

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

October 8, 2009

**Prepared and Submitted by
CIIC Staff**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| I. INSPECTION PROFILE | 5 |
| Areas and Activities Included in Inspection | |
| Survey Questionnaires | |
| II. SUMMARY OF THE INSPECTION | 7 |
| Staff Commitment | |
| Reduction in Staff..... | 8 |
| Mission | |
| Staff Morale | |
| Female Staff Frustration..... | 9 |
| Serious Inmate Misconduct | |
| Sanitation Problems Overview | |
| Food Services..... | 10 |
| Kitchen Maintenance | |
| Kitchen Equipment and Supplies | |
| The Meal | |
| Rodents and Insects..... | 11 |
| Inmate Workers | |
| Housing Areas | |
| Bedding, Uniforms | |
| Cleaning Supplies | |
| Insects | |
| Maintenance..... | 13 |
| Overcrowding | |
| Idleness | |
| 50+ Recreation | |
| Education and Programming..... | 14 |
| Unique Programs | |
| Short Term Offender Programs | |
| Returning Home Re-entry Program | |
| Library | |
| Overview of Inmate Problems, Issues and Concerns..... | 15 |
| Receiving and Discharge and Sexual Threats..... | 16 |
| Suicide Prevention Pilot | |
| Physical Plant Deterioration | |
| III. CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | 17 |
| Attendance at General Meal Period..... | 18 |
| Food Services | |
| Food Services: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 20 |
| Attendance at Educational or Rehabilitative Programming..... | 22 |
| Educational Center | |
| Education and Programming Data | |
| Educational and Programming Services..... | 23 |
| Learning, Skills, and Work Activities: | |
| <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 24 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Assistance in the Development of Improvements..... | 27 |
| The Library: Creation or Expansion of Minority Book Sections | |
| The LORCI Library..... | 28 |
| Table 1. Library Hours at the Lorain Correctional Institution..... | 29 |
| Library: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses | |
| IV. FACILITY PROFILE | 30 |
| Property Description | |
| Core Function | |
| Budget | |
| Staff Demographics..... | 31 |
| Inmate Population and Race | |
| Table 2. Inmate Population on July 29, 209 at Lorain Correctional Institution with Breakdown by Short Term Offenders, Work Cadre and Reception Status..... | 32 |
| Length of Stay | |
| Use of Force Data..... | 33 |
| Rated Capacity and Percent of Crowding | |
| Table 3. ODRC Percentage of Crowding per Institution Based on Rated Capacity and Inmate Population Count on August 3, 2009..... | 35 |
| V. INSPECTION | 36 |
| Entrance Grounds and Entry Building | |
| Receiving and Discharge | |
| Unit 4B – Initial Reception Housing Unit..... | 37 |
| Unit 3B – Mental Health..... | 38 |
| Mental Health Caseload | |
| Table 4. Mental Health Classification with Definitions..... | 39 |
| Table 5. Percent of Prison Population on the Mental Health Caseload by Institution..... | 40 |
| Table 6. Monthly Average on Mental Health Caseload by Institution and Mental Health Classification in 2008..... | 41 |
| Suicide Attempts..... | 42 |
| Pilot Suicide Prevention Program | |
| Program Status | |
| Staff Support | |
| CIIC Perspective | |
| The Concept..... | 43 |
| Informal Inmate Support | |
| Self-Harm and Suicide: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 44 |
| Compound and Walkways..... | 52 |
| Medical Services Department | |
| Table 7. Medical Department Services for June 2009..... | 54 |
| Recreation..... | 55 |
| Segregation Unit | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Unit 7B..... | 56 |
| Unit 8A | |
| Unit 10A – Short Term Offender Program..... | 57 |
| Unit 10B – Cadre..... | 58 |
| Residential Units: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 59 |
| Overview | |
| Clothing and Possessions..... | 61 |
| Hygiene | 62 |
| VI. STAFF COMMUNICATION..... | 63 |
| Staff-Prisoner Relationships: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 68 |
| Security and Rules: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 69 |
| Bullying and Violence Reduction: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 71 |
| VII. INMATE COMMUNICATION..... | 76 |
| VIII. INMATE CONTACTS /CONCERNS | 77 |
| Table 8. Inmate Contacts and Concerns Relayed to CIIC Letters of Inquiry | |
| IX. INMATE USE OF THE INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE | 78 |
| Institutional Inspector Report on the Inmate Grievance Procedure – July 2009 Complaint/Grievance Procedure: <i>Expectations</i> Questions and Responses..... | 79 |
| X. CORRECTIONAL FAITH BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES..... | 84 |
| Infrastructure | |
| Alternatives to Incarceration..... | 91 |
| Institutional Programming..... | 93 |
| Re-Entry Programming | 97 |

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

I. INSPECTION PROFILE

| | |
|---|--|
| Date of Inspection: | August 3, 2009 |
| Type of Inspection: | Unannounced Inspection |
| CIIC Member and Staff in Attendance: | Representative Tyrone Yates Shirley Pope, Director CIIC Greg Geisler, Inspector Adam Jackson, Inspector Carol Robison, Inspector |

Areas and Activities Included in Inspection:

