Reformatory	83
Madison Correctional Institution	78
Trumbull Correctional Institution	78
Grafton Correctional Institution	74
Warren Correctional Institution	70
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	66
North Central Correctional Institution	64
Toledo Correctional Institution	64
<b>Lebanon Correctional Institution</b>	<b>58</b>
London Correctional Institution	55
Marion Correctional Institution	52
Belmont Correctional Institution	49
Allen Correctional Institution	48
Other	45
Noble Correctional Institution	43
Ohio Reformatory for Women	40
Richland Correctional Institution	38
Correctional Reception Center	33
Ross Correctional Institution	26
Hocking Correctional Facility	17
Lorain Correctional Institution	16
Southeastern Correctional Institution	16
Oakwood Correctional Facility	13
Corrections Medical Center	11
Dayton Correctional Institution	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	6
Lima Correctional Institution- closed	5
North East Pre Release Center	2
Franklin Pre Release Center	1
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center	1
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,803</b>

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

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

## INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

### INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

In 2004, a total of 30,492 informal complaints were filed system wide, from 62 at Hocking Correctional Facility, to the high of 3,432 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The **Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked 13th among the institutions, with 1,052 informal complaints filed in 2004.** The breakdown by institution is provided below:

#### INFORMAL COMPLAINTS IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	INFORMAL COMPLAINTS IN 2004
Southern Ohio CF	3,432
Ohio Ref for Women	2,443
Ohio State Penitentiary	1,938
Mansfield CI	1,693
North Central CI	1,537
Madison CI	1,371
Chillicothe CI	1,206
Lake Erie CI	1,171
Toledo CI	1,153
Grafton CI	1,141
London CI	1,133
Marion CI	1,105
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>1,052</b>
Trumbull CI	1,040
Richland CI	978
Lorain CI	892
Noble CI	888
Pickaway CI	828
North Coast CTF	745
Warren CI	679
Ross CI	614
Belmont CI	609
Southeastern CI	595
Allen CI	519
Warren CI	433
Corr Medical C	252
Corr Reception C	217
Montgomery EPRC	193
Oakwood CF	177
Dayton CI	119
Hocking CF	62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30,492</b>

According to the 2004 Chief Inspector's Annual Report, untimely responses to informal complaints system wide totaled 4,756. The **Lebanon Correctional Institution had 91 informal complaints with untimely responses. Lebanon Correctional Institution ranks 18<sup>th</sup> among the institutions in the number of untimely responses** to informal complaints. That is, 17 institutions had more untimely responses than Lebanon Correctional Institution. Untimely responses system wide ranged from only six at the Hocking Correctional Facility to as high as 1,017 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

Although the number of informal complaints system wide decreased by 1,136 from 2003 to 2004, the number of untimely responses to informal complaints increased by 149, from 4,607 in 2003 to 4,756 in 2004. At **the Lebanon Correctional Institution, untimely responses increased from 41 in 2003 to 91 in 2004.** The breakdown of untimely responses for each institution in 2004 is provided below:

**INFORMAL COMPLAINTS WITH UNTIMELY RESPONSES IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION**

<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>INFORMAL COMPLAINTS WITH UNTIMELY RESPONSES IN 2004</b>
Ohio Ref for Women	1,017
Toledo CI	318
Ohio State Penitentiary	311
London CI	295
Lake Erie CI	256
Madison CI	235
Trumbull CI	203
Marion Ci	194
Southern Ohio CF	185
Pickaway CI	185
Mansfield CI	160
Ross CI	155
North Central CI	148
Richland CI	148
Warren CI	121
Southeastern CI	100
North Coast CTF	95
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>91</b>
Chillicothe CI	85
Lorain CI	59
Corr Medical C	42
Grafton CI	38
Oakwood CI	37
Belmont CI	34
Allen CI	30
Corr Reception C	29
Montgomery EPRC	29
Noble CI	22
Dayton CI	16
Warren CI	10
Hocking CF	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,756</b>

## FILERS

In 2004, a total of 3,211 inmates system wide used the grievance procedure, filing a total of 6,303 grievances. At the Lebanon Correctional Institution, **161 inmates used the grievance procedure, filing a total of 351 grievances. Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked fifth among the institutions in the number of inmates who filed one or more grievances.**

In 2003, a total of 3,297 inmates filed one or more grievances. The number of filers declined in 2004 by 86. However, at the **Lebanon Correctional Institution, the number of inmates who used the grievance procedure increased slightly from 137 in 2003 to 161 in 2004, an increase of 24.** The number of inmates who used the grievance procedure at each institution in 2004 is presented below:

### NUMBER OF INMATES WHO FILED ONE OR MORE GRIEVANCES IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF INMATES WHO FILED ONE OR MORE GRIEVANCES IN 2004
Southern Ohio CF	249
Mansfield CI	224
Pickaway CI	190
North Central CI	183
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>161</b>
Madison CI	159
Grafton CI	152
Chillicothe CI	151
Ohio Ref for Women	148
Marion CI	145
Ohio State Penitentiary	141
Warren CI	131
Allen CI	130
Richland CI	129
Noble CI	127
Toledo CI	115
London CI	101
Ross CI	84
Trumbull CI	79
Belmont CI	72
Lorain CI	65
Lake Erie CI	63
Southeastern CI	59
Corr Reception C	40
North Coast CTF	27
Corr Medical C	20
Montgomery EPRC	15
Oakwood CF	13
Hocking CF	12
Franklin PRC	10
Northeast PRC	8
Dayton CI	8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,211</b>

## GRIEVANCES FILED

In 2004, a total of 6,303 grievances were filed system wide, ranging from nine at the Dayton Correctional Institution, to 656 grievances at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. **Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked fourth among the institutions, with 351 grievances in 2004**, exceeded only by the Ohio State Penitentiary, Mansfield Correctional Institution, and Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

The number of grievances filed system wide in 2003 totaled 6,395. The number of grievances declined by 92 system wide in 2004. **At the Lebanon Correctional Institution, there were 244 grievances filed in 2003. The number of grievances increased by 107 in 2004, with a total of 351 grievances filed.**

### GRIEVANCES FILED IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES FILED IN 2004
Southern Ohio CF	656
Mansfield CI	447
Ohio State Penitentiary	443
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>351</b>
North Central CI	346
Madison CI	307
Warren CI	295
Ohio Ref for Women	293
Pickaway CI	291
Grafton CI	281
Chillicothe CI	278
Allen CI	271
Toledo CI	265
Noble CI	247
Marion CI	230
Trumbull CI	206
Richland CI	205
London CI	164
Lake Erie CI	133
Ross CI	128
Lorain CI	89
Belmont CI	88
Southeastern CI	77
North Coast CTF	46
Corr Medical C	44
Corr Reception C	43
Montgomery EPRC	21
Oakwood CF	13
Hocking CF	13
Franklin PRC	12
Northeast PRC	11
Dayton CI	9
TOTAL	6,303

## GRIEVANCE APPEALS

If an inmate is not satisfied with the Inspector's decision on a grievance, the inmate may appeal the grievance disposition to the Chief Inspector.

In calendar year 2004, the Chief Inspector's office received 3,005 grievance appeals system wide, ranging from no appeals from the Dayton Correctional Institution and North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility, to 418 appeals from the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. **Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked fifth among the institutions, with 181 grievance appeals.** Only the Ohio State Penitentiary, Madison Correctional Institution, Mansfield Correctional Institution, and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility submitted more appeals than the Lebanon Correctional Institution. The number of appeals from each institution is provided below:

### GRIEVANCE APPEALS IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	GRIEVANCE APPEALS 2004
Southern Ohio CF	418
Mansfield CI	203
Madison CI	198
Ohio State Penitentiary	188
<b>Lebanon Correctional Institution</b>	<b>181</b>
Chillicothe CI	175
Warren CI	160
Trumbull CI	137
Allen CI	135
Noble CI	124
Grafton CI	123
North Central CI	120
Pickaway CI	99
Richland CI	99
Marion CI	93
Toledo CI	87
London CI	86
Lake Erie CI	76
Ohio Ref for Women	75
Belmont CI	65
Ross CI	52
Lorain CI	32
Corr Medical C	31
Southeastern CI	23
Hocking CF	7
Oakwood CF	7
Montgomery EPRC	4
Corr Reception	3
Northeast PRC	3
Franklin PRC	1
North Coast CTF	0
Dayton CI	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,005</b>

According to the Chief Inspector's 2003 Annual Report, there were **64 appeals from the Lebanon Correctional Institution in 2003. The number of appeals increased by 117 in 2004, with a total of 181 grievance appeals received from the Lebanon Correctional Institution in 2004.** System wide, grievances increased by 601 in the two-year period, from 2,404 in 2003 to 3,005 in 2004.

### ORIGINAL GRIEVANCES

If an inmate has a problem or complaint pertaining to the Inspector or Warden, the inmate may file a grievance directly with the Chief Inspector. Such grievances are referred to in the Chief Inspector's Annual Report as "Original Grievances." In 2004, the Chief Inspector received 509 original grievances system wide.

#### ORIGINAL GRIEVANCES PERTAINING TO INSPECTOR OR WARDEN IN 2004

INSTITUTION	ORIGINAL GRIEVANCES PERTAINING TO INSPECTOR OR WARDEN 2004
Southern Ohio CF	60
Trumbull CI	38
Belmont CI	35
Mansfield CI	33
Noble CI	28
Chillicothe CI	27
Allen CI	25
Grafton CI	23
London CI	20
Warren CI	20
Madison CI	19
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>19</b>
Ohio State Penitentiary	18
Richland CI	18
Toledo CI	18
Marion CI	17
Corr Medical Center	14
Lake Erie CI	14
Lorain CI	13
North Central CI	13
Pickaway CI	9
Ross CI	8
Ohio Ref for Women	6
Southeastern CI	5
Hocking CF	3
Montgomery EPRC	3
Oakwood CF	2
Franklin PRC	1
North Coast CTF	0
Dayton CI	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>509</b>

## JULY 2005 INSPECTOR'S REPORT

Grievance data contained in the LECI Inspector's monthly report for July 2005 was reviewed. Filing an Informal Complaint is the first step to using the grievance procedure. According to the monthly report, **109 Informal Complaints were filed in July 2005.** If an inmate is not satisfied with the response to his Informal Complaint, he may file a grievance with the Inspector who may investigate and take or recommend any corrective action found warranted.

**Of the 39 grievances that received dispositions in the month, 30 were classified as "Not Resolved," comprising 76.9% of all grievance decisions.** The breakdown of reasons for "Not Resolved" Dispositions is provided below:

### NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES IN JULY 2005 CATEGORIZED AS "NOT RESOLVED" WITH SPECIFIC REASON FOR DISPOSITION

<b>Insufficient evidence to support claim</b>	<b>13</b>
Contrary to Administrative Rule	5
Staff Action was valid exercise of discretion	4
Contrary to DRC Policy	3
Contrary to LECI Policy	2
Contrary to Ohio Revised Code	1
Failure to use informal complaint procedure	1
Not within scope of grievance procedure	1
Not within time limit	0
False Claim	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>

Of the 30 "Not Resolved" grievance dispositions, White inmates filed 17 of the grievances, and 13 of the grievances were filed by Black inmates. There were no extensions of grievance decisions during the month.

Of the 39 grievances dispositions in July 2005, there were **only nine grievances categorized by the Inspector as "Resolved."** **Seven of the nine resolved grievance dispositions were filed by White inmates,** with only two of the resolved grievances filed by Black inmates. In all nine dispositions categorized as "Resolved," the Inspector reported that the **problem was noted, with correction pending.**

There were **no resolved grievances in the other two possible categories which include: "Problem corrected," and "Problem noted, report/recommendation to the Warden."** The **nine resolved grievances were in the following categories: Religious Services, Dental Care, Safety/Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Personal Property, and Visiting.**

**“RESOLVED” GRIEVANCES AT LECI IN JULY 2005 BY SUBJECT**

<b><u>GRIEVANCE SUBJECT</u></b>	<b><u>NUMBER OF “RESOLVED” GRIEVANCES</u></b>
Religious Services	
Services for Particular Faith	2
Dental Care	
Access/delay in receiving dental care	1
Improper/Inadequate dental care	1
Safety/Sanitation	
Unsafe living areas	1
Facilities Maintenance	
Toilets	1
Personal Property	
Lost, damaged, confiscated by staff	1
Visiting	
Visitor not approved/removed from list	1
Other	1
<b>TOTAL RESOLVED GRIEVANCES</b>	<b>9</b>

As noted below, of the total 39 grievances filed at LECI in July 2005, **nearly 44 percent of the grievances pertained to Staff/Inmate Relations. There were 17 grievances in the category, with 13 regarding Use of Force or Inappropriate Supervision, and four regarding Staff Accountability.**

The second largest category pertained to **Institutional Operations**, with 11 grievances regarding Personal Property, Health Care, Dental Care, Safety/Sanitation, and Facilities Maintenance.

The third largest category only contained six grievances. Four grievances pertained to Mail/Packages and two were in the Visiting category. There were three grievances in the Institutional Programs category, with two regarding Religious Services, and one regarding job assignments. There was only one grievance in the Administration category, and one in the Custody and Housing Status category.

**NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES FILED AT LECI IN JULY 2005 BY SUBJECT**

<b>SUBJECT CATEGORY</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>SUBTOTALS</b>
<b>STAFF/INMATE RELATIONS</b>		
Force/Supervision	13	
Staff Accountability	4	
Discrimination		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>17</b>
<b>INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS</b>		
Personal Property	3	
Health Care	2	
Dental Care	2	
Safety and Sanitation	1	
Facilities Maintenance	3	
Food Service		
Laundry/Quartermaster		
Commissary		
Inmate Account		
Psychological/Psychiatric		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>11</b>
<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		
Mail/Package	4	
Visiting	2	
Telephone		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>6</b>
<b>INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS</b>		
Religious Services	2	
Job Assignments	1	
Education/Vocational Training		
Library		
Recovery Services		
Recreation		
Inmate Groups		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>3</b>
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>		
Records	1	
Legal Services		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>CUSTODY AND HOUSING STATUS</b>		
Institution Assignment	1	
Security Classification		
Housing Assignment		
Special Management Housing		
Protective Control		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL GRIEVANCES</b>		<b>39</b>

The following information reflects the type and number of grievances filed at the Lebanon Correctional Institution from October 2003 through November 2004.

**NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES FILED AT LECI BY SUBJECT  
FROM OCTOBER 2003 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004**

<b>SUBJECT OF GRIEVANCE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES</b>
<b>Force/ Supervision</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Health Care</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Personal Property</b>	<b>52</b>
Staff Accountability	25
Non-Grievable Matters	23
Mail/ Package	22
Safety and Sanitation	14
Food Service	13
Visiting	10
Religious Services	9
Laundry/ Quartermaster	8
Dental Care	8
Housing Assignment	7
Inmate Accounts	6
Job Assignments	6
Psychological/ Psychiatric	6
Institution Assignment	5
Education/ Vocational Training	4
Discrimination	4
Inmate Groups	3
Facilities Maintenance	3
Library	3
Commissary	2
Records	2
<b>UNRESOLVED</b>	<b>319</b>
<b>RESOLVED</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>398</b>

**No grievances were filed in the following areas: Recreation, Telephone, Legal Services, Special Management Housing, Recovery Services, Security Classification, or Protective Control.**

System-wide, 7,381 grievances were filed for the time period of October 2003 through November 2004. There were **398 grievances filed at the Lebanon Correctional Institution, or 5.4% of all grievances filed, system-wide**. In the same time period, the number of grievances filed range from eight or 0.1% at the Dayton Correctional Institution, to the highest number of grievances filed at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 722, or 9.8% of all grievances filed.

Caution should be taken in interpreting the meaning of a large or small number of grievances filed. A large number of grievances could mean that a multitude of problems exist, or that inmates have enough faith and confidence in the grievance procedure that they are willing to use it to relay problems and to seek assistance. Similarly, a low number of grievances could mean that very few problems exist, or that inmates do not use the grievance procedure to seek help with a problems due to lack of faith in the grievance procedure or fear of retaliation for complaining. Therefore, a low number of grievances can be a cause for concern.

From the time period of July 2004 through November 2004, 1,930 grievances were unresolved system-wide. The **Lebanon Correctional Institution accounted for 20, or 31.3% of the 64 not resolved grievances due to “inmate failure to use informal complaint procedure.”**

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

- Problem **corrected**
- Problem noted, **correction pending**
- Problem noted, report/ **recommendation to the Warden.**

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

- Contrary to Ohio Revised Code
- Contrary to administrative rule
- Contrary to department policy
- Contrary to institution policy
- Staff action was a **valid exercise of discretion**
- **Insufficient evidence** to support claim
- **False claim**
- **Failure to use informal complaint procedure**
- Not within the scope of the grievance procedure
- **Not within the time limits.**

The Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked **eighth in total grievances resolved, with 79 for the time period of October 2003 through November 2004. This is an average of only 6.1 resolved grievances per month, with an average of total grievances per month standing at 30.1. The Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked fifth in unresolved grievances with 319, an average of 24.5 unresolved grievances per month.**

#### **INVESTIGATOR CASELOAD**

The Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report provides information on the number of **investigations initiated by the Investigator** at each institution. In 2004, a total of 6,660 investigations were initiated system wide. The number of investigations ranged from the low of 15 at the Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center, to the largest number at the Ohio State Penitentiary, where 583 investigations occurred. The Madison Correctional Institution ranked second, with 538 investigations. **Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked 15<sup>th</sup> in number of investigations, with 212 in the year.**

The number of investigations increased system wide by 984 from 5,676 in 2003 to 6,660 in 2004. However, the **number of investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution decreased from 219 in 2003 to 212 in 2004.** The breakdown of 2004 investigations per institution is provided below:

**2004 INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED BY INVESTIGATORS BY INSTITUTION**

<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>2004 INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED BY INVESTIGATOR</b>
Ohio State Penitentiary	583
Madison CI	538
Noble CI	436
Trumbull CI	416
Warren CI	357
Ross CI	352
Belmont CI	342
Mansfield CI	293
North Central CI	287
Corr Medical C	270
Lorain CI	263
Richland CI	257
Pickaway CI	256
Lake Erie CI	240
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>212</b>
Southeastern CI	164
Allen CI	145
Northeast PRC	143
Chillicothe CI	142
Ohio Ref for Women	134
Corr Reception C	123
Oakwood CF	104
Franklin PRC	99
Marion CI	82
Toledo CI	75
Hocking CF	69
Southern Ohio CF	62
London CI	60
North Coast CTF	57
Grafton CI	43
Dayton CI	41
Montgomery EPRC	15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,660</b>

## STAFF MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

According to the Chief Inspector's **2004** Annual Report, there were 242 investigations system wide by the Investigators regarding staff misconduct. There **were no such investigations at three prisons, including North Central Correctional Institution**, and only **one such investigation each at the Lebanon Correctional Institution, Hocking Correctional Institution and Allen Correctional Institution**. The remaining prisons ranged from two such investigations at the Correctional Medical Center to 37 such investigations at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

According to the Chief Inspector's **2003** Annual Report, there were 274 investigations of staff misconduct in 2003. Such investigations decreased by 32 in 2004. In 2003, the number of staff misconduct investigations ranged **from zero at Mansfield Correctional Institution to 40 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women**. **There were only four such investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution in 2003, which further declined to only one in 2004.**

## STAFF/INMATE RELATIONSHIPS INVESTIGATIONS

According to the Chief Inspector's Annual Report for **2004**, there were 186 investigations system wide regarding staff/inmate relationships, ranging from **no such investigations at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Belmont Correctional Institution**, to a high of 21 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. **The Lebanon Correctional Institution reported only two such investigations**, the same as Dayton and Noble Correctional Institution.

There were 229 investigations of staff/inmate relationships system wide in **2003**. Such investigations decreased by 43 in 2004, to a total of 186. In 2003, such investigations ranged from **no such investigations at three prisons, Ross Correctional Institution, Ohio State Penitentiary, and Corrections Medical Center**, to a high of 37 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. While Marion and Noble Correctional Institution had **one** such investigation in 2003, **Lebanon, North Central and Warren Correctional Institutions each reported two such investigations in 2003.**

## POSITIVE DRUG URINALYSIS RESULTS

According to the **2004** Annual Report of the Chief Inspector, there were 936 positive drug urinalysis tests system wide in the 12-month period. **Six institutions had no positive drug test results, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Ross Correctional Institution, London Correctional Institution, Franklin Pre-Release Center, Oakwood Correctional Facility, and Corrections Medical Center**. The largest number of positive drug test results occurred at the North Central Correctional Institution, with **202 positives**.

**Lebanon Correctional Institution had 23 positive drug test results in 2004.**

System wide in **2003**, there were 898 positive drug tests, ranging from zero at the Corrections Medical Center to 141 at the Ross Correctional Institution.

Four of the prisons, including the **Lebanon, Dayton, Southeastern and Ross Correctional Institutions had 100 or more positive drug test results in 2003**. Although the number of positive test results increased system wide from 2003 to 2004 by 38, there were **significant decreases in the number of positive test results at Lebanon, Dayton, Southeastern, and Ross Correctional Institutions**. Ross Correctional Institution decreased from 141 positive results in 2003 to zero in 2004, Southeastern Correctional Institution decreased from 130 positive results in 2003 to 16 in 2004. Dayton Correctional Institution decreased from 102 positive results in 2003 to 31 in 2004. **Lebanon Correctional Institution decreased from 100 positive drug test results in 2003 to 23 in 2004**. The breakdown of 2004 positive test results at each institution is provided below.

#### 2004 POSITIVE DRUG TEST RESULTS BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	2004 POSITIVE DRUG TEST RESULTS
North Central CI	202
Lake Erie CI	96
Richland CI	92
Belmont CI	78
Allen CI	59
Trumbull CI	54
Chillicothe CI	46
Mansfield CI	46
Noble CI	35
Pickaway CI	33
Dayton CI	31
Marion CI	25
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>23</b>
Southeastern CI	16
Corr Reception C	15
Madison CI	13
Grafton CI	13
Lorain CI	12
Toledo CI	11
Warren CI	9
Ohio State Penitentiary	7
North Coast CTF	7
Montgomery EPRC	6
Northeast PRC	3
Ohio Ref for Women	2
Hocking CF	2
London CI	0
Ross CI	0
Southern Ohio CF	0
Franklin PRC	0
Oakwood CF	0
Corr Medical C	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>936</b>

## INMATE/VISITOR DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

From 2003 to 2004, drug investigations regarding inmates or visitors increased from 245 to 273 system wide. In both years, **the Lebanon Correctional Institution had the largest volume of such investigations, with 53 in 2003 and 82 in 2004.** A breakdown of the number of investigations at each institution in 2004 is provided below:

### INMATE/VISITOR DRUG INVESTIGATIONS IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	INMATE/VISITOR DRUG INVESTIGATIONS 2004
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>82</b>
Warren CI	34
Pickaway CI	21
Richland CI	20
Mansfield CI	14
Southeastern CI	11
Trumbull CI	10
Allen CI	9
Belmont CI	8
Noble CI	8
Madison CI	7
Grafton CI	7
Lorain CI	7
Toledo CI	7
Ross CI	5
Chillicothe CI	3
Corr Reception C	3
Lake Erie CI	3
Dayton CI	2
North Central CI	2
Northeast PRC	2
Marion CI	2
London CI	2
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2
Montgomery EPRC	1
Hocking CF	1
<b>Southern Ohio CF</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Corr Medical C</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Franklin PRC</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>North Coast CTF</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Oakwood Corr F</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Ohio State Penitentiary</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>273</b>

## STAFF/INMATE DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

In 2004, there were 72 staff/inmate drug investigations system wide. Such investigations ranged from no such investigations at 14 prisons, to the high of 20 such investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. Pickaway Correctional Institution ranked second highest, with 17 such investigations. The remaining institutions reported from one to five such investigations in 2004.

Staff/Inmate Drug Investigations system wide totaled 36 in 2003, and doubled to 72 in 2004. There were only three such investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution in 2003. Such investigations increased by 17 to a total of 20 in 2004 at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. The breakdown per institution in 2004 is provided below:

### STAFF/INMATE DRUG INVESTIGATIONS IN 2004 BY INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION	STAFF/INMATE DRUG INVESTIGATIONS IN 2004
<b>Lebanon CI</b>	<b>20</b>
Pickaway CI	17
Marion CI	5
Trumbull CI	4
Richland CI	4
Warren CI	3
Lake Erie CI	3
Grafton CI	3
Allen CI	3
Mansfield CI	2
Madison CI	1
Ohio Ref for Women	1
Southeastern CI	1
Toledo CI	1
Belmont CI	1
Lorain CI	1
Noble CI	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	1
London CI	0
Chillicothe CI	0
Corr Reception C	0
Ross CI	0
Southern Ohio CF	0
Corr Medical C	0
Dayton CI	0
Franklin PRC	0
Hocking CF	0
Montgomery EPRC	0
North Central CI	0
North Coast CTF	0
Northeast PRC	0
Oakwood CF	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>72</b>

## DRUG INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING STAFF

Drug investigations pertaining to staff totaled 25 system wide in **2004**, ranging from **one each at six prisons, to the high of eight** such investigations at the Pickaway Correctional Institution. There were **21 prisons with no such investigations, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution**. In **2003**, drug investigations pertaining to staff system wide totaled only **six**, with **one such investigation at six prisons**. **The remaining institutions, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution, had no such investigations**.

## DRUG INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING MAIL

There were 69 drug investigations involving mail/packages system wide in **2004**, ranging from **no such investigations at 15 prisons (including the Lebanon Correctional Institution)** to the high of 13 at Ross Correctional Institution. Richland Correctional Institution ranked second with 10 such investigations. **The Lebanon Correctional Institution is one of nine prisons that had no such investigations in 2003 or 2004**. Such investigations system wide in 2003 totaled 66, with a slight increase to 69 in 2004.

## OTHER DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

There is a “Drugs (Other)” category of investigations initiated by the Investigator, which totals 353 system wide in 2004. There were **no such investigations at eight prisons, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution**. Such investigations at the remaining institutions range from one each at the Warren Correctional Institution and Northeast Pre-Release Center, to 47 such investigations at the Chillicothe Correctional Institution. Richland Correctional Institution ranks second with 45. Such investigations totaled 263 system wide in 2003, and increased by 90 in 2004, to a total of 353 such investigations. Six prisons had no such investigations in either year, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution.

## SEARCHES, SHAKEDOWNS:

**Illicit Pills Confiscated:** According to the 2004 Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, 447 searches/shakedowns were conducted system wide in which illicit pills were confiscated. **There were 25 prisons including the Lebanon Correctional Institution reporting no such incidents**. The remaining seven prisons had from two such incidents at Belmont Correctional Institution to 349 at the Ross Correctional Institution. Noble Correctional Institution ranked second, with 76 such incidents reported.

In 2003, there were 565 searches/shakedowns resulting in confiscation of illicit pills system wide, **with 20 prisons including the Lebanon Correctional Institution, reporting no such incidents**. However, three prisons reported over 100 such incidents, with 128 at the Grafton Correctional Institution, 137 at the Ross Correctional Institution, and 152 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The number of incidents system wide declined from 565 in 2003 to 447 in 2004.

**Heroin Confiscated:** In 2004 there were nine prisons in which heroin was confiscated during searches or shakedowns, including Lebanon Correctional Institution. Mansfield, Ross and Richland Correctional Institutions each confiscated 8.5 grams. London Correctional Institution reported confiscation of three grams, and Lebanon Correctional Institution confiscated two grams. Smaller amounts of heroin were confiscated at the Toledo, Marion, and Noble Correctional Institutions, and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

In 2003, there were nine prisons in which heroin was confiscated during searches or shakedowns, with the largest amount at the Mansfield and Trumbull Correctional Institutions, at 8.5 and eight grams respectively. Lebanon Correctional Institution reported confiscating two grams each in 2003 as well as in 2004. Other prisons in which heroin was confiscated in 2003 include London, Toledo, Ross, Richland, Lake Erie and Chillicothe Correctional Institution.

**Crack/Cocaine Confiscated:** In 2004, crack/cocaine was confiscated in 12 prisons, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution, where one gram was reportedly confiscated, the same as Mansfield and Noble Correctional Institutions. From two to 7.6 grams were confiscated from London, Pickaway and North Central Correctional Institutions. The largest amount was confiscated at the Ross Correctional Institution, with 15.44 grams.

In 2003, Lebanon Correctional Institution also reported confiscation of one gram of crack/cocaine, the same as in 2004. However, Warren Correctional Institution (also located in Lebanon, Ohio) reported confiscation of 44.4 grams in 2003, the largest amount of all Ohio prisons. Toledo Correctional Institution ranked second highest in 2003, with 19.55 grams confiscated, followed by Ross Correctional Institution with over 12 grams, Richland Correctional Institution with over six grams, and Trumbull Correctional Institution with five grams.

**Marijuana Confiscated:** In 2004, marijuana was confiscated from all but 11 prisons. Amounts confiscated ranged from a “trace” at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Ohio State Penitentiary, and Northeast Pre-Release Center, to the high of 23.24 ounces at the North Central Correctional Institution. Lebanon Correctional Institution reported confiscations in the amount of .21 ounces.

In 2003, the Southeastern and **Lebanon Correctional Institutions reported the largest amount of marijuana confiscated, with 24.46 and 13.5 ounces respectively.** Both institutions reported significant reductions in 2004, with .76 and .21 respectively.

**“Hooch” Confiscated:** According to the Chief Inspector’s Annual Reports for 2003 and 2004, the confiscation and destruction of “hooch” varies from institution to institution and may not include Investigator involvement. Therefore, no reported confiscation of “hooch” may only indicate that the Investigator had no involvement in its confiscation and destruction. In 2004, a total of 784.86 gallons of “hooch” were confiscated in nine of

the prisons, from 1.75 gallons at the Marion Correctional Institution to over 200 gallons each at the Mansfield and Noble Correctional Institutions. The remaining institutions, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution, reported that no “hooch” was confiscated in the year.

In 2003 there were 13 prisons in which “hooch” was confiscated, with the largest amount at the Mansfield Correctional Institution, where 224 gallons were confiscated in 2003 as well as in 2004. No “hooch” was confiscated at the Lebanon Correctional Institution in 2003 or in 2004. In all 18 prisons reported no such confiscations in either year.

## **MAJOR SHAKEDOWNS**

According to the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, there were 52 major shakedowns in 2004 system wide. **There are 13 prisons that received no shakedowns, including the Lebanon Correctional Institution.** Six prisons received one shakedown. Six prisons received two major shakedowns. The remaining seven prisons received from three shakedowns at the Oakwood Correctional Facility and Richland Correctional Institution, to the high of eight at the Madison Correctional Institution. London Correctional Institution ranked second, with seven shakedowns in 2004.

**Lebanon Correctional Institution and six other prisons had no major shakedowns in 2003 or 2004.** Madison and London Correctional Institutions received the largest number of shakedowns in both years, with eight and seven respectively. There were 52 major shakedowns in 2003 and the same in 2004.

## **CANINE SEARCHES**

According to the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, there were 127 canine searches system wide in 2004. No searches were reported to have occurred at seven prisons. At the remaining prisons, canine searches range from one each at four prisons, to 13 searches each at the Lorain Correctional Institution and North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility. **There were six canine searches each at the Lebanon and London Correctional Institutions.**

In 2003 there were 116 canine searches system wide, with none at eight prisons. One search was conducted at each of four prisons. **Lebanon Correctional Institution is one of four prisons in which 12 canine searches occurred in the year, the largest volume of any prison.** Although the number of canine searches system wide increased from 116 in 2003 to 127 in 2004, the number **of canine searches at the Lebanon Correctional Institution decreased from 12 in 2003 to six in 2004.**

## **EMPLOYEE STRIP/PATDOWNS**

According to the Chief Inspector’s 2004 Annual Report, there were 85 employee strip/patdowns in 2004 system wide. However, they only occurred at 10 of the prisons, ranging from one each at Grafton and Warren Correctional Institution, to 51 at North

Central Correctional Institution. Belmont Correctional Institution ranked second, with 12 in 2004. **Lebanon Correctional Institution was one of 23 prisons in which no employee strip/patdowns occurred.**

In 2003 there were only eight employee strip/patdowns in the entire year system wide, and they occurred at six of the prisons. **One each occurred at the Lebanon, Lake Erie, London, Pickaway and Warren Correctional Institutions.** Three occurred at the Toledo Correctional Institution.

#### **VISITOR STRIP/PATDOWNS**

**In 2004** there were 80 visitor strip/patdowns system wide. No such patdowns occurred at 14 prisons. The remaining prisons had from one to 21 such patdowns, with **the largest number at the Warren Correctional Institution**, and the second highest at the Correctional Reception Center, with ten. **The Lebanon Correctional Institution reported six such patdowns in 2004, the third highest in the system.**

**In 2003**, there were 49 visitor strip/patdowns system wide, with none at 17 prisons. The remaining prisons ranged from one such patdown at Lorain Correctional Institution and the Correctional Reception Center, to **seven patdowns at the Lebanon Correctional Institution.** The Warren Correctional Institution ranked second highest, with six such patdowns in the year. The number of patdowns increased by 31 in the two years, from 49 in 2003 to 80 in 2004.