

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT:**

**INSPECTION OF THE
LORAIN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

**PREPARED AND SUBMITTED
BY CIIC STAFF**

June 12, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction.....	6
Inspection Profile	
Inspection Date	
Type of Inspection	
CIIC Members and Staff Present	
Institution Staff Present	
Areas/Activities Included on the Inspection	
Statutory Requirements.....	7
Meal Attendance	
Educational Program	
Findings Summary	
Institution Overview.....	8
Mission Statement	
Opening	
Accreditation	
Acreage and Design.....	9
Costs	
Table 1. Average Cost Per Inmate Meal by Institution	
Capacity, Population, Classification.....	10
Table 2. Racial Composition of the LORCI Inmate Population	
Table 3. Institutions Ranked by Inmate Population.....	11
Escapes, Walkaways, Deaths.....	12
Staff	
Table 4. Racial Breakdown of LORCI Staff	
Table 5. Racial Breakdown of LORCI Security Staff.....	13
Entry/Administrative Building	
Reception Inmate Housing	
Table 6. DRC Percentage of Crowding Rated Capacity as of May 1, 2006....	14
Overcrowding.....	15
Inspector's Checklist	
Cadre Inmate Housing.....	16
Segregation.....	17
Table 7. Number of Inmates Housed in Segregation as of April 4, 2006	
Table 8. Racial Breakdown of Inmates Housed in Segregation	
Segregation Recreation.....	18
Safe Cells.....	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Inspector's Checklist.....	20
Key Programs.....	21
Unit Programs	
Recovery Services / Substance Abuse.....	23
Table 9. Urinalyses: Number of LORCI Inmates Tested and Percent	
Testing Positive.....	24
Recovery Services Programs	
Enrollment.....	25
Mental Health Services.....	26
Mental Health Services Programs.....	27
Staffing.....	28
Residential Treatment Unit Access.....	29
Attempted Suicides	
Table 10. Number of Suicide Attempts in Calendar Year 2005 by	
Institution.....	30
Table 11. Number of Suicide Attempts from January through	
March 2006 by Institution.....	31
Medical Services	
Staffing.....	32
Medical Staff.....	33
Contract Medical Staff	
Medical Services Statistical Summary	
Civil Service Staff Summary	
Pharmacy.....	34
Contractual Staff Utilization	
Primary Health Care	
Intake Screenings	
Sick Call.....	35
Emergency Triage	
Infirmery Care	
Dental Care.....	36
Specialty Care	
Optometry	
Podiatry	
Infectious Disease Data	
Inspector's Checklist.....	37
Laundry/Quartermaster.....	38
Educational/Vocational Programs and Services	
Staffing	
Educational/Vocational Programs.....	39
Enrollment Data.....	40

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table 12. LORCI March 2006 Enrollment Data.....	40
Table 13. Number of GEDs Administered and Passed:	
April 2005 - March 2006.....	41
Table 14. Number of GEDs Administered and Passed:	
July 2005 - March 2006.....	42
Vocational Programs.....	43
Religious Services Programs	
Table 14. Religious Services Schedule.....	44
Community Service Programs	
Team Greyhound Adoption of Ohio	
Ohio Reads Reading Room.....	45
Table 16. Institutions Ranked by Number of Children Served in the	
Reading Room.....	46
Adopt-A-School.....	47
Unique Programs	
Release Preparation Program	
Responsible Family Life Skills.....	48
Recreation Program.....	49
Barber.....	51
Food Services	
Use of Force.....	52
Table 17. Use of Force Incidents Per Month with Racial Breakdown	
April 2005 to March 2006.....	53
Use of Force Committee Investigations	
Table 18. Use of Force Committee Assignments with Racial Breakdown	
April 2005 to March 2006.....	54
Extensions.....	55
Table 19. Use of Force Investigation Extensions April 2005 to March 2006	
Table 20. Number of Completed/Not Completed Extended Investigations....	56
Grievance Procedure	
Informal Complaints	
Table 21. Informal Complaint Resolution Numbers:	
April 2005 to March 2006.....	57
Table 22. Institutions Ranked by Total Number of ICRs Handled.....	58
Grievances.....	59
Table 23. Number and Disposition of LORCI Grievances:	
April 3005 to March 2006	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table 24. 2004 Top Ten Most-Cited Subject Matter for Inmate Grievances in the entire DRC.....	61
Grievance Appeals	
Table 25. Number of Appeals in 2004 by Institution.....	62
Original Grievances	
Table 26. Number of Original Grievances Filed in 2004.....	63
Chief Inspector's 2004 Summary	
Investigations.....	64
Table 27. 2005 Lorain Correctional Institution Investigator Caseload	
Table 28. 2003-2005 Lorain Correctional Institution Investigator Caseload.....	65
Table 29. Condensed Analysis of 2003-2005 Investigator Caseload.....	66
Searches, Seizures, and Shakedowns.....	68
Table 30. Searches Performed in CY 2005	
Table 31. Searches Performed in CY 2003-2005.....	69
Table 32. Confiscated Contraband in CY 2005	
Table 33. Confiscated Contraband in CY 2003-2005.....	70
CIIC Database	
Contacts	
Logged Concerns	
Conclusions.....	71

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT:
INSPECTION OF THE
LORAIN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

INTRODUCTION

This report provides data and information regarding the Lorain Correctional Institution gathered from January 2006 to April 2006, including the inspection performed on April 4, 2006. While the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee is charged with inspecting each Ohio prison biennially, the CIIC is also required to evaluate operations, conditions, and the grievance procedure. Monitoring and evaluation involve an ongoing process that begins long before an inspection and continues long after the inspection is complete. This inspection report includes information that is specific to Lorain Correctional Institution, as well as comparison data with other Ohio prisons. It includes information and observations from the one-day inspection, as well as information gathered previously from the monthly reports for evaluative purposes.

INSPECTION PROFILE

INSPECTION DATE: April 4, 2006

TYPE OF INSPECTION: Unannounced

CIIC MEMBERS AND STAFF PRESENT: Representative Michael DeBose
Shirley Pope, CIIC Director
Adam Jackson, Inspector
Joanna Saul, Inspector

INSTITUTION STAFF PRESENT:

Communication with staff on-site included, but was not limited to the following: Bob Riddle, Deputy Warden of Operations; Barb King, Deputy Warden of Administration; Lydia Hishynsky, Deputy Warden of Special Services; Donald Redwood, Major; Mary Migra, Mental Health Administrator; Sue Norman, Health Care Administrator; Ms. Scott, Special Education Teacher.

AREAS/ACTIVITIES INCLUDED ON THE INSPECTION:

Entryway	Kitchen	Intake
Entry/Exit Interview with Warden	Inmate Dining Room	Career Tech class
Medical/Dental Services Area	Mental Health Services	
Recreation Yard and Gymnasium	Education Unit	
Housing Units	Segregation	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

MEAL ATTENDANCE

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 103.73, each inspection must include "attendance at one general meal period." CIIC Member Representative DeBose and CIIC staff attended a meal at Lorain Correctional Institution in the inmate dining hall. Inmates enter the dining hall in a single file line, pick up a tray with food, and proceed to sit, in the same order, at a long cafeteria table. Although inmates did engage in conversation, the overall level of noise was low.

For the meal, inmates were served a large portion of beef and noodles, three slices of white bread, red Kool-aid in a plastic bag, small portion of pears, and broccoli. The meal was the appropriate temperature, was of a sufficient quantity, and appeared to be nutritious.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 103.73, each inspection must also include attendance at "one educational or rehabilitative program." CIIC Member, Representative Michael DeBose and CIIC staff attended a career-technical cable and fiber optics class. There were seven inmate students. The class reportedly leads to an entry level technician career. The program lasts two to three weeks. Eligibility requirements include that the inmate must be at or above the 10th grade reading level, cannot be a sex offender, and must have at least four months left before they are released. The program is designed for a short-term offender. Inmates had a workbook titled, "Network Cabling." All inmates appeared to be very interested in the project at hand.

FINDINGS SUMMARY

Overall, the inspection was very positive. Institution staff were extremely courteous, willing to discuss issues, and were open to constructive suggestions. The observed dynamic between inmates and staff also bespoke a mutually beneficial, "controlled calm." As an example, in the observed housing unit, inmates immediately responded to the direction of the corrections officers. Despite the large number of inmates housed on bunk beds in the middle of the dorm, the area was devoid of conversation and classical music played via radio.

The Cadre inmates also appeared to appreciate the secure environment. All inmates seemed relaxed and content with their institutional assignment (as compared to another institution). Inmates reported no fear or threats by other inmates. Inmates did not report fear of staff retaliation or other misconduct. Inmates also were somewhat racially mixed, even in casual company. Several of the inmates reported time spent at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (Level 4 security) and yet appeared to be very well adjusted to the Level 3 environment.

Reception institutions tend to sacrifice educational programs, as the majority of inmates are there for a short duration. However, Lorain Correctional Institution had several short educational programs for the reception inmates and one Cadre inmate reported that he was involved in correspondence courses for college credit. Inmates involved in the Canine program appeared to appreciate their ability to participate.

Although inmates did report complaints about the food, the food was plentiful, palatable, and of an appropriate temperature. The Kitchen area appeared to be clean, as did the inmate workers. Inmates assigned to the Kitchen reported that the food was always freshly made and they did not report any sanitary issues.

All areas of the institution appeared to be very clean and the grounds were well-maintained.

An issue of concern at Lorain Correctional Institution is overcrowding, a problem common to all of the reception institutions that will be discussed more in-depth within this report. Staff reported that Intake ranges from 250-300 per week. In the housing unit, the cells were filled and bunk beds were stacked in the middle, open area. According to DRC staff, the population increase is indeed a concern as the population has climbed to around 2,100 in the past 12 months (reported as 1,816 at the time of the CIIC inspection). According to information provided by the institution on-site, the main design capacity was 750 inmates.

In spite of this concern, the institution appears to be doing an excellent job at both housing short-term reception inmates, as well as providing long-term opportunities for the Cadre inmates. The atmosphere was positive in its sense of discipline and order.

INSTITUTION OVERVIEW

MISSION STATEMENT

As described on its website, the Lorain Correctional Institution (LORCI) seeks to protect Ohio's citizens and Department of Rehabilitation and Correction employees and inmates by receiving and processing inmates from northern Ohio counties who have been sentenced to prison in a controlled environment that is conducive to self improvement.

OPENING

According to information provided by the institution on-site, the groundbreaking date for construction of LORCI was June 12, 1986. The first inmates were received on March 28, 1990.

ACCREDITATION

LORCI was awarded accreditation status in January of 1998 and 2004. According to staff, the institution is scheduled to be reaccredited later this year.

ACREAGE AND DESIGN

LORCI is located on 111 total acres. The Main Housing area comprises 69 acres. There are 11 buildings inside the fence and two outside the fence. The design of the institution is "New Generation Style." The original purpose of the institution was as a Reception Center. According to the information provided on-site, two modular units have been set up outside of buildings 4 & 5 for Recovery Services. Cells are 11' x 7' in size.

COSTS

According to information provided on-site, the annual budget (FY) is \$38,542,109.00. The average daily cost per inmate is \$58.46. Of that, Food Services accounts for \$1,790,214.00. The number of meals per year is 1,752,000, with an average cost of \$0.88 per meal.

According to an ODRC analysis of FY 2005 costs¹, the average cost of a meal at LORCI in FY 2005 was \$1.26. Currently, the reported cost of \$0.88 per meal places LORCI as the third lowest in the entire system. The ODRC average in FY 2005 is quoted as \$1.08. The following information was provided regarding costs of meals:

Table 1. Average Cost Per Inmate Meal By Institution

Institution	Average Cost Per Meal
Corrections Medical Center	\$4.71
Ohio State Penitentiary	\$1.84
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	\$1.41
Ohio Reformatory for Women	\$1.30
Lorain Correctional Institution	\$1.26
Dayton Correctional Institution	\$1.23
Correctional Reception Center	\$1.17
London Correctional Institution	\$1.15
Mansfield Correctional Institution	\$1.14
Lebanon Correctional Institution	\$1.13
Warren Correctional Institution	\$1.11
Trumbull Correctional Institution	\$1.11
Montgomery Edu. And Pre-Release Center	\$1.10
Pickaway Correctional Institution	\$1.09
Belmont Correctional Institution	\$1.07
Richland Correctional Institution	\$1.05
Toledo Correctional Institution	\$1.02
Ross Correctional Institution	\$1.01
Allen Correctional Institution	\$1.00
Franklin Pre-Release Center	\$1.00
Noble Correctional Institution	\$0.98
Southeastern Correctional Institution	\$0.97
Marion Correctional Institution	\$0.97
North Central Correctional Institution	\$0.97
Northeast Pre-Release Center	\$0.95
Grafton Correctional Institution	\$0.94
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	\$0.92
Hocking Correctional Facility	\$0.90
Madison Correctional Institution	\$0.84
Oakwood Correctional Institution	\$0.17

¹ <http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/Reports/costperinmate/June%202005.pdf>

The food experienced by CIIC at LORCI was satisfactory. **It is not known how the average price dropped from \$1.26 to \$0.88 or what the effect was on the quality.**

CAPACITY, POPULATION, CLASSIFICATION

Also according to the information provided on-site, the population as of April 2006 was 1,854 inmates. As stated above, the main design capacity was 750 inmates. The racial composition of that population is as follows:

Table 2. Racial Composition of the LORCI Inmate Population

Race	Count	Percentage
African American	1,072	57.82%
Caucasian	702	37.86
Hispanic	73	3.94
Native American	3	.16
Asian	2	.11
Other	2	.11
TOTAL	1,854	100%

According to an ODRC report of the inmate count as of April 17, 2006², LORCI had 1,785 inmates. The following system-wide data is provided for comparison purposes:

² <http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/Reports/count/Apr%2017%202006.pdf>

Table 3. Institutions Ranked by Inmate Population

Institution	Inmate Population (As of 4/17/06)
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2,817
Belmont Correctional Institution	2,472
Richland Correctional Institution	2,396
Noble Correctional Institution	2,308
Ross Correctional Institution	2,271
North Central Correctional Institution	2,269
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2,211
London Correctional Institution	2,183
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2,162
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2,035
Madison Correctional Institution	1,947
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1,940
Correctional Reception Center	1,851
Marion Correctional Institution	1,836
Lorain Correctional Institution	1,785
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1,461
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1,444
Grafton Correctional Institution	1,401
Allen Correctional Institution	1,314
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1,252
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1,134
Warren Correctional Institution	1,032
Toledo Correctional Institution	797
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	596
Northeast Pre-Release Center	578
Ohio State Penitentiary	532
Hocking Correctional Facility	475
Franklin Pre-Release Center	463
Dayton Correctional Institution	411
Montgomery Edu. Pre-Release Center	332
Corrections Medical Center	124
Oakwood Correctional Facility	108
TOTAL	45,937

All Reception inmates housed at LORCI are considered to be Level 3 (close security) inmates for purposes of security. Once they are assigned the appropriate level of security classification and assigned to a parent institution, they will be transferred.

All Cadre inmates are also reported to be Level 3. However, the information provided indicates that one inmate, presumably in Cadre, is classed as Level 2 and one inmate is classed as Level 1.

According to the Inmate Handbook, it is a violation of institutional rules for Cadre inmates and Reception inmates to interact or mingle together without staff authorization. However, it was reported that some jobs require Cadre inmates and Reception inmates to interact, which has generated some complaints among the Cadre population. According to the inmate communication on site, the Cadre inmates want to be able to mix with the Reception inmates, and cite the fact that they have such contact in job assignments, as reason to reassess the no mixing rule.

ESCAPES, WALKAWAYS, DEATHS

The institution information reports that there have been no escapes, walkaways, or recaptures in the past five years. Since January of 2005, there have been two natural deaths and one suicide. There have been no employee deaths in the line of duty in the past five years.

STAFF

According to the information provided on-site, the total number of institutional staff was 447. Of the total, 304 were male and 143 were female; 99 African Americans, 332 Caucasians, and 16 were categorized as "Other." The information is presented in the following table:

Table 4. Racial Breakdown of LORCI Staff

Demographic	Number	Percent of Total Staff
Gender		
- Male	304	68.0%
- Female	143	32.0%
Race		
- Caucasian	332	74.3%
- African American	99	22.1%
- Other	16	3.6%

As shown above, 74.3 percent of the staff are Caucasian, while 57 percent of the inmates are African American. According to the above data, only 22.1 percent of the overall staff population is African American. Staff relayed to CIIC that employees are drawn from the surrounding areas—Elyria, Lorain, Grafton, Akron, Cleveland, Spencer, and Lodi.

Of the 447 total staff, 260 are considered Security staff. Of that number, 204 are male and 56 are female; 68 African Americans, 178 Caucasians, and 14 "Other." The information is provided in the following table:

Table 5. Racial Breakdown of LORCI Security Staff

Demographic	Number	Percent of Total Staff
Gender		
- Male	204	78.5%
- Female	56	21.5%
Race		
- Caucasian	178	68.5%
- African American	68	26.2%
- Other	14	5.4%

According to the inmate handbook, the housing units at Lorain Correctional Institution are operated under the concept of Unit Management. That is, institution staff are assigned to the housing unit to be available for inmates to quickly address any questions, problems, or concerns that inmates may have. The Unit Staff is made up of the Unit Manager, Case Manager, Secretary, Correctional Counselor, and the Correction Officer. Inmates are directed to address questions and problems to these individuals first.

In addition to staff, volunteers also provide services at LORCI, such as in the area of Religious Services.

ENTRY/ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

The overall appearance of the facility upon entry was very positive, clean, and well maintained. A circular stone fountain was built in the front of the entry building in the past year, which is a positive addition. The lobby area was very clean and orderly.

RECEPTION INMATE HOUSING

As part of the inspection, the CIIC inspected Housing Unit 4A, which houses Reception inmates. At that time, 130 inmates were housed in the unit, with 44 inmates on bunks on the floor. According to both inmates and staff, the institution is overcrowded and new bed space must be creatively engineered to accommodate the rising number of new arrivals. As stated previously, the main design capacity was 750 inmates; currently, 1,816 inmates are housed at LORCI.

As shown below, as of May 1, 2006, the Lorain Correctional Institution ranked first system-wide in terms of crowding rate, with its population comprising 237 percent of its designed capacity.

Table 6. Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Percentage of Crowding Rated Capacity as of May 1, 2006

Institution	Gen. Beds		Hospital	Local	Levels	All	05/01/06 Pop. Count	% of Crowding
	Cells	Dorms	Beds	Control	4A/4B	Beds		
Lorain C.I.	746	0	0	10	0	756	1,789	236.64
Corr. Reception	888	0	0	12	0	900	1,850	205.56
Warren C.I.	538	0	0	13	0	551	1,034	187.66
Chillicothe C.I.	606	997	0	70	0	1,673	2,843	169.93
Ross C.I.	1,008	375	0	20	0	1,403	2,284	162.79
Ohio Reformatory	530	685	17	14	0	1,246	2,005	160.91
Hocking C.F.	0	298	0	0	0	298	477	160.07
Mansfield C.I.	1,010	369	0	39	0	1,418	2,224	156.84
Allen C.I.	500	312	0	32	0	844	1,308	154.98
Grafton C.I.	496	425	0	18	0	939	1,414	150.59
Lebanon C.I.	1,188	180	0	113	0	1,481	2,148	145.04
Trumbull C.I.	496	369	6	31	0	902	1,289	142.90
Belmont C.I.	0	1,845	0	10	0	1,855	2,443	131.70
Franklin Pre Rls.	45	316	0	0	0	361	470	130.19
Richland C.I.	0	1,845	0	10	0	1,855	2,388	128.73
Noble C.I.	0	1,845	0	10	0	1,855	2,324	125.28
North Central C.I.	0	1,845	0	10	0	1,855	2,264	122.05
Marion C.I.	310	1,232	0	48	0	1,590	1,873	117.80
London C.I.	65	1,760	0	65	0	1,890	2,160	114.29
North Coast Corr.	0	552	8	0	0	560	607	108.39
Southeastern C.I.	355	978	0	25	0	1,358	1,454	107.07
Lake Eric C.I.	0	1,380	0	0	0	1,380	1,470	106.52
Madison C.I.	496	1,409	0	10	0	1,915	1,968	102.77
Pickaway C.I.	12	1,931	102	20	0	2,065	1,961	94.96
Montgomery Edu.	64	288	0	0	0	352	334	94.89
Southern Ohio C.F.	1,198	0	0	0	0	1,198	1,122	93.66
Northeast PRC	64	576	0	0	0	640	562	87.81
Dayton C.I.	480	0	0	2	0	482	422	87.55
Toledo C.I.	616	186	7	95	0	904	791	87.50
Ohio State Pen.	504	180	0	0	0	684	538	78.65
Corr. Medical	0	0	210	0	0	210	118	56.19
Oakwood C.F.	163	28	0	0	0	191	98	51.31
Totals	12,378	22,206	350	677	0	35,611	46,032	129.26

At the time of the inspection, it was count time and the inmates were all sitting on their bunks. It was extremely quiet and classical music played from a radio. The inmates responded to the direction of the corrections officers.

One inmate relayed that, "we need circulation out here," saying that fans were in the units, but that the staff would not turn them on. A large fan was in the corner, but it was off. The Corrections Officer relayed that officers are willing to turn on the fans if the inmates just ask them.

The Corrections Officer also relayed that there is a lot of idleness among the Reception inmates. He mentioned that they are permitted passes to various group activities. Inside recreation reportedly varies; according to the LORCI Inmate Handbook, during "Inside Recreation" inmates may use the telephone, take showers, watch television, or participate in board/card games. The inside recreation room is small and contains a microwave, books, TV, and wooden benches. The window has horizontal bars. Outside recreation is permitted for Reception inmates from 7 am to 9 am.

OVERCROWDING

As stated above, according to both inmates and staff, the institution is overcrowded, as demonstrated by the number of bunk beds on the floor of the housing unit. Overcrowding is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. Overcrowding can lead to heightened tension and stress, for both inmates and staff, and result in an increase in incidents, including violence. Facility conditions are also negatively impacted by crowding, due to more demand on limited space and support structures.

In the CIIC meeting of May 10, 2006, DRC Director Terry Collins reported to the CIIC that from May 2, 2005 to May 6, 2006, there has been an increase of 2,183 inmates within the DRC. **Of that increase, the highest increase has been reported at Lorain Correctional Institution, with a total of 412 additional inmates.** For an institution originally built to house 750 inmates, an increase of 412 within one year is truly significant.

INSPECTOR'S CHECKLIST

The Institutional Inspector has the responsibility of checking the conditions and facilities in the housing units. Enclosed with the Institutional Inspector's February 2006 monthly report was the Housing Areas (Unit 4/A, B, C) Inspection Checklist, dated February 28, 2006, that answered the following questions:

- Are living areas clean?
- Are toilet facilities operational?
- Are toilet areas sanitized daily?
- Is the room temperature appropriate to weather conditions?
- Are fire exits marked and evacuation plans posted?
- Are fire doors secured and checked?

- Does the C.O. know the Fire Plan?
- Is fire equipment operational and inspected?
- Are trash cans clean?
- Is the Commissary schedule posted?
- Are inmate programs posted?
- Is unit staff accessible during non-business hours?
- Are kites available in the unit?
- Are C.O.'s making regular security checks every 30 minutes?
- Are Post Orders signed? Secured?
- Is the C.O.'s area adequately secured?
- Is there a first aid kit available?
- Are ice machines and water machines operational?
- Are inmates receiving 48 hour notification of reclassification?
- Are conduct reports being heard in a timely manner?
- Are inmates given 24 hour notice of disciplinary hearings?
- Are inmates given a copy of conduct reports?
- Are laundry facilities operational?
- Are inmates' clothing inventoried when turned in for laundry services?
- Are inmate workers trained and is this documented?
- Are all chemicals secured properly and inventory sheets accurate?

The Inspector answered in the affirmative for every question. This checklist, complete with the Inspector's signature, should serve as an assurance that these areas are checked on a monthly basis by the Inspector.

CADRE INMATE HOUSING

At the time of the inspection, 120 inmates were housed in the unit. Some of the inmates were involved in the Team Greyhound Adoption of Ohio program; five or six greyhounds were seen in the unit.

Inmates were seated around the tables, playing cards, conversing. Some inmates were doing laundry. Racially, the inmate groups were mixed. There did not appear to be any obvious cliques or gangs formed.

Inmates relayed concern that they only have one or two programs for the Cadre. They said that the only advantage to being in the Cadre is being close to home. They also reported a desire for more apprenticeship programs. One inmate relayed that he was involved in a long-distance correspondence class for college credit.

Other concerns relayed by the inmates pertained to: state-issued clothing (inmates reported that they only receive five pairs of underwear a year, which they did not believe was sufficient); permitted music (inmates reported that their music was often screened out); and, permitted movie choices (inmates reported that they were only permitted "kid"

movies). According to staff, the movie choices were somewhat limited due to the institution's contract.

Overall, the inmates appeared to be positive and the complaints were minor. The inmates reported that there was no tension between inmates and reported little STG activity. They enjoyed the work and believed that the institution was better than their previous experiences.

SEGREGATION

At the time of the inspection, 43 inmates were housed in Segregation. Of that number, 21 were identified as being in Security Control; six were in Security Control Pending Transfer; six were in Local Control; four inmates were housed in Disciplinary Control; two inmates were under Investigation; two inmates were in Protective Control; one was "Unknown": and, one was on suicide watch. This information is presented in the following table:

Table 7. Number of Inmates Housed in Segregation as of April 4, 2006

Segregation Area	Number of Inmates
Security Control	21
Security Control (Pending Transfer)	6
Local Control	6
Disciplinary Control	4
Under Investigation	2
Protective Control	2
Unknown	1
Suicide Watch	1
Total	43

The racial breakdown of the inmates at the time of the inspection consisted of the following: 31 Black inmates, 10 White inmates, and two Other inmates (listed as Hispanic). The information was further broken down by segregation area:

**Table 8. Racial Breakdown of Inmates Housed in Segregation
(As of April 4, 2006)**

Segregation Area	Inmate Race		
	Black	White	Other
Security Control	18	8	1
Local Control	5	1	0
Disciplinary Control	3	0	1
Other Placement	5	1	0
Total	31	10	2
Percent of Total Inmates Housed in Segregation	72.1%	23.3%	4.7%

According to the inmate population count, Black inmates account for 57.82% of the total inmate population. As portrayed in the above numbers, they reportedly account for 72.1% of the total inmates in Segregation.

Overall, the Segregation area was very clean, with fresh paint in the main area. There was also an office area for staff that appeared to be very orderly. According to the Captain on duty, first shift includes four officers, while second shift includes three officers.

For the most part, the inmates were single-celled, although four of the cells were double-celled. The entire area was mostly quiet and inmates were conversational. Inmates are allowed a very limited amount of personal property, pursuant to ODRC Administrative Rules.

The Captain reported that Local Control stays are not generally long, as the inmates are typically in Reception and are in transit to their parent institution. There are sometimes Protective Control issues, but not often. Assaults on staff were reported to be very low. In addition, staff relayed that there were no issues with inmates throwing bodily fluids. The Captain reported that the maintenance is good in the Segregation cells and that the inmates do not complain about much. Complaints were reported to be most often about wanting more Commissary purchases allowed or more phone calls.

While talking with the CIIC staff, one inmate stated that there were ants in his cell. Another inmate relayed that the cells were "dirty" and "have never been cleaned" since he had been there. This complaint was relayed to staff, who responded that in addition to the Saturday cell cleanings by the porters, the inmate occupying the cells need only request cleaning items from the officer. As the inmate did not appear to be aware of that fact, efforts may be needed to improve communication with the inmates on what they need to know while in segregation.

Outside of each inmate's cell in segregation, a sheet is posted that documents all contacts and activities between staff and inmates, such as meals.

SEGREGATION RECREATION

The inside and outside Recreation areas were observed. Inmates in Segregation are allowed one hour of recreation time. The inside Recreation area was caged, and included a sit-up bench and a dip bar. The outside Recreation area consisted of a cement, caged area that had one basketball hoop mounted on the wall. Although for the most part clean, the outside Recreation area had cigarette butts littered on the floor. According to staff, these were most likely dropped by segregation officers.

ACA Standard 44270 titled, "Exercise Outside of Cell," states that, "Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that inmates in segregation receive a minimum of one

hour of exercise per day, outside their cells, five days per week, unless security or safety considerations dictate otherwise." The ACA further wrote:

Inmates in segregation should be provided with the opportunity to exercise in an area designated for this purpose, with the opportunities to exercise outdoors, weather permitting, unless security or safety considerations dictate otherwise. A written record should be kept of each inmate's participation in the exercise program. Reasons for the imposition of constraints should be documented.

Outdoor exercise can be extremely important to the physical and mental health of the inmates, affecting their behavior, attitude, and overall environment in segregation. Thus, the extent to which inmates in segregation are permitted to exercise outside of their cells, both indoors and outdoors, can ultimately have a positive effect on inmate behavior, thus aiding the Officers who supervise Segregation. Based on outdoor recreation areas for 4B and segregation inmates at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Death Row formerly at the Mansfield Correctional Institution, segregation at other Level Three (close security) prisons, and even the new outdoor recreation area for Level Five inmates at the Ohio State Penitentiary, consideration should be given to improvements to maximize the potential for real physical exercise outdoors for those in segregation.

Examining the Recreation areas at LORCI, it should be noted that the primary function of LORCI segregation staff is to provide a secure environment for the inmates until they are classified and sent to their parent institutions.

SAFE CELLS

Each Segregation unit has one "safe cell" for inmates on Suicide Watch. DRC policy 67-MNH-09, "Suicide Prevention," defines a safe cell as:

Designated cells within each institution for placement of offenders on watch status. Safe cells must allow clear visibility to all areas of the cell to allow continuous visual observation. The cells shall be suicide-resistant and include: stainless steel fixtures, fine mesh screens or other BOMHS approved coverings over windows and vents with no exposed plumbing or other fixtures/objects from which a person could hang or otherwise harm him or herself. The cell door must contain a food/cuff port with locks and the cell outfitted with a BOMHS approved bed and/or suicide resistant mattress.

The first cell in the unit was designated as a "safe cell." However, this cell is reportedly the last resort for potentially suicidal inmates due to the steel bed, which is not advised for inmates who are suicidal as reportedly they may cause themselves harm on its edges. Mental Health Services was reportedly in the process of getting a new replacement bed.

Posted outside of the cell of each inmate who is on Constant or Close Watch is a "Watch Property List" on which is marked the items that the inmate is allowed, such as: dentures; suicide gown, suicide blanket, glasses, jumpsuit, mattress, pillow, reading material, sheets/blankets, and toiletries.

Staff relayed that one challenge for the institution is that all inmates received from the counties who are considered to be on Suicide Watch must be maintained on Watch at LORCI, regardless of the results of the Mental Health evaluation performed by the LORCI staff. According to DRC policy 67-MNH-09, "Suicide Prevention,"

Reception offenders who were on suicide precautions in the county jails during the six months prior to admission to the reception center will be placed on constant suicide watch and then downgraded to close suicide watch when clinically appropriate, for a total minimum of 72 hours.

This requirement not only necessitates beds/cells to house the inmates, but also requires officers to appropriately monitor the inmates and the time of the Mental Health staff, who must evaluate the inmates. According to policy, an officer must observe all inmates on Constant Watch on a "continuous, uninterrupted basis" and must document the inmate's condition/behavior in intervals of no more than 15 minutes.

One inmate was in a "Dry Cell" (a cell that does not include a sink or toilet) on defecation watch following alleged drug ingestion during visiting. The inmate was covered with a suicide blanket, one of which was shown to us by LORCI staff. Suicide blankets are made to be indestructible so that they cannot be a threat to the inmate's own safety—the blankets are flame-retardant, extremely difficult to tear (so as to prevent the inmate from tearing it into strips), etc. According to staff, inmates in dry cells are given a bed pan and are on Constant Watch.

According to DRC records, the last suicide at Lorain Correctional Institution occurred in January of 2006.

INSPECTOR'S CHECKLIST

The Institutional Inspector also has the responsibility of checking the conditions and facilities in the Segregation unit. Enclosed with the Institutional Inspector's February 2006 monthly report was the Special Management (Segregation) Inspection Checklist, dated February 28, 2006, that answered the following questions:

- Is the area clean?
- Are proper tool and chemical control procedures followed?
- Are officers conducting security checks every 30 minutes?
- Are unit staff conducting rounds? How often?
- Are Class II tickets being heard in a timely fashion?
- Are kites and informal complaint forms available?

- Are individual log sheets maintained and then filled out properly (regarding Meals, Exercise, Linen/Towels, Razor issue, and Cell cleaning)?
- Are inmate property boxes labeled?
- Are property boxes secured?
- Are doors leading into housing areas secured?
- How often are inmates afforded the opportunity to: Shower, Shave, Exercise, Receive haircuts, Exchange Linen, Make a Phone Call?
- Do inmates have access to library and legal services?
- Is food being served at proper temperatures?
- Are withholding of privilege forms being utilized when necessary?
- Is legal mail being opened in the presence of the inmates?
- Are inmates provided with the required cell furnishings, clothing, toilet paper, soap, etc?

The Institutional Inspector's notes and signature on this checklist should serve as an assurance that these aspects of the Segregation Unit are examined at least on a monthly basis by the Inspector. The Inspector noted that the answer was "yes" to all of the above questions and noted that the Unit Staff conducted rounds every 30 minutes. Inmates are allowed to shower and shave daily; exercise five times per week; receive haircuts as needed; and, exchange linen three times per week.

KEY PROGRAMS

The following information was provided by the institution regarding the programming provided at the Lorain Correctional Institution.

UNIT PROGRAMS

Victim Awareness

The program is presented to the Cadre population using the course format and outline developed by the Office of Victim Services. It is an ongoing ten-week course. The intent of the program is to make offenders think about and realize the impact of their criminal actions on their victims through "victim impact panels."

Managing Money

This is a Reentry-certified, unit management program that teaches inmates to budget money to adapt to income, maintain a checking account, and establish a savings account. It helps them realize they must be prepared for the unexpected and allows them to focus on short and long term financial goals. Class length is ten one-hour sessions.

Release Preparation Program

Students who will be released into the community within the next 30-60 days attend classes for three weeks. Subjects and programs covered in this class include: positive

solutions, reentry, interactive video interviewing with prospective employers, interviewing skills, applications, resumes, community and employment resources, service learning workshop, goal setting, decision making, stress management, and other life skills.

Responsible Family Living Skills

This is a 27-week parenting skills program presented to the Cadre population using the DRC program course outline. The program is designed to enhance family relationships and teach proper parenting skills.

Cage Your Rage

This is a Reentry-certified, unit management program that teaches inmates to understand, deal with, and control their anger and emotions.

People Skills

This program aims to increase adaptive functioning in the community through modifying antisocial interpersonal behavior.

Current Events

This is a discussion group activity for Reception inmates to keep them aware of events and issues occurring outside the institution and thereby connected to society. Increased awareness of current issues and events helps prepare the offender to reenter society.

Stress Management

This program is a short-term, one session program aimed at the Reception population. It teaches basic stress management skills to inmates. It is primarily an introductory course due to the short stay for Reception inmates at Lorain Correctional Institution.

Family Orientation Program

This is an orientation to family members and visitors through a video presentation in the entrance building. Visitors can view this as they wait to be processed to visit. In addition to this, an orientation using a Powerpoint presentation is offered to visitors to view at the conclusion of visiting. The Family Orientation Program enlists the support of the inmate's family during the inmate's incarceration. The purpose is to educate family members regarding institution and departmental rules, regulations, policies and procedures affecting the offender during his incarceration.

RECOVERY SERVICES / SUBSTANCE ABUSE

According to the Lorain Correctional Institution Inmate Manual, LORCI employs several Certified Chemical Dependency Counselors in the Recovery Services Department. Recovery Services assists the inmate in beginning to recover from addiction. Drugs, alcohol, and addictive behaviors are a major contribution to being in prison. Both Voluntary and Mandatory programs are offered. The Voluntary Program is for those who choose to begin to live sober. The Mandatory Program is for those who choose to use or possess alcohol or drugs while in prison and involves some stern disciplinary sanctions.

Recovery Services has a limited supply of literature and booklets about substance abuse in the Recovery Services area. These materials support inmate efforts to live sober and change lives.

The Inmate Manual advises the inmates that they are subject to drug testing at any time. The Director of the ODRC, as well as the Warden of LORCI, are reported as having zero tolerance for drug use. Inmates may be tested as follows:

- Randomly – each month 5% of the inmate population is randomly selected for drug testing through urinalysis.
- Cause – Inmates will be tested when there is reasonable suspicion of drug use.
- Programs – including, furlough consideration; post visit; alcohol and other drug treatment programs, once every two months; prior to and following a parole hearing; as indicated by the Warden.
- Saturation Level – once per year, all Cadre inmates are tested to determine a baseline of drug activity within the institution.

According to the 2005 data provided by the institution, Lorain Correctional Institution had a total of five initiated investigations related to positive urinalyses during that year. In addition, the LORCI Institutional Investigator reported the following initiated investigations during CY 2005:

Type of Investigation	Total Number of Initiated Investigations
Drugs (Staff/Inmate).....	4
Drugs (Inmate/Visitor).....	3
Drugs (Mail/Packages).....	2
Drugs (Staff).....	4
Drugs (Other).....	12

More discussion on the Investigator's Caseload may be found in the section titled "Investigations" at the end of this report. Information provided on-site by the institution also relayed the following data pertaining to inmate drug testing:

Table 9. Urinalyses: Number of LORCI Inmates Tested and Percent Testing Positive

Year	Number of Inmates Tested	Percent of Inmates that Tested Positive
2000	1,326	2.04%
2001	1,508	2.7%
2002	1,187	0.6%
2003	1,231	1.29%
2004	938	1.7%
2005	890	0.67%
2006 (to date)	289	0%

As shown in the above numbers, there has been a decreasing number of inmates tested for drug use within the institution each year, which is believed to be a system-wide trend. When asked whether the amount of testing was sufficient to the need, regardless of possible budgetary constraints, staff relayed their belief that the amount of testing was statistically valid and implied a belief that the amount of testing was sufficient.

RECOVERY SERVICES PROGRAMS

According to the Manual, LORCI offers a program where an inmate's time is devoted to recovery. The program is aimed at the use of chemicals (alcohol, cocaine, marijuana, etc). The following is a list of the programs offered by Recovery Services:

Intensive Outpatient Treatment

This program is for Cadre outpatients to provide outpatient treatment services for alcohol and other drug-impacted offenders.

Parole Violators Outpatient Group

This program is for Reception inmates who return as violators, geared toward relapse prevention.

Relapse Prevention

A study of the dynamics of relapse on drug use.

Smoking Cessation

To assist inmates in living tobacco-free.

12 Steps to Recovery

Introduction to the 12 steps of recovery for Cadre inmates.

Alcohol Anonymous

This is a fellowship of men who share their experiences, strength and hope with each other that they may solve their common problem and help others to recover from alcohol.

Narcotics Anonymous

This is a fellowship of men who share their experiences, strength and hope with each other that they may solve their common problem and help others to recover from narcotics.

Cocaine Anonymous

This is a fellowship of men who share their experiences, strength and hope with each other that they may solve their common problem and help others to recover from cocaine.

Gamblers Anonymous

This is a fellowship of men (Cadre inmates only) who share their experiences, strength and hope with each other that they may solve their common problem and help others to recover from gambling.

Criminality and Substance Abuse

How the use of alcohol and drugs leads to criminal behavior.

Big Book

A discussion to deepen the understanding of the Big Book.

ENROLLMENT

The institution provided the following information regarding average inmate enrollment count for each Recovery Services program:

Program	Number of Inmates
Reception AA.....	104
Reception NA.....	98
Cadre AA.....	16
Parole Violators Groups.....	15
Intensive Outpatient.....	12
Cadre NA.....	12
12 Steps.....	8
Smoking Cessation.....	8
Aftercare Group.....	7

In addition to the above groups, the institution averages 350-450 inmates a month in the Recovery Services Department.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Mental Health Services area consisted of a waiting room and several offices. All areas appeared to be clean and orderly. The waiting room had seven chairs, but staff relayed that only two to three inmates are allowed in the waiting room at any given time. All Mental Health staff persons were open and friendly, very willing to discuss issues of concern pertaining to inmates and the current level of services provided. The Mental Health Administrator was particularly helpful and open regarding the needs that she perceived in her department.

According to the Lorain Correctional Institution Inmate Manual, all inmates are contacted within 14 days of arrival at LORCI for an introduction to Mental Health Services and a screening interview. The conditions of confidentiality are explained at this time and the orientation form is reviewed.

Mental Health Services are provided at LORCI by a staff of Mental Health professionals. Services available include:

- Assistance in dealing with stressful problems, such as adjustment to prison, grief and loss, family problems, etc.
- Group or individual counseling that allows the inmate to examine past behavior patterns and explore other coping styles.
- Psychological evaluations when requested by the Parole Board or Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, or to assist with treatment.
- Referral to a Psychiatrist, if necessary for treatment with medication.
- Specialty group counseling.
- Crisis stabilization services, and transfer to institutions that provide residential treatment.
- Ongoing psychiatric care.

Inmates are instructed to contact by kite the Mental Health Department if they wish to speak with mental health staff about routine matters, such as scheduling for group or individual counseling or programs offered. In an emergency situation, inmates are directed to contact their Case Manager or any staff member to receive immediate mental health assistance.

Inmates are advised that inmate debriefing/counseling is available in the event of an inmate suicide or attempt or any critical incident.

The Inmate Manual also includes a lengthy section on Sexual Assaults, including:

- Facts Related to Sexual Assault
- Statistics
- Definition of Sexual Assault
- Inmate Terminology
- Sexual Assault Awareness
- Sexual Assault Avoidance
- Reporting Sexual Assault
- Aftermath
- Information for Inmates who Sexually Assault other Inmates

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PROGRAMS

Depression Group

This is a basic introduction to issues of depression, which imparts some understanding of depression and a few basic skills that can be used to combat it.

Dual Diagnosis Group

Discusses substance abuse problems and how they interact with mental illness. It is also designed to help participants learn some techniques that can be used to control substance abuse.

Anger Group

Helps inmates understand more about anger and to learn techniques that can be used to control anger. It is not a comprehensive anger management program, nor is it a substitute for treatment for domestic violence.

Interpersonal and Social Group

Based on Yalom's model of interpersonal group therapy, these groups are designed to give inmates an opportunity to better understand themselves and how they function in an interpersonal context and to diminish acute symptoms of mental illness that manifest themselves in social interactions while, in the process, address important issues in their lives. One group (interpersonal) is designed for higher functioning inmates and the other (social) addresses the needs of the Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI) with serious impairment.

Mental Health Education Group

Mental health education is an overview of a variety of topics related to mental health. Using a psycho-educational model, it imparts some basic understanding and skills for dealing with mental health issues. It is also designed to sensitize mental health patients to the need for and benefits of therapy as an adjunct to and at times a substitute for medication.

Medication Education

Discusses various psychotropic medications, their uses, side effects, doses, and benefits. Question & Answer session is provided about specific medications.

Stress Management

Stress Management is designed to help patients understand more about stress and how it affects their lives and to learn things that can be done to control it.

STAFFING

The institution provided an organizational chart of Mental Health staff that was current as of February 2006. According to this chart, there are two contract Psychiatrists, one of whom is reportedly on-site every day. Other staff include: two Psychologists and four Psychology Assistants, who report to the Psychology Supervisor; five Psych/MR Nurses, who report to the Psychiatric Nurse Supervisor; and two Secretaries. The Mental Health Administrator is in charge of coordinating all mental health services and staff.

At the time of the inspection, staff relayed that there was only one vacancy for a Psych/MR Nurse that has since been filled.

In addition, staff relayed that although they would like to do more group therapy (and although it is listed in the Inmate Manual as an available resource for inmates), there is insufficient staffing to truly accomplish this goal. At present time, due to the Reception nature of the institution, much of the Mental Health staff time is used for assessments and for crisis intervention. When asked where the money would be allocated if an extra \$100,000 was suddenly made available, staff replied without hesitation, "An additional Psychologist." **Staff relayed that the department had to cut two Psychologist positions within the past four years, while the number of policies and mandates increased.**

Staff relayed that they currently see about 12-15 inmates per week. The Inspector's monthly checklist, dated February 28, 2006, reports that mental health rounds were conducted twice per day to the Segregation unit.

Regarding crises, the "crisis phone" can be called at any time and staff will respond. Staff also relayed that they would like to do more crisis-type intervention.

After the assessment is performed, the records travel with the inmates to the parent institution. Staff relayed the belief that the system was efficient and effective. At the parent institution, Mental Health staff at that facility will go over the treatment plan with the inmate.

RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT UNIT ACCESS

According to staff, Lorain Correctional Institution and Grafton Correctional Institution are within the same "cluster," with the Residential Treatment Unit (RTU) at the latter institution. Since Dunn, the prisons were divided into 11 clusters, with each cluster providing the necessary levels of mental health services, including but not limited to an RTU and a Crisis Stabilization Unit. According to the original concept, if an inmate at one institution is determined to need placement in one of the two units cited above, but no such unit exists at his current institution, arrangements would be made for his temporary transfer to the institution within his cluster that has such a unit. Under the concept, each inmate within a cluster would have access to all levels of mental health services, without having to provide all levels at every prison.

As noted on the monthly report, the Lorain Correctional Institution has no RTU for the mentally ill. Although Grafton Correctional Institution has a 73 bed RTU and is within LORCI's cluster, Grafton Correctional Institution is a Level Two (Medium Security) facility, while Lorain Correctional Institution is a Level Three (Close Security) facility, due to its Reception population. According to Central Office Mental Health staff, when an inmate needs to be transferred to access an RTU, the transfer request is processed through the Bureau of Classification. It was further relayed that the Bureau assigns the inmate to a particular institution based on security level, and also takes into account any separations from other inmates, as well as RTU bed availability.

Based on communication from RTU inmates in the past, there was a previous mixing of security levels with the RTUs, which reportedly created serious difficulties for the RTU inmate patients. In most of the cases brought to the CIIC's attention, the inmates were Level Two (Medium Security) inmates who were transferred to Level Three (Close Security) RTUs for mental health purposes. It is therefore regarded as a positive factor that the security level of the RTU is reportedly matched to the security level of the inmate RTU patient.

ATTEMPTED SUICIDES

In the 2005 calendar year, Lorain Correctional Institution reported two suicide attempts, both of which occurred in September. System-wide, there were 140 suicide attempts in 2005, from a low of seven attempts in both May and December, to a high of 20 in August. The number of suicide attempts at Lorain Correctional Institution ranks in the bottom half of the institutions, the same number as Allen Correctional Institution, Grafton Correctional Institution, and London Correctional Institution. The largest number of attempts occurred at the Correctional Reception Center, with 26 total attempts. Five institutions reported no suicide attempts in 2005, including the Warren Correctional Institution, which is a Level Three (Close Security) prison.

Table 10. Number of Suicide Attempts in Calendar Year 2005 by Institution

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF ATTEMPTED SUICIDES
Correctional Reception C	26
Ohio Ref for Women	16
Chillicothe CI	14
Mansfield CI	9
Southeastern CI	9
Southern Ohio CF	8
Toledo CI	6
Oakwood CF	6
Lebanon CI	5
Madison CI	5
Ohio State Penitentiary	4
Ross CI	4
North Central CI	3
Pickaway CI	3
Richland CI	3
Trumbull CI	3
Allen CI	2
Grafton CI	2
London CI	2
Lorain CI	2
Belmont CI	1
Dayton CI	1
Franklin Pre-Release C	1
Lake Erie CI	1
Marion CI	1
Noble CI	1
Northeast Pre-Release C	1
Corrections Med C	0
Hocking CF	0
Montgomery Pre-Release C	0
North Coast Corr Treat F	0
Warren CI	0
TOTAL	140

From January 2006 through March 2006, Lorain Correctional Institution has logged two suicide attempts. One attempt was in January and one was in March. As previously stated, Lorain Correctional Institution also is the only institution as yet in calendar year 2006 to have a completed suicide, which occurred in January of 2006. In the first quarter of 2006, a total of 27 suicide attempts occurred system-wide.

According to staff, there were 65 inmates on Suicide Watch at the time of the inspection.

Table 11. Number of Suicide Attempts from January through March 2006

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF SUICIDE ATTEMPTS
Lebanon CI	4
Ohio Ref for Women	4
Lake Erie CI	3
Mansfield CI	3
Lorain CI	2
Pickaway CI	2
Allen CI	1
Corrections Med C	1
Correctional Reception C	1
Franklin Pre-Release C	1
Marion CI	1
North Central CI	1
Southern Ohio CF	1
Trumbull CI	1
Toledo CI	1
Belmont CI	0
Chillicothe CI	0
Dayton CI	0
Grafton CI	0
Hocking CF	0
London CI	0
Madison CI	0
Montgomery Pre-Release C	0
North Coast Corr Treat. F	0
Noble CI	0
Northeast Pre-Release C	0
Oakwood CF	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0
Ross CI	0
Richland CI	0
Southeastern CI	0
Warren CI	0
TOTAL	27

MEDICAL SERVICES

According to the Lorain Correctional Institution Inmate Manual, the Medical Department is staffed by Nurses and Doctors who are licensed by the State of Ohio to practice nursing and are supervised by the Health Care Administrator. Health Care at LORCI is provided by employees of the Department.

Access to Medical Services is made by completing a Health Services Request form, and placing it in a white box located outside the chow hall. It was relayed that inmates are generally seen in one or two days. Nurse's Sick Call is daily Monday through Friday, except holidays. Inmates who wish to be seen by a Doctor must be seen first at Nurse's Sick Call for evaluation and then may be scheduled for a visit with the Doctor. Reportedly, individuals with chronic illnesses are automatically scheduled to be seen by the Doctor on a regular basis. It was also relayed that physical examinations for the Cadre inmates are scheduled on an annual or biannual basis, as required.

Inmates on controlled medication must come to the Infirmary to receive each dose of the medication during Pill Call. Lorain Correctional Institution employs one Pharmacist, who also serves Grafton Correctional Institution. Staff relayed that most medications come in a bubble pack. In addition, a reported 100-120 inmates report for Pill Call during First Shift. Reportedly, an even greater number report for the Second Shift Pill Call. Inmates must show their ID badge to receive the medication and staff check the inmate's mouth to ensure that the medication was swallowed. Any medication that is purposely held in the inmate's mouth ("cheeking") may result in a conduct report for the inmate.

The Medical Services area appeared clean, sanitary, and uncluttered. There is a reported maximum capacity of 14 inmates for the Infirmary, with the average occupancy ranging from four to nine. At the time of the inspection, there were five inmates in the Infirmary. The cells are double-bunked, though a few have a capacity of three inmates.

In addition to the general cells, there is also a cell specifically for juveniles, a trauma room, an examination room, and an X-ray room. The Health Care Administrator relayed that Lorain Correctional Institution performs the X-rays for neighboring Grafton Correctional Institution, as GCI does not have an X-ray machine. LORCI also has two Respiratory Isolation cells with machines that can produce reverse or negative air flow to prevent contamination. Also observed was the Medical Records office and the Optometrist's office.

The Dental Examination room is complete with two dental patient chairs. The Dentist, a contract employee, is reportedly on-site five days a week. A Dental Hygienist is on-site one day per week.

STAFFING

The institution relayed that they employ 25 Medical staff and 13 Contract Medical staff to serve the medical needs of the inmates. The following breakdown was provided:

Medical Staff

16 Registered Nurses
 2 Licensed Practical Nurses
 1 Office Assistant
 2 MIT/Schedulers
 1 Health Care Administrator
 1 X-Ray Technician
 1 Medical Lab Technician
 1 Diet Tech

Contract Medical Staff

2 Physicians
 1 Physician Assistant
 1 Dentist
 1 Podiatrist
 1 Optometrist
 1 Phlebotomist
 2 Dental Techs
 1 Dental Hygienist
 1 Pharmacist
 2 Pharmacy Techs

MEDICAL SERVICES STATISTICAL SUMMARY

ODRC prisons are required to submit reports on their medical monthly data. The following data pertains to the number of hours each staff person worked at Lorain Correctional Institution during the month of March of 2006:

Civil Service Staff Summary

Health Care Administrator	184
RN	2,080
LPN	317
X-Ray Technician	153.5
Lab Technician	168
Clerical	530
Total Medical Staff Hours	3,432.5

In addition to the above number, Lorain Correctional Institution reported a total of 170 hours of RN Overtime. LORCI reported only one vacancy: an LPN.

Pharmacy

According to the Pharmacy data for the month, the following was reported:

Prescriptions Filled

New Prescriptions	2,499
Prescription Refills	<u>733</u>
Subtotal	3,232
Psychotropic Prescriptions	1,200
Controlled Medications	1,288
Total	5,720

Reviewing data from Calendar Year 2005, the total number of New Prescriptions and Prescription Refills ranged from 2,312 to 3,320 in 2005.

As stated previously, the Pharmacist is reportedly shared between Lorain Correctional Institution and Grafton Correctional Institution. The Pharmacist's services are on a contractual basis and the hours are reported in the following section.

Contractual Staff Utilization

The following data was provided regarding the number of hours served by contractual staff at Lorain Correctional Institution during March of 2006:

Contractual Staff Utilization

RN	0
LPN	72
Physician	152
Dentist	136
Ancillary Dental Staff	272
Pharmacist	95
Pharmacy Technician	95
Lab Technician	112
Total	934

PRIMARY HEALTH CARE

Intake Screenings

According to the monthly report, in March of 2006, intake screenings by Nurses and the Physician were provided to 927 inmates at Lorain Correctional Institution.

Reviewing 2005 data, Reception intake screenings ranged from 760 in February 2005 to 1,034 in September 2005.

Sick Call

Also per the monthly institutional report, Nurse's Screenings for General Population inmates were primarily on the Second Shift, with 364 reported in March of 2006. No screenings were reported during First or Third Shift. Of those screenings, 89 inmates were referred to a Physician.

Physician appointments for Doctor's Sick Call consisted of 631 scheduled visits, with ten "no shows," and zero reported emergent add on appointments.

Segregation Screenings for Nurses Sick Call in March of 2006 totaled 1,253, all of which reportedly occurred during First Shift. No Physician visits to Segregation were reported for the month. The Inspector's monthly checklist of February 2006 states that medical rounds were conducted three times per day to the Segregation unit.

In 2005, Nurse's screenings for General Population ranged from 233 in July 2005 to 442 in December 2005. Physician visits ranged from 403 in February 2005 to 874 in September 2005. Segregation Screenings for Nurses ranged from 35 in September 2005 to 96 in April 2005.

Emergency Triage

According to Emergency Triage statistics, a Nurse screened 178 inmates and a Physician treated 164 inmates on site at Lorain Correctional Institution. Twelve inmates were sent to the local Emergency Department and two inmates were sent to the Ohio State University Emergency Department, for a total of 14. In addition, one of the inmates who was sent to the local Emergency Department was reported to have been sent from there to the OSU Department.

During March of 2006, one inmate was admitted to the local hospital and one inmate was admitted to the OSU hospital. In addition, five staff in the month received emergency treatment, in addition to one visitor.

In 2005, the highest number of inmates to be sent to an Emergency Department in a month was 22 in September 2005. The highest number of inmates admitted to a hospital during the year was 12, also during September.

Infirmary Care

Regarding Infirmary Care, 434 Infirmary Bed Days were reported during March of 2006.

Dental Care

In March 2006, Dental Care was provided to 95 inmates who were seen by appointment. An additional 28 inmates were seen on an emergent basis, for a total of 123 inmates seen by Dental Services staff.

Specialty Care

Regarding on site Specialty Care via Telemedicine, a total of six inmates were provided services in March 2006 as follows:

Specialty Care On-Site – Telemedicine

Surgery	0
Pulmonary	1
Cardiovascular	0
Infectious Disease	1
Internal Medicine	0
Nutrition	0
Other	4
Total	6

The highest number of inmates to receive Specialty Care in 2005 was 12 in September. The most common identified service during 2005 was in Internal Medicine.

Optometry

In March 2006, Optometry services were provided to 50 inmates in the space of 16 total hours by Optometry staff. In 2005, a total of 530 inmates were seen by Optometry staff.

Podiatry

In March 2006, podiatry hours were provided to 70 inmates in the space of 16 total hours on-site by Podiatry staff. In 2005, a total of 598 inmates were seen by Podiatry staff.

Infectious Disease Data

The March 2006 medical data shows that 1,093 inmates were given a TB test in the month, with 66 positive. According to communication with DRC staff, persons may test positive to a TB test if they have ever been exposed to the virus. The positive test indicates that the person's body has created antibodies in response to such an exposure. A positive TB test does not indicate that a person has TB. If a person tests positive, additional testing will be performed to determine whether the person does in fact have TB and is contagious.

It was reported that six inmates were on INH and that no inmates at Lorain Correctional Institution have tuberculosis. According to the report, 24 inmates at LORCI are HIV positive. Two inmates were positively diagnosed as HIV positive in March 2006. Three inmates were reported to be on Protease Inhibitors.

In 2005, the highest number of TB tests given to inmates was 994 in December 2005. The highest number of positive tests was 65. According to the data, at no time did the institution house an inmate who was identified as having tuberculosis. The number of inmates who were HIV positive ranged from 19 to 32 in 2005.

According to the institution, for the reporting period of July 2004 through June 2005, LORCI had 688 positive skin tests out of 10,758 admissions. Of these, 28 were placed on medications for a positive TB test. None were diagnosed with active TB.

INSPECTOR'S CHECKLIST

The Institutional Inspector also has the responsibility of checking the conditions and facilities in the Medical Services area. Enclosed with the Institutional Inspector's February 2006 monthly report was the Medical Services Inspection Checklist, dated February 27, 2006, that answered the following questions:

- Are medical services available to all inmates?
- Are Class A tools properly secured?
- Are daily inventories completed and correct?
- Are adequate medical supplies on hand?
- Are pharmaceutical inventories correct?
- Are inmates referred to outside agencies?
- Are Sick Call schedules maintained?
- Do inmate workers have access to medical records?
- Do the doctors review nursing notes and treatment?
- Is a waiting list maintained for dental services?
- Is a waiting list maintained for specialty services?
- Is the medication line supervised properly?
- Are beds and clothing sanitized on a regular basis?
- Does the nursing staff make daily rounds to segregation?
- Is a kite log maintained?
- Is the medical co-payment policy being followed?
- Do the living areas and clinic include notices regarding co-payment fees?
- Are all chemicals secured properly and inventories accurate?

The Inspector marked "yes" for all questions, except for the question pertaining to inmate access to medical records, which was appropriately determined in the negative. He further noted that the Health Care Administrator checked the pharmaceutical inventory on February 24, 2006; that there was a two-week waiting list for dental services; and, that

there was a waiting list of no more than 30 days for specialty services. These areas are evaluated by the Inspector on a regular basis.

LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER

The inmate laundry and quartermaster are located outside of the Recreation complex. The cleaning, repair, inventory, and distribution of inmate clothing, uniforms and bedding takes place in the laundry and quartermaster areas. Although they were not observed during the CIIC inspection, inmates relayed concerns to CIIC staff regarding the number of articles of clothing permitted to them.

According to the Lorain Correctional Institution Inmate Manual, Reception inmates are issued the following: 1 laundry bag, 2 sheets, 1 towel, 1 washcloth, 1 pillowcase, 1 blanket, and 1 pair of shoes. An inmate may own up to five pairs of socks, five undershorts, and five T-shirts. Cadre inmates are also permitted special/seasonal items such as jackets, gloves, etc.

EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Lorain Correctional Institution offers a very limited selection of educational and vocational programs, due to its Reception status. As noted in the LORCI Inmate Manual, parent institutions offer various programs including vocational training and college training for work experience. Once an inmate transfers from LORCI to his parent institution, he may contact the school guidance counselor with any education concerns.

The Inmate Manual also states that the Ohio Central School System believes that each student is different in terms of his education needs and desires and should be dealt with on the basis of these individual differences. The programs at LORCI are designed to meet those differences.

In addition to the educational and vocational programs listed, the Inmate Manual also states that Guidance Counseling Services are available in the areas of: Orientation, Enrollment, Assessment, and Educational Counseling.

STAFFING

The institution relayed that there are 12 staff members in the Education area, with no volunteers. The institution provided the following breakdown of the Education staff:

Education Staff

1 Librarian
 1 Library Assistant
 1 Guidance Counselor
 2 Academic Teachers
 1 Special Education/Intervention Teacher
 1 Release Preparation Teacher
 2 Education Specialists
 1 Career Tech Teacher
 1 School Administrator
 1 Shared Services Area Principal

EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

GED Class

This class parallels the subject matter and session times of the pre-GED class except for the reading levels of the students. The students in this group initially read 240 and up based on the CASAS. Class schedules include computer instruction for GED test preparation. The student population per class session averages 16-20.

GED Fast Track

Classes meet daily Monday-Friday for three hours per day. Eligible students must have achieved a CASAS (California Adult Student Assessment System) minimum reading score of 243 and math score of 228. (The institution notes that education emphasis at reception centers has shifted from traditional classrooms to assessment in order to ready inmates for more in-depth education programs and more reliable placement at parent institutions.)

A class restricted to Cadre inmates (students may be ABLE, pre-GED, or GED level) meets for the same amount of time, Monday through Friday.

Apprenticeship Programs

The apprenticeship program, although carried out in areas besides the school, is aligned with education and receives funding for its programs from the education budget. Approved Lorain Correctional Institution apprenticeship programs include:

- Cook
- Baker
- Animal Trainer
- Janitor.

Career Scope

This is a computer program to help individuals identify possible career options (an aptitude/interest inventory).

Career-Technical

Lorain Correctional Institution offers a short-term vocational program that trains individuals in Fiber Optic and Coaxial Cable Wiring (approximately 70 hours). Eligible inmates must be within 90-120 days of their expected release date.

Special Education Services

Intervention is provided as needed for students who have been identified as needing special education. Individuals who might need special education services in parent institutions are identified and the appropriate documentation is placed in each student's education folder. The special education teacher serves Lorain Correctional Institution, Northeast Pre-Release Center, and Grafton Correctional Institution for their special education needs. A student receives special education services through the school quarter in which he reaches his 22nd birthday.

ENROLLMENT DATA

The following data was taken from the March 2006 monthly report of enrollment:

Table 12. LORCI March 2006 Enrollment Data

Academic Program	March 2006	Under Age 22	Year to Date Enrollment	Waiting List*	Number of Completers Year to Date**
Literacy	0	0	0	0	0
ABLE	0	0	0	130	0
Pre-GED	0	0	72	119	20
GED	0	0	59	136	10
GED Fast Track	28	5	256	0	182
HS/HS Options	0	0	0	0	0
Total	28	5	387	385	212

* Waiting List refers to enrollment, not yet participating.

** Year to Date refers to the cumulative total from the fiscal start of July 1.

Although there are no high school options offered at Lorain Correctional Institution, the GED Fast Track program provides educational assistance to inmates preparing for the GED. As of March 2006, a reported 137 GED tests were given in fiscal year 2006 and a

reported 90 inmates passed. In fiscal year 2005, a total of 169 GED tests were given and a reported 111 inmates passed, yielding a passage rate of 66%. The following table was taken from the monthly enrollment reports submitted by the institution.

Table 13. Number of GEDs Administered and Passed: April 2005 - March 2006

Month	Total Number of GEDs Administered	Total Number of GEDs Passed
April 2005	11	9
May 2005	29	32
June 2005	20	12
July 2005	16	15
August 2005	22	5
September 2005	13	19
October 2005	7	2
November 2005	13	8
December 2005	21	11
January 2006	10	4
February 2006	8	8
March 2006	27	18
Year Total	197	143

Overall, the 143 inmates who passed represent a 73% passage rate for the GED.

In comparison, the following data was extracted from the monthly enrollment reports submitted by the separate institutions*:

Table 14. Number of GEDs Administered and Passed from July 2005 through March 2006 with Breakdown by Institution

Institution	Number of GEDs Administered (Year to Date)	Number of GEDs Passed (Year to Date)	Passage Rate (Year to Date)
Richland CI	167	84	50.3
Marion CI	156	88	56.4
Trumbull CI	146	62	42.5
Madison CI	145	83	57.2
Chillicothe CI	144	54	37.5
Lorain CI	137	90	65.7
Mansfield CI	133	79	59.4
Lake Erie CI	130	60	46.2
Pickaway CI	127	68	53.5
North Central CI	109	53	48.6
Ross CI	89	59	66.3
North Coast CTF	87	59	67.8
Lebanon CI	84	70	83.3
Belmont CI	82	46	56.1
Mont. Edu. PRC	69	40	58.0
Ohio Ref. Women	67	46	68.7
Toledo CI	57	21	36.8
Northeast PRC	51	30	58.8
Grafton CI	38	31	81.6
Dayton CI	38	14	36.8
Allen CI	35	17	48.6
Warren CI	27	18	66.7
Southern Ohio CF	20	9	45.0
Hocking CF	15	6	40.0
Oakwood CF	2	2	100
Corr. Med. Center	0	0	0
Total	2,155	1,189	55.2
Average	82.9	45.7	55.1

*Does not include all 32 institutions.

According to the above table, Lorain Correctional Institution has an excellent GED program, administering a high number of GEDs in comparison with the other institutions. Reportedly, inmates are required to be enrolled in GED classes if they have no proof of GED certificate or high school diploma. LORCI also has an excellent passage rate of 65.7, which is above average.

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Fiber Optic and Coaxial Cable Wiring class, observed by the CIIC during the inspection, is a new program. As stated previously, it is a short-term program aimed at equipping offenders who are within 90-120 days of release with job skills that will assist them in seeking employment in the community. According to the monthly enrollment reports submitted by Lorain Correctional Institution, the first ten students were enrolled in February of 2006, three of whom were under the age of 22. All ten completed the program.

As stated above, LORCI has several Apprenticeship programs, in the areas of: Cook, Baker, Animal Trainer, and Janitor. Several inmates did question the necessity for a Janitor "apprenticeship." According to the monthly enrollment data submitted by the institution, only two or three inmates are involved in the Apprenticeship program at any given time.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES PROGRAMS

According to the Lorain Correctional Institution's 2005 Inmate Manual, the institution's Chaplain(s) coordinate religious programs for the various religions represented in the inmate population. The Chaplains are available for personal counsel, help with family matters, aid in crisis upon request, and make rounds in all of the units of the institution on a regular basis.

According to information provided on the LORCI website, there is currently one full-time Institutional Chaplain and two Contract Chaplains (Catholic and Muslim). The Institutional Chaplain is available Tuesday through Saturday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, with the exception of Wednesday, when he is available 12:00 pm to 8:30 pm. Both the Catholic Priest and the Muslim Imam are available two days of the week.

Currently, Protestant, Catholic, and Islamic worship services are offered weekly. Numerous study classes are also offered weekly including Bible Study, Prison Fellowship, Taleem, Jehovah Witness meetings, and a variety of developmental inter-denominational/inter-faith classes. According to information provided by the institution, worship services and Bible Studies may be conducted by the Institutional Chaplain or Contract Chaplains and/or by volunteers from the local community.

In addition to the worship services and Bible studies, a spiritual re-entry program is offered on Friday mornings at 9:00 a.m. by volunteers from Matthew Prison Ministry. It is specifically for those in the pre-release program offered by the education department (discussed below under "Unique Programs"). This program provides the spiritual component.

Inmates must kite the Chaplain to receive a pass in order to attend the religious programs, which are voluntary. Monthly schedules of services and classes are reportedly posted in the housing units and may be requested from the Chaplain's office.

The LORCI website includes the monthly schedule of services and programs, which is reproduced in the following table:

Table 14. Religious Services Schedule

Day	Time	Name of Program
Sunday	2:30 pm – 4:00 pm	Reception Service
	6:30 pm – 8:00 pm	Cadre Service
Monday	1:30 pm – 3:00 pm	Jehovah Witness
	5:00 pm – 6:00 pm	Cadre Jehovah Witness
	6:30 pm – 8:00 pm	Cadre Bible Study
Tuesday	9:30 am – 10:45 am	Reception Bible Study
	12:30 pm – 1:45 pm	Spanish Service
	2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Fellowship of Faith
Wednesday	8:30 am – 10:30 am	Chapel Library
	8:30 am – 10:30 am	Band/Choir Practice
	1:00 pm – 2:30 pm	Catholic Rosary
	1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Taleem
Thursday	5:00 pm – 7:00 pm	Imam Counseling
	9:00 am – 10:45 am	Reception Bible Study
	1:30 pm – 3:00 pm	Reception Service
Friday	9:00 am – 10:00 am	Spiritual Reentry
	1:00 pm – 2:00 pm	Cadre Mass/Reception Mass
Saturday	1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Chaplain Counseling
	2:30 pm – 4:00 pm	Band/Choir Practice

COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

According to the Lorain Correctional Institution website, Community Service programs include the following:

Team Greyhound Adoption of Ohio

According to staff, the Greyhound program allows inmates to train old race greyhounds. Inmates keep the dogs for four months, at which point the dog is either adopted or taken back to a foster care home. Any inmate who is eligible to be in the Work Cadre can apply for the program.

While on the inspection, the CIIC visited a Cadre housing unit that included inmates who were involved in the Team Greyhound Adoption project. All inmates reported a very high level of satisfaction with the program. Some inmates cited the program as being responsible for their rehabilitation.

According to information relayed by staff, LORCI Cadre inmates take great pride in this program. Staff expressed that it gives the inmate a sense of responsibility, compassion,

self-confidence, and accomplishment when they take part in preparing the animals for adoption.

According to information provided by the institution that was obtained from Team Greyhound's website (www.teamgreyhound.com), Team Greyhound is working with several correctional facilities in the state of Ohio. Team Greyhound started with the first dogs at Lorain Correctional Institution in March of 2001. Team Greyhound is currently working with five facilities throughout the state of Ohio (and one juvenile correctional facility) and hopes to add more. This type of program is not new for the state of Ohio; however, it is the first foster or training program in Ohio to involve retired racing greyhounds.

According to the website, while the dogs are at the facility, they each have one handler and a helper whose job will be teaching the dogs general manners and basic obedience skills. The goal is that when the dogs leave the program, they will know how to walk nicely on a lead and obey the basic commands of sit, down, stay, and come. Based on the willingness of the dog to learn, more commands can be taught. This type of foster and training program is a great opportunity for future greyhound adopters to adopt a greyhound that is already well mannered and trained in the basic commands.

According to the website, the program was modeled after a program in Kansas. The dogs are in training for a period of 12-16 weeks. The following guidelines are promoted by Team Greyhound as criteria for handler selection:

- **Only caring gentle natured inmates should be allowed to handle the dogs. Greyhounds cannot be handled roughly like other breeds. They are usually not play rough type of dogs.**
- The handler should "want" to train a greyhound. He/she should be asked why they want to work specifically with a greyhound.
- It would be best if the handlers had some knowledge about dogs in general and would be helpful if they know a little about greyhounds. They should watch a video, read information and be a part of a discussion seminar before handling a greyhound.
- **New handlers should be put on a trial period of 30 days with close supervision of handling and training the dogs. If any signs of roughness or mishandling the dog, the trainer should be eliminated from the program.**

Ohio Reads Reading Room

According to the LORCI website, the First Lady approached the DRC Director in 2000 about establishing a reading room for the children who visited their incarcerated parent at the Pickaway Correctional Institution. This idea spread across the state, and now the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction maintains children's reading rooms in each of the 32 institutions. The reading rooms encourage family literacy by providing a pleasant and comfortable setting for both child and incarcerated parent. Each room is stocked with a wide variety of children's books and has an inmate narrator who reads to

the visiting children twice a day. The role of the inmate narrator is to read picture books to the children in much the same manner that children's hour would be done at a public library. A variety of arts and craft supplies for the children are also available in most of the rooms. Employees and service organizations donated many of the supplies and books. Just in the past year, the Department reportedly served over 45,000 children. The inmate narrators worked over 32,000 hours in reading to and with the children.

According to the monthly enrollment data submitted to CIIC from the institution, in fiscal year 2005, 941 children were served in the Reading Room, for a total of 375.5 Narrator Hours.

In March of 2006, 146 children were served in the Reading Room, bringing the Year-To-Date total (for FY 2006) to 1,343. A total of 38 Narrator Hours were logged in March 2006, bringing the Year-To-Date total to 326.

A comparison can be made with the other institutions within the DRC by ranking the institutions by the number of children served in the Reading Room. The data is extracted from the March 2006 monthly reports submitted by each institution:

Table 16. Institutions Ranked by Number of Children Served in the Reading Room*

Institution	Children Served in Reading Room (Year to Date)	Children Served in Reading Room (March 2006)	Narrator Hours Logged (Year to Date)
North Central CI	2,843	355	1,174
Dayton CI	2,576	305	1,760
Richland CI	2,383	263	1,394
Grafton CI	1,843	235	1043
Northeast PRC	1,564	113	902
Trumbull CI	1,485	122	1,066
Lorain CI	1,343	146	326
Lebanon CI	1,183	119	None Reported
Belmont CI	1,113	173	1,009
Southern Ohio CF	1,113	138	None Reported
Pickaway CI	1,030	85	1,395
Allen CI	951	67	455
Toledo CI	889	72	902
Montgomery PRC	835	75	514
Lake Erie CI	739	81	616
Marion CI	682	79	709
Chillicothe CI	610	63	None Reported
Ohio Reformatory for Women	519	113	1,146
Madison CI	495	52	505
North Coast CTF	435	44	362
Mansfield CI	402	54	160.5
Corrections Med Center	231	36	None Reported
Hocking CF	202	15	54
Oakwood CF	130	30	None Reported
Ross CI	0	0	0
Warren CI	0	0	0
Total	25,596	2,835	15,492.5
Average	984.5	109.0	595.9

*Does not include all 32 institutions.

As portrayed in the data above, Lorain Correctional Institution is in the upper half of the institutions in terms of number of children served (year to date). As this program furthers the family and re-entry initiatives by creating positive experiences between inmates and their children, this is a very positive note for LORCI.

Adopt-A-School

According to information relayed by the institution, Longfellow Elementary School, located in Lorain, Ohio, is Lorain Correctional Institution's adopted elementary school. LORCI staff members volunteer to read to lower-level students who have been identified by staff of the school in the hopes of tutoring them with their reading skills.

UNIQUE PROGRAMS

According to the LORCI website, the Release Preparation Program, the Apprenticeship Programs, and the Responsible Family Life Skills Program are listed as unique programs at LORCI. The Apprenticeship Programs are discussed above in the Educational/Vocational Programs area.

Release Preparation Program

Students who will be released into the community within the next 30-60 days attend classes for three weeks. Subjects and programs covered in this class include:

- Positive salutations
- Reentry
- Interactive video interviewing with prospective employers
- Interviewing skills
- Applications and resumes
- Community employment resources
- Service learning workshops
- Goal setting
- Decision making
- Stress management
- Other life skills.

LORCI staff provided to CIIC the Release Preparation Program Components and Lesson Plans Outline, which included the following:

- A. Employment Preparation Components
 - 1. Goal Setting
 - 2. Work History
 - i. Work Skills
 - ii. Self-Management Skills
 - 3. Resume Writing
 - 4. Job Search
 - 5. Job Interview Skills
 - 6. Job Retention Skills
 - 7. Offender Job Linkage

- B. Community Resources
 - 1. Identification
 - i. Social Security Card
 - ii. Birth Certificate
 - iii. Temporary Identification
 - 2. Voting Rights
 - 3. Ohio Jobs and Family Services
 - 4. Community Justice ABLÉ Centers
 - 5. Driver's License and Traffic Laws
 - 6. Expungement
 - 7. Other Community Agencies/Services

- C. Additional Components
 - 1. Faith-Based Resource Workshop
 - 2. Recovery Services Workshop
 - 3. Mental Health Workshop
 - 4. Community Justice Workshop
 - 5. Adult Parole Authority

Responsible Family Life Skills

Responsible Family Life Skills is a voluntary program for Cadre inmates designed primarily to teach parenting skills. It is also intended to develop and enhance parenting skills and improve family relationships and interaction. The program is divided into three phases over 26 weeks.

The following is an outline of the three phases of the Responsible Family Life Skills class, as provided by the institution:

- **Phase I**
 - Getting to Know Yourself
 - Communication, Sharing and Interaction
 - The Impact of Crime
 - Community Justice
 - Repairing Family and Community
 - The Underclass and the Cycle of Poverty
 - Taking Responsibility
 - Dynamics of Family
 - Culture and Morality

- **Phase II**
 - History of Child Rearing
 - Stages of Development
 - Growing up Drug Free – A Parent's Guide to Prevention
 - Discipline
 - Violence Prevention
 - Communication Skills
 - Grief and Separation Issues

- **Phase III**
 - Examining Your Self-Esteem
 - Planning for Your Release: Is it Really Necessary?
 - Communication is the Key
 - Dealing with Stressors Concerning "Going Home"
 - Common Stressors of Re-entry
 - Anger Management and Domestic Violence
 - Appropriately Expressing Angry Feelings and Responding to the Angry Feelings of Others
 - The Juggling Act – Balancing Your Responsibilities and Spending Time with your Children
 - Relapse Prevention Planning
 - Developing Your Individualized Relapse Prevention Plan

RECREATION PROGRAM

According to the LORCI Inmate Manual, a complete program of both seasonal and contest play is offered for the following sports:

- Basketball
- Volleyball, and
- Flag football

Inmates are reportedly separated into different leagues based on player ability.

The days and hours of operation for the Recreation Department are reportedly posted in the housing units. General rules and guidelines are also posted in the Recreation area. Weightlifting and any form of boxing or martial arts are prohibited.

According to the Manual, movies shown in the recreation area are screened in accordance with Department policy for appropriateness. In speaking with the inmates, a frequently repeated concern was the "kid" movies that were shown. In communication with the institution, the following was relayed:

LORCI is in the process of adding an additional screening committee member to provide diversity to the panel. Also, inmates do have an opportunity to provide input. LORCI is restricted by state contract from showing Fox, 20th Century Fox, and New Line Home videos, which are not licensed in the prisons. LORCI makes every attempt to show recent releases. Because LORCI is a reception institution, it shows more than the minimum 12 movies monthly indicated by DRC policy. LORCI will be showing eight new releases in May 2006 and 12 general releases.

"Inside" Recreation is offered in the housing units and is completed on a rotating schedule basis. During Inside Recreation, inmates may use the telephone, take showers, watch television, or participate in board/card games (gambling is prohibited).

The "Outside" Recreation area at Lorain Correctional Institution includes: a movie room, a gymnasium, an outdoors exercise equipment area, and several fields for sports, including a track for inmates to walk around.

On the day of the inspection, several dozen inmates were seated in the movie room, watching "Cliffhanger." Most inmates appeared to be actively involved in watching the movie; others were obviously just "hanging out" in the room, as they were not even facing the screen. The entire area was calm and under staff supervision.

In the gym, inmates were playing basketball. A volleyball net and a ping-pong table were also established in the gym. In addition to those amenities, the gym also included machines: four treadmills and eight stair-steppers.

Outside of the gym, several dozen inmates were utilizing the smoking area. Consistent with the Department-wide no-smoking policy that was recently put into effect by the ODRC, no inmate or staff person is allowed to smoke within the buildings.

Several fields are available for inmate use. At the time of the inspection, inmates were involved in a softball game. There are also two baseball diamonds, a football field, a basketball court, and a picnic area. Several metal exercise structures are also in the area for inmate use. All grounds observed appeared to be clean and well landscaped.

Regarding staffing, the Supervisor relayed that they have three staff plus the Supervisor. In comparison, the other men's Reception facility, the Correctional Reception Center, housed the same number of inmates, yet employed only two Recreation staff.

BARBER

Also housed within the Recreation Department is the Barber shop. The Inmate Manual relays that Reception inmates and inmates assigned to the Mandatory Drug Program receive haircuts, during scheduled Outside Recreation times.

Staff relayed that the shop is used for the inmates, who are not necessarily licensed. As stated previously, one of the Apprenticeship programs is in the Barber field. Thus, this shop may be used for experience and training.

FOOD SERVICES

Inmate Food Services at Lorain Correctional Institution consists of two dining halls, one for Reception inmates and a smaller one for the Cadre population. The Reception dining hall was outfitted with long, cafeteria style tables. There is also an Officers Dining Room for staff.

As stated within the Inmate Manual, Food Service prepares three full meals each day from a master menu prepared by the State Dietitian. All meals meet or exceed recommended daily dietary allowance of good nutrition. Changes may be made when necessary. Per DRC policy, inmates with special dietary needs may be prescribed a diet order from the Physician or Dentist. Inmates who have such an order must present a diet card at each meal.

Housing Units are called to chow on a scheduled basis and inmates are escorted to and from the chow hall by the Housing Unit Officer. Reception inmates are seated by the Officer; they do not choose where to sit. Smoking, and loud or rowdy talking is prohibited. The low level of noise, a positive indication of staff control, was observed during the inspection.

Staff relayed that there are currently 21 staff persons in Food Services, including 18 Coordinators and three Supervisors, comprised of two Manager Ones and one Manager Two, who serves as the overall Food Services Manager.

Historically, Ohio prisons have typically assigned large numbers of inmates to work in Food Services. It was not unusual for an institution to report having 200 or more inmate Food Service workers. However, that trend may be changing, and the change serves good purposes. The difficulties of meeting staff supervision needs for such a large number of workers are lessened with a reduced number of workers. The reduced number of Food Service workers provides less of a drain on other job assignments and opportunities.

Staff relayed that the institution currently uses volunteer Reception inmates in Food Services. A total of 100 such volunteers are involved in this program, with 35-40 serving at any given time. Of the Cadre population, about 30 Cadre are assigned to Food Services, serving five days on and two days off.

In order to obtain these "volunteers" from the Reception population, staff relayed that incentives are offered such as extra food. After all inmates have been served, the inmate workers are allowed to eat a second time. In addition, given the predominately idle status of the Reception inmates who are awaiting transfer to their parent institution, staff relayed its belief that the large incentive is the inmate volunteers' ability to get out of their cell and to be involved in a structured activity.

The use of incentives to achieve willing volunteers is considered to be a huge plus. Some institutions have made it a practice to assign inmates to Food Services as an entry, "bottom level" work assignment. Inmates adopt this attitude and become negligent in their duties, which reveals itself in the poor quality of food. As Food Services is a frequently cited issue to CIIC staff by inmates, and as it is something that affects the entire inmate population, institutions should provide incentives to ensure that the inmates in Food Services want to be there, and thus put forth the best effort for overall institutional benefit.

Staff relayed that meals are served after the main counts; or, at approximately 6:00 a.m., 12:00 p.m., and 5:00 p.m. For the meal, inmates were served a large portion of beef and noodles, three slices of white bread, red Kool-aid in a plastic bag, small portion of pears, and broccoli. Although a few inmates did voice negative opinions regarding the food, the meal was the appropriate temperature, was of a sufficient amount, and appeared to be nutritious.

USE OF FORCE

According to DRC policy 63-UOF-01, "Use of Force," it is the policy of the DRC that,

Force, up to and including deadly force, may be used to respond to resistance, protect persons, prevent escapes, protect its institutions, [and] enforce its rules. Force shall never be used as punishment. Only the amount of force necessary to control the situation shall be used.

DRC Administrative Rule 5120-9-01, "Use of Force," defines "force" as the "exertion or application of a physical compulsion or restraint." However, only "greater than minimal force" is considered reportable, as in the following tables.

Lorain Correctional Institution submits monthly reports pertaining to its Use of Force data. In March 2006, LORCI reported a total of 10 Use of Force incidents. The following data was taken from monthly reports from LORCI from April 2005 to March 2006:

**Table 17. Use of Force Incidents Per Month with Racial Breakdown
April 2005 to March 2006**

Month	Race			
	Black	White	Other	Total
April 2005	4	2	0	6
May 2005	5	1	0	6
June 2005	5	0	0	5
July 2005	7	6	0	13
August 2005	3	1	0	4
Sept 2005	2	0	0	2
October 2005	2	0	0	2
November 2005	5	2	0	7
December 2005	8	2	1	11
January 2006	4	4	0	8
February 2006	5	7	0	12
March 2006	8	2	0	10
Total	58	27	1	86
Percent	67.4%	31.4%	1.2%	100%
Average per Month	5	2	0	7
Monthly Range	2-8	0-7	0-1	2-13

The above data from April 2005 to March 2006 shows that a total of 86 Use of Force incidents occurred during the 12-month period, ranging from two to 13 incidents per month, with an average of seven per month. July 2005 had the highest number of incidents, with a total of 13.

USE OF FORCE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

Per DRC policy and administrative rule, certain Use of Force incidents may be referred to a Use of Force Committee for investigation. DRC policy 63-UOF-03, "Use of Force Investigation," further states,

It is the policy of the [ODRC] to monitor and ensure that responses to resistance and uses of force are appropriate and consistent with applicable administrative rules and DRC policies by documenting and investigating such incidents where appropriate.

According to DRC Administrative Rule 5120-9-02, "Use of Force Reports and Investigation," each incident of "greater than minimal" force must be documented in a report submitted by the corrections staff to the shift supervisor, who collects written statements from the persons involved. All documentation is reviewed by the Deputy Warden of Operations, followed by the Warden, who has the authority to refer the incident to a Use of Force Committee for investigation at any time. The Warden is

required to refer the incident to the Use of Force Committee or to the Chief Inspector in the following incidents:

- The factual circumstances are not described sufficiently in the record to enable an evaluation of the propriety of the amount of force utilized;
- The incident involved serious physical harm to any person;
- The incident constituted a significant disruption to the normal operation of the institution; or
- Weapons, PR-24, chemical agents, less-lethal munitions, or a stun shield were used during the incident, whether by staff or by inmates.

The following data was taken from the LORCI monthly reports of April 2005 to March 2006:

**Table 18. Use of Force Committee Assignments with Racial Breakdown
April 2005 to March 2006**

Month	Race			
	Black	White	Other	Total
April 2005	2	1	0	3
May 2005	3	0	0	3
June 2005	5	0	0	5
July 2005	5	2	0	7
August 2005	3	1	0	4
Sept 2005	2	0	0	2
October 2005	2	0	0	2
November 2005	2	2	0	4
December 2005	3	0	0	3
January 2006	1	1	0	2
February 2006	4	3	0	7
March 2006	1	0	0	1
Total	33	10	0	43
Percent	76.7%	23.3%	0	100.0%
Average per Month	3	1	0	4
Monthly Range	1-5	0-3	0	1-7

As shown in the data above, a total of 43 Use of Force incidents were referred to a Use of Force Committee for investigation; or, an average of three to four each month. All incidents that were not assigned to a Use of Force Committee were logged as "No Further Action Required."

According to the data, 76.7 percent of the Use of Force Committee assignments pertained to a Black inmate; 23.3 percent pertained to a White inmate.

Using the data in the previous table, of the 58 Use of Force **incidents involving a Black inmate, 33 (56.9%) resulted in a Use of Force investigation. Of the 27 Use of Force incidents involving a White inmate, 10 (37.0%) resulted in a Use of Force Committee assignment.**

EXTENSIONS

Also included in the information submitted in the monthly report is the number of Use of Force incidents where the investigation was not completed within 30 days and was therefore extended. According to DRC Administrative Rule 5120-9-02, Use of Force Committees must complete all interviews within 20 working days of the date of assignment, or be granted an extension by the Warden. The Committee must produce a report to be submitted to the Warden.

The following data was taken from the LORCI monthly reports of April 2005 to March 2006:

**Table 19. Use of Force Investigation Extensions
April 2005 to March 2006**

Month	Total Number of Use of Force Investigations	Total Number of Extensions	Percent of Investigations that were Extended
April 2005*	3	1	33%
May 2005*	3	0	0%
June 2005*	5	4	80%
July 2005*	7	4	57%
August 2005	4	1	25%
Sept 2005	2	2	100%
October 2005	2	1	50%
November 2005	4	0	0%
December 2005	3	0	0%
January 2006	2	2	100%
February 2006	7	3	43%
March 2006	1	0	0%
Total	43	18	42%

*An extension in these months was for investigations that were not completed in 15 (rather than 30) days.

As shown in the data above, 42% of the Use of Force investigations required an extension beyond 30 days. **It is important to investigate incidents as soon after they occur as possible, so as to obtain the most accurate recollection of the incident when questioning participants and witnesses.** In addition, a long delay in investigation may be viewed by the inmates as an indicator that the institution does not care about truly investigating the Use of Force incident in which he was involved.

In addition to the above information, the monthly reports also include data pertaining to the number of extended investigations from previous months that were Completed or Not Completed:

Table 20. Number of Completed/Not Completed Extended Investigations from Previous Months

Month	Total Number of Extensions	Total Number of Extended Investigations that were Completed	Total Number of Extended Investigations that were Not Completed
April 2005	1	0	2
May 2005	0	1	2
June 2005	4	2	3
July 2005	4	3	2
August 2005	1	0	7
Sept 2005	2	1	13
October 2005	1	1	0
November 2005	0	0	2
December 2005	0	3	2
January 2006	2	0	4
February 2006	3	1	1
March 2006	0	0	4
Total	18	12	42

As is made obvious from the numbers above, the numbers do not add up. **It would appear from the above numbers that the problem is not merely that an investigation may be extended for 15 to 30 days.** In just one example, in September 2005, 13 investigations were reported as being Not Completed from previous months. At no point in the rest of the year is a sufficient number of investigations Completed that would account for the 13 that were Not Completed during that one month alone.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The Lorain Correctional Institution Inspector also submits monthly reports pertaining to the grievance procedure. The grievance procedure consists of three steps: Informal Complaint Resolution (ICR), Grievance, and Appeal. Of the three, the Inspector of Institutional Services handles primarily the Grievances, although he or she does also track the number of ICRs and is responsible, as will be discussed shortly, for ensuring timely responses to the ICRs.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

The Inspector's monthly reports also include a record of other communications, such as the number of Informal Complaint Resolutions (ICR) filed and the number of responses. Of particular note is the number of untimely responses reported. According to DRC

Administrative Rule 5120-9-31, an inmate must submit an Informal Complaint Resolution (ICR) within 14 calendar days of the date of the event giving rise to the complaint. Staff must respond in writing within seven calendar days of receipt of the informal complaint. If no response is received within a "reasonable time," the inmate should notify the Inspector of Institutional Services, whose responsibility it is to take prompt action to ensure a response within an additional four calendar days.

Although a "reasonable time" is not defined, an "untimely response" is generally thought to be a response that is given to the inmate a maximum of 30 days from the date it is received from the DRC staff person. More than simply a nuisance, untimely responses severely inhibit the use of the grievance procedure as they both delay any investigation that may be performed by the Inspector or Chief Inspector proceeding from the ICR and they may lessen inmates' faith in the efficacy of the system, which will impact inmate use.

The following information was extracted from the monthly reports of April 2005 to March 2006:

**Table 21. Informal Complaint Resolution Numbers
April 2005 to March 2006**

Month	Total Number of ICRs Received	Total Number of ICR Responses	Total Number of Untimely ICR Responses
April 2005	52	39	3
May 2005	57	45	0
June 2005	73	63	5
July 2005	63	62	2
August 2005	66	47	7
Sept 2005	94	142	9
October 2005	54	90	35
November 2005	65	39	2
December 2005	72	54	54
January 2006	56	56	5
February 2006	50	43	1
March 2006	49	33	1
Total	751	713	124

As shown above, the total number of ICRs received ranged from a low of 49 in March 2006 to a high of 94 in September 2005. The number of ICR responses ranged from 33 in March 2006 to 142 in September 2005. The number of untimely responses ranged from a reported zero in May 2005 to a reported high of 54 in December 2005.

According to the above data, the number of reported Untimely ICR Responses does not appear to match the Total Number of ICRs Received minus the Total Number of Responses. For example, in April 2005, there is a difference of 13 between the

number of ICRs received and the number of responses, yet only three untimely responses are reported. This could make sense if there was a higher number of responses reported the following month; rather, an additional deficit of 12 occurs in May 2005, yet only zero untimely responses are reported. In September and October of 2005, there is a perceptible attempt to catch up—yet, some of those ICRs had to have been several months old, which would surely qualify as an untimely response.

The job of Inspector of Institutional Services at LORCI has recently changed hands and the current Inspector did not have knowledge of why the numbers above appear to conflict. However, the current Inspector stated that his understanding was that a staff person should respond within seven days; if not, the response was untimely. The Inspector further reported that he is establishing a tracking system that will better enable him to determine which staff persons have not responded to ICRs in a timely manner so that he may notify them and better ensure a response.

The Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report reported the following number of ICRs system-wide:

Table 22. Institutions Ranked by Total Number of ICRs Handled

Institution	Total ICRs	ICR Responses
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	3,432	3,663
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2,443	1,426
Ohio State Penitentiary	1,938	1,752
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1,693	2,079
North Central Correction Institution	1,537	2,007
Madison Correctional Institution	1,371	1,134
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1,206	758
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1,171	1,161
Toledo Correction Institution	1,153	1,254
Grafton Correctional Institution	1,141	1,103
London Correctional Institution	1,133	867
Marion Correctional Institution	1,125	1,105
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1,052	1,139
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1,040	837
Richland Correctional Institution	978	927
Lorain Correctional Institution	892	759
Noble Correctional Institution	888	888
Pickaway Correctional Institution	828	512
North Coast Corr. Treatment Facility	745	729
Warren Correctional Institution	679	669
Ross Correctional Institution	614	450
Belmont Correctional Institution	609	607
Southeastern Correctional Institution	595	457
Allen Correctional Institution	519	519
Franklin Pre-Release Center	433	341
Northeast Pre-Release Center	457	254
Corrections Medical Center	252	254
Correctional Reception Center	217	173
Mont. Education and Pre Release Center	193	191
Oakwood Correctional Facility	177	141
Dayton Correctional Institution	119	103
Hocking Correctional Facility	62	60
TOTALS	30,532	28,204

In addition, within the same report, Lorain Correctional Institution reported a total of **59** untimely responses in CY 2004, placing it in the bottom half of the institutions for the total number of ICRs. However, as shown in the closer analysis previously, that number is suspect.

GRIEVANCES

In previous years, the Inspector's final disposition of a Grievance determined it to be Resolved or Not Resolved, terms that were slightly misleading. In all cases, a grievance should be resolved in the sense that a disposition or decision was rendered. This terminology switched to Granted or Denied in January of 2006.

A Grievance is granted when the Inspector's response to the inmate's stated concern is:

- (1) Problem corrected;
- (2) Problem noted, correction pending; or,
- (3) Problem noted, report/recommendation to the Warden.

A Grievance is denied when the Inspector's response to the inmate's stated concern is:

- (1) No violation of rule, policy, or law;
- (2) Staff action was a valid exercise of discretion;
- (3) Insufficient evidence to support claim;
- (4) False claim;
- (5) Failure to use informal complaint procedure;
- (6) Not within the scope of the grievance procedure;
- (7) Not within the time limits.

The following data was extracted from the monthly reports from April 2005 to March 2006 that pertained to the inmate grievance procedure:

**Table 23. Number and Dispositions of LORCI Grievances*
April 2005 to March 2006**

Month	Total Number of Grievances Received	Granted	Denied
April 2005	3	1	0
May 2005	3	2	3
June 2005	5	0	5
July 2005	10	3	7
August 2005	6	2	4
Sept 2005	10	3	5
October 2005	7	5	4
November 2005	13	4	5
December 2005	4	3	5
January 2006	0	0	0
February 2006	4	0	3
March 2006	1	2	0
Total	66	25	41
Percent	100%	37.9%	62.1%

*The number of Grievances received in one month will not equal the sum of the dispositions for that month, as occasionally the Inspector may carry some Grievances over from one month to the next. However, the year sum of Grievances accurately matches the sum of the dispositions, as the Inspector reported that he had zero Grievances on hand at the beginning of April 2005 and he carried over zero Grievances at the end of March 2006.

As shown in the above numbers, there is a wide range in the number of Grievances that an Inspector may receive during the month, from a reported total of zero in January 2006 to a reported 13 in November 2005. The Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report stated that in the entire DRC system for that year, 6,324 grievances were received by Institutional Inspectors.

In the entire 12-month period, the Inspector reported only one 14-day extension, which occurred in November 2005. This is a very good track record; in comparison, the Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report states that there were 772 14-day extensions system-wide in 2004.

Of the 66 Grievances filed during the 12-month period, 25 (37.9 percent) were granted and 41 (62.1 percent) were denied.

The following is a six-month snapshot of the subject matter of the grievances filed for October 2005 through March 2006, extracted from the monthly reports:

Month	Area(s) of Grievance(s)
October 2005	Safety and Sanitation; Food Service; Personal Property; Staff/Inmate Relations (racial/ethnic slurs)
November 2005	Laundry/Quartermaster; Inmate Account; Personal Property; Staff/Inmate Relations (conduct report, Intimidation, harassment); Security Classification
December 2005	Personal Property; Recreation; Staff Accountability; Institution Assignment
January 2006	No grievances reported
February 2006	Dental Care; Personal Property; Supervision
March 2006	Inmate Account; Supervision

The above noted concerns are in accord with the overall number of reported concerns system-wide. According to the Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report, the top ten inmate concerns, by number of Completed Grievances, were as follows:

Table 24. 2004 Top Ten Most-Cited Subject Matters for Inmate Grievances System-wide

Area of Complaint	Completed Grievances
Personal Property	1,152
Health Care	1,050
Force/Supervision	1,009
Staff Accountability	570
Mail/Packages	281
Non-Grievable Matters	276
Safety and Sanitation	237
Food Services	225
Inmate Account	182
Housing Assignments	161

GRIEVANCE APPEALS

If an inmate is not satisfied with an Inspector's decision on a grievance, he may appeal that decision to the Chief Inspector. In calendar year 2004, the Chief Inspector's office received 3,005 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. Lorain Correctional Institution ranked 22nd in the number of appeals, with a reported total of 32.

According to the 2003 Chief Inspector Annual Report, Lorain Correctional Institution was responsible for 26 appeals during that year. From 2003 to 2004, the number of appeals from LORCI increased by six. System-wide, grievance appeals increased by 601 in the two-year period, from 2,404 in 2003 to 3,005 in 2004.

Table 25. Number of Appeals in 2004 by Institution

Institution	# Of Appeals
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	418
Mansfield Correctional Institution	203
Madison Correctional Institution	198
Ohio State Penitentiary	188
Lebanon Correctional Institution	181
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	175
Warren Correctional Institution	160
Trumbull Correctional Institution	137
Allen Correctional Institution	135
Noble Correctional Institution	124
Grafton Correctional Institution	123
North Central Correctional Institution	120
Pickaway Correctional Institution	99
Richland Correctional Institution	99
Marion Correctional Institution	93
Toledo Correctional Institution	87
London Correctional Institution	86
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	76
Ohio Reformatory for Women	75
Belmont Correctional Institution	65
Ross Correctional Institution	52
Lorain Correctional Institution	32
Corrections Medical Center	31
Southeastern Correctional Institution	23
Hocking Correctional Facility	7
Oakwood Correctional Facility	7
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	4
Correctional Reception Center	3
Northeast Pre Release Center	3
Franklin Pre Release Center	1
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Total	3,005

ORIGINAL GRIEVANCES

If an inmate has a problem or complaint pertaining to the Warden or the Institutional Inspector, he may file a Grievance directly with the Chief Inspector. Such Grievances are considered "Original Grievances." In 2004, the Chief Inspector received 509 Original Grievances. Lorain Correctional Institution ranked 19th in the number of Original Grievances, with a total of 13 in 2004.

Table 26. Number of Original Grievances Filed in 2004

Institutions	Original Grievances
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	60
Trumbull Correctional Institution	38
Belmont Correctional Institution	35
Mansfield Correctional Institution	33
Noble Correctional Institution	28
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	27
Allen Correctional Institution	25
Grafton Correctional Institution	23
London Correctional Institution	20
Warren Correctional Institution	20
Madison Correctional Institution	19
Lebanon Correctional Institution	19
Ohio State Penitentiary	18
Richland Correctional Institution	18
Toledo Correctional Institution	18
Marion Correctional Institution	17
Corrections Medical Center	14
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	14
Lorain Correctional Institution	13
North Central Correctional Institution	13
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9
Ross Correctional Institution	8
Ohio Reformatory for Women	6
Southeastern Correctional Institution	5
Hocking Correctional Facility	3
Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center	3
Oakwood Correctional Facility	2
Franklin Pre-Release Center	1
Correctional Reception Center	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0
Total	509

CHIEF INSPECTOR'S 2004 SUMMARY

The following is the Chief Inspector's summary of grievance procedure data pertaining to Lorain Correctional Institution, as presented in the 2004 Annual Report:

Population (1/3/05)	1,463
Total Grievances	89
Total Inmates Filing Grievances	65
Rate of Inmates Filing Grievances*	4.4
Appeals	32
Rate of Appeals**	35.9
Original Grievances	13

*Rate of Inmates Filing Grievances = 4.4% of the total inmate population filed a Grievance in 2004

**Rate of Appeals = 35.9% of the total number of Grievances resulted in an Appeal.

INVESTIGATIONS

Institutional Investigators work as counterparts to the Institutional Inspectors. Rather than the institutional facilities and procedures, which are the province of the Inspectors, Investigators are generally focused on illegal substances, assaults, or professional misconduct. Investigators may also monitor Security Threat Group (STG, aka "gang") activity.

The institution provided information regarding the Investigator's Yearly Caseload. The following information pertains to January through December of 2005:

Table 27. 2005 Lorain Correctional Institution Investigator Caseload

Type of Investigation	Total Number of Initiated Investigations in 2005	Total Number of Investigations Closed in 2005	Total Number of Investigations Still Open by 2006
Assault Related	27		
- Sexual Assault	13	11	2
- Inmate on Inmate	8	6	2
- Inmate on Staff	6	4	2
Drug-Related	23		
- Other	7	6	1
- Positive Urinalysis	5	5	0
- Staff/Inmate	4	1	3
- Staff	4	4	0
- Inmate/Visitor	3	1	2
- Mail/Packages	2	2	0
Professional Misconduct	16		
- Staff/Inmate Relationship	8	3	5
- Staff Misconduct	8	7	1
Other Investigations	9	9	0
- Background Checks*	489	489	0
Total	564	548	16
Percent	100%	97.2%	2.8%

*In past years, background checks have been included in the "Other" category.

As portrayed in the numbers above, there were 564 initiated investigations in calendar year 2005, 548 of which (97.2 percent) were closed by the year's end. Only 16 (2.8 percent) remained open by 2006. Investigations pertaining to assaults were most prevalent, with a total of 27 assault investigations initiated; followed by drug investigations, 23; and Other, nine.

According to the Investigator's report, "Other" investigations pertained to: Escape Plans, BWC Fraud, Attempted Suicide, STG Problem, STG Homeland Security, and Inmate Death.

For comparison, data was obtained from the CY 2003 and 2004 Chief Inspector's Annual Reports, which includes Investigator reports.

Table 28. 2003-2005 Lorain Correctional Institution Investigator Caseload

Type of Investigation	Total Number of Initiated Investigations in 2003	Total Number of Initiated Investigations in 2004	Total Number of Initiated Investigations in 2005
Assault Related	6	21	27
- Sexual Assault	0	9	13
- Inmate on Inmate	1	0	8
- Inmate on Staff	5	12	6
Drug Related	10	38	23
- Other	1	12	7
- Positive Urinalysis	4	12	5
- Staff/Inmate	0	1	4
- Staff	0	2	4
- Inmate/Visitor	4	7	3
- Mail/Packages	1	4	2
Professional Misconduct	5	18	16
- Staff/Inmate Relationship	3	13	8
- Staff Misconduct	2	5	8
Other Investigations	39	186	498
Total	60	263	564

*"Other" investigations includes background checks

As shown above, there has been a drastic upswing in the number of initiated investigations at Lorain Correctional Institution. Although it is possibly indicative of a growing problem, it is equally possible that the higher numbers are indicative of greater diligence on the part of the Investigator to take serious action in light of allegations. In

particular, the increasing number of assault investigations is a positive move; that assaults happen in prison is a well-known fact and they should be fully investigated.

Table 29. Condensed Analysis of 2003-2005 Investigator Caseload

Type of Investigation	2003		2004		2005	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Drug	10	16.7	38	14.4	23	4.1
Assault	6	10.0	21	8.0	27	4.8
Professional Misconduct	5	8.3	18	6.8	16	2.8
Other	39	65.0	186	70.7	498	88.3
Total	60	100	263	100	564	100

% = percent of total investigations initiated in that year.

In 2003 through 2005, there were 71 total drug related investigations; 54 assault related investigations; 39 professional misconduct investigations; and, 723 "other" investigations.

As seen above, the majority of investigations fell under the "Other" category. As discussed in the 2005 data, a wide range of topics may be covered by investigations that fall into the "Other" category. However, the vast majority pertain to background checks.

In response to state legislators' questions pertaining to drug trafficking within the institutions, on March 1, 2006, the DRC South Regional Director provided the following testimony pertaining to Drug investigations to the CIIC:

It is the policy of the Department to increase public safety, provide for inmate accountability, institutional control and order by establishing a zero tolerance of inmate drug use within our prisons. We strive to achieve this through a variety of methods.

All staff, visitors, and contractors are subject to search by a metal detector upon entrance to any of our institutions, and all of their personal items are searched as well. Inmates working outside of the institution are subject to search before leaving and are strip-searched when they reenter the institution. Inmates are currently permitted to receive packages containing food from their family and friends, which are thoroughly searched for illegal drugs and other forms of contraband.

Each institution has a full-time investigator that spends a considerable amount of time trying to identify those involved in the introduction of illegal drugs. This is done through the gathering of intelligence

information by monitoring inmate telephone calls, interviewing inmates, visitors, and staff. They also follow up on leads from these sources. The institution investigators work in conjunction with the Ohio State Highway Patrol investigators and county prosecutors to ensure that all of the necessary information for prosecution is gathered during the investigative stages.

Five percent of the inmate population is randomly drug tested each month. We also perform for cause testing when there is a reasonable suspicion of drug use. Inmates involved in specific recovery service programs or work sites are subjected to testing as well. In addition, each year we complete a saturation testing of approximately 20 percent of the inmate population. The Department tests inmates for the following substances: Cocaine, THC, Opiates, PCP, Amphetamines, Methamphetamines, Benzodiazepines and alcohol.

Lastly, DRC has developed an enforcement unit comprised of parole officers and institution investigators. The focus of this unit is to stop the introduction of drugs into the prisons by working with local law enforcement agencies to identify the sources and make arrests.

In the past two years, Department staff have deterred over 200 visitors and 50 staff from bringing drugs or attempting to bring drugs into our prisons...Appropriate disciplinary or legal action is taken in all such [staff] cases based upon the available evidence and investigation. It is important to note that in Amended Substitute Senate Bill 111, in the 122nd General Assembly, conveyance of drugs onto the grounds of a correctional facility by a DRC employee requires imposition of a mandatory prison term. The Department strongly advocated for this change in the law.

The number of drugs found in food packages has continued to rise over the last few years. In 2003 there were 29 food packages containing drugs, 31 in 2004, and 32 through October of 2005. We are still compiling the final numbers for 2005.

We are encouraged, however, that our drug testing results have decreased. In 2003, the number of positive drug tests was 2.35 percent of inmates tested. In 2004, the number was 2.24 percent of inmates tested and 2.18 percent in 2005.

While DRC has worked to eliminate drugs in our prisons, those desiring to convey the drugs have become increasingly adept at concealing their efforts. Food packages are a significant source of drugs...Drugs have been sent in using re-canned soup, resealed candy bars, hollowed out bagels, inside of sweetener and seasoning packets, and resealed pudding

cups. These are only a few examples of the items intercepted through the tremendous efforts of our staff and the Ohio State Highway Patrol.

As a result of this growing issue, last year a leadership training team was assigned the task of reviewing our inmate package operation, benchmarking with other state correctional agencies and exploring an alternative method for inmates to be able to receive food packages through the use of a vendor. Their findings resulted in a committee being established to further investigate the need for such a system. Currently, the committee is obtaining information from potential vendors to identify how they would operate their system, what products would be offered, and ensuring that family members—and even the inmates themselves—would be able to order food items. The ordering would be done by mail, fax, telephone or the internet and would eliminate the costly and time consuming efforts to return unauthorized food items to the sender which would enable us to utilize our available custody staff in other areas of the prison operation. We plan to survey inmates and their families this month to establish support for this program.

While this would be a change to our current system, we believe that it would continue to allow inmates to receive the desired food items from their loved ones and greatly enhance our ability to stop the obvious flow of drugs through the current system.

SEARCHES, SEIZURES, AND SHAKEDOWNS

According to information provided by the institution, the institution performed the following searches in calendar year 2005:

Table 30. Searches Performed in CY 2005 at LORCI

Type of Search	Number of Searches Performed in CY 2005
Employee Pat Down	435
Canine Search	12
Mail/Packages	10
Major Shakedowns	6
Other/Vehicle	2
Visitor Strip	1
Visitor Pat Down	1
Employee Strip	0

Data was extracted from the 2003 and 2004 Chief Inspector Annual Reports to provide a three-year overview of searches conducted at Lorain Correctional Institution:

Table 31. Searches Performed in CY 2003-2005 at LORCI

Type of Search	2003	2004	2005	Change from 2003-2005
Canine Search	12	13	12	0
Visitor Strip/Pat Down	1	3	2	+1
Major Shakedown	1	2	6	+5
Employee Strip/Pat Down	0	3	435	+435

*The Chief Inspector Annual Reports do not separate the Employee and Visitor Strip Searches and Pat Downs into separate categories, nor is there a category for Other/Vehicle Searches.

As can be seen in the above table, Lorain Correctional Institution has made some extremely positive strides in the last year toward cracking down on the flow of contraband into the institution. **In particular, Lorain Correctional Institution reports a laudable number of major shakedowns.** According to the 2004 Chief Inspector's Annual Report, the average number of major shakedowns performed during that year was a mere 1.6 system-wide. Thirteen institutions reported conducting zero major shakedowns during 2004.

All of the efforts listed above are necessary in order to provide adequate deterrence to criminal activity. It is hoped that LORCI continues on this path during the current year.

In addition to searches, the institutions also report the number and type of seizures performed. The following information was provided by the institution for CY 2005:

Table 32. Confiscated Contraband in CY 2005

Type of Contraband	Amount
Marijuana	2.4 g*
Cocaine	.05 g and 11 rocks
Pills	18.5
Weapons	6

*The total amount of marijuana seized was not reported for every case and this number also does not include a "marijuana cigarette."

Weapons confiscated in CY 2005 included: four shanks, a lock in a sock, and a knife. Also reported as confiscated was a syringe and a "white powdery substance." Almost all incidences of confiscated contraband resulted in referral to the Ohio State Highway Patrol. Several cases were also referred for prosecution and/or discipline.

For purposes of comparison, the following information was extracted from the 2003 and 2004 Chief Inspector Annual Reports to provide a three-year overview:

Table 33. Confiscated Contraband in CY 2003 - 2005

Year	Marijuana (g)	Cocaine (g)	Heroin (g)	Pills
2003	0	0	0	0
2004	18.14	.56	0	0
2005	2.4	.05*	0	18.5
Total	20.54	.61	0	18.5

* This amount does not include the 11 rocks of crack cocaine reported as confiscated.

In light of the low 2003 numbers, it is unknown whether Lorain Correctional Institution benefits from being a Reception facility, as perhaps the low numbers indicate that inmates are not at the institution for sufficient time to establish trafficking networks, or whether the institution staff just have not been able to find the drugs.

The new DRC Director spoke at a recent CIIC meeting and reported that the sudden increase in the number of inmates is mostly due to an increased number of drug convictions. If this is the case, it stands to reason that more inmates are likely to be drug-involved even while incarcerated. This does not appear to be reflected in the numbers, however.

CIIC DATABASE

CONTACTS

The CIIC Database for May 2005 through May 2006 shows that only 11 contacts were received from inmates at Lorain Correctional Institution. In that same time period, the CIIC Database shows that a total of 2,042 contacts were received system-wide (including juvenile correctional facilities). Thus, contacts from Lorain Correctional Institution composed only 0.54% of the total contacts received for this time period.

LOGGED CONCERNS

Each contact may contain several concerns related to different subject areas. According to the CIIC Database, a total of 40 concerns were logged regarding LORCI. The concerns pertained to the following subject areas:

- Health
- Safety/Sanitation
- Facilities Maintenance
- Educational/Vocational Programs
- Library
- Records
- Legal Services
- Force/Supervision
- Staff Accountability

- Security Classification
- Institution Assignment
- Housing Assignment
- Inmate Grievance Procedure
- Non-Grievable Matters
- Other

The most cited area of concern was in Force/Supervision, with six total logged concerns. The Force/Supervision category covers a broad variety of issues, from Use of Force to harassment and intimidation to retaliation.

The second most cited area of concern pertained to the inmate grievance procedure. Again, this category tends to be broad and could refer to an inmate stating that he has used the grievance procedure to no avail, that he has not received a response, or that he is simply dissatisfied with the grievance procedure in place. The third most cited area of concern pertained to Health Care.

All inquiries made to Lorain Correctional Institution have been answered in a prompt and thorough manner. Only three inquiries have been made in the past year, one pertaining to the previously discussed inmate suicide, and two inquiries regarded facility conditions, staff conduct, and medical treatment.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, Lorain Correctional Institution appears to be performing extremely well: Facility conditions all appeared to be adequate, tension appeared to be low among inmates, and no serious concerns were voiced by staff or inmates.

Unfortunately, LORCI's greatest challenge is overcrowding. The reception has no control over intake or admissions from the local detention facilities. Clearly the DRC executive staff are directing their attention to the issue of overcrowding and CIIC staff fully applaud all efforts to provide the facilities with the necessary resources to manage increasing populations.

Overcrowding also relates to the staff-reported desire for increased Mental Health programs. Overcrowding has reportedly reduced Mental Health services to primarily assessment and handling crises. Although most of the LORCI inmates are headed out to parent institutions that may be able to offer a fuller slate of Mental Health programs, the permanently assigned Cadre population may experience this lack of programming.

The Educational program appears to be running well, with an above average number of GEDs administered and an above average passage rate. LORCI also serves a high number of children in the Reading Room. In addition, the short-term career-technical Fiber Optic and Coaxial Cabling class is an excellent step toward equipping inmates with useful skills that will increase employment and thereby reduce recidivism.

All housing units, recreation areas, medical services, and food services all met or exceeded expectations. Inmates housed in Segregation voiced facility condition concerns and the recreation areas appeared to be lacking in meaningful recreation, but for the most part, Segregation also met expectations.

Efforts should be made by staff to determine the causes of the discrepancies found in the data for the inmate grievance procedure. That said, the rate of grievances granted or denied appears to be favorable. Hopefully, that is a reflection of the inmate's perception that the inmate grievance procedure is an effective problem-solving mechanism, and that each grievance is decided on its merits.

The increasing number of investigations initiated by the Investigator is also taken to be a positive. In particular, the impressive leap in the number of employee strip searches or pat downs is extremely positive, as is the increased number of shakedowns. Hopefully, the increased activity of the Investigator will have the intended result of decreased contraband flow.