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Pre-Inspection Meeting with Warden | Entrance Building and Grounds |
| Medical and Dental Services | Receiving and Discharge Area |
| Housing Units: 4B, 3B, 7B, 8A, 10A, 10B | Segregation Unit |
| Meal Period, Food Services and Dining Hall | Educational Program and Center |
| Library | Indoor/Outdoor Recreation |
| Group Discussion with Facility Staff | Closing with Warden |
| Individual Discussion with Staff | Individual Discussion with Inmates |

Survey Questionnaires:

Two questionnaires were developed by CIIC for use on inspections beginning in 2007. One questionnaire is based on the 16 recommendations of the Ohio Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force. The purpose of the questionnaire is merely to gather information on the extent to which progress is being made in implementing the recommendations. Brief, handwritten responses to the questions by any staff person knowledgeable of the subject, were requested. **The questions and responses to the Faith-Based Initiatives questionnaire are provided at the end of this report.**

One of the questionnaires is based on selected sections of *Expectations* used for inspections by the British Inspectorate of Prisons. These British *Expectations* were the subject of one of the presentations at an international conference on effective prison oversight in 2006. They are reported to be consistent with international standards for correctional institutions. The purpose of gathering information on the extent to which Ohio correctional institutions are similar or different from selected sections of *Expectations* is twofold: To identify possible areas in need of improvement, and to communicate new and innovative ideas to resolve problems or bring about improvements. **The questions and responses to sections and**

subsections of the British *Expectations* questionnaire are inserted in the relevant subject areas included in this report.

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

The *Expectations* are self-described as a tool for examining every aspect of prison life, from reception to reentry. The *Expectations* are drawn upon and referenced against international human rights standards. The Inspectorate’s four tests are:

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

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

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

II. SUMMARY OF THE INSPECTION

The following detailed summary was provided on August 5, 2009 by the CIIC Director to the Warden, Regional Director, and Assistant Director of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

There is respect and admiration for the Warden and his staff for their ongoing perseverance and accomplishments in a time of work overload and scarcity of essential resources. The vast majority of the issues and concerns noted below are believed to be linked to serious and increasing overcrowding, reduction in staff, and reduced funding to operate the prisons, even for the basic necessities. Staff attitude and commitment were found to be excellent. The caliber, commitment, and attitude of staff at all levels were impressive, and observable throughout the institution, including on the units in their interaction with inmates and others, and in the verbal communication from staff in the round table discussion prior to the closing.

From December 31, 2007 to December 29, 2008, the facility's crowding rate or percent of crowding increased by nine percent. On December 29, 2008 the facility population was 263 percent of its rated capacity. Currently, the facility with its 756 bed rated capacity has a population of 2,077, which computes to 275 percent of its rated capacity. It continues to be the most overcrowded of all Ohio prisons. Staff throughout the facility expressed serious concern about the observable increase in their inmate population, coupled with the observable behavioral and attitudinal difference in the taxing young inmate population entering the prison system.

Staff Commitment

- The administration and staff uniformly represented an impressive commitment and work ethic in carrying out the duties of their positions and responsiveness to the comments by the CIIC Director, shared during and at the completion of the inspection.
- Without exception, the Warden, administrators, and staff were hospitable, forthcoming with answers and explanations to questions, and acknowledgement of the ways that their daily duties have evolved due to the increasing number of inmates and the reduction in staff and funds to operate the institution.
- There was full responsiveness shown toward any suggestions for solutions to the current problems that are faced on a daily basis.
- The overall demeanor of the administration and staff was fully professional throughout the inspection.
- Examples of excellence in administrative management and staff quality of supervision and service delivery were observed throughout the institution, from the main entrance, to the units, to medical, to the desire to serve even more inmates and take extra steps to stay aware of the increasing presence of gang-connected offenders.
- CIIC offered praise to the Lorain administration and staff for their commitment and continuation of service delivery, especially under the continuing challenges associated with overcrowding, reduction in staff, and funding concerns.

Reduction in Staff

- As a result of budget cuts, the number of staff has been significantly reduced. There are fewer staff members serving a greater number of inmates compared to previous years.
- There is reported concern about safety and security on the units because of the reduction in staff. Staff noted that simultaneous with staff reductions, there has been an increasing presence of young inmates coming into the system with bold, disrespectful, and defiant attitudes. A notable number of younger inmates reportedly have a gang-orientation. The influence of the younger and bolder inmates causes a concern for safety and security because the reception center serves as the entrance threshold to the system for first-time inmates who are fearful and vulnerable, and is also the parent institution to older inmates, who have reported their increased frustration and intolerance of the young gang-driven inmates. With demographics among inmates changing in this manner and the reduction of staff, there is a concern that the environment is left weak and vulnerable and could quickly become unstable.
- Unit officers are reportedly working with a sense of insecurity and a degree of fear due to the severely disproportionate ratio of officers to inmates on units.
- Unit staff indicate that they are coping daily with feelings of being overwhelmed and stretched too thin, as they are swarmed by the continuous concerns and large volume of inmates seeking assistance or information.
- Unit staff reported being continually swarmed by inmates from the beginning of their shift to the end.
- Although the average caseload used to be 250 inmates per Case Manager, the current caseload is 600 due to staff reductions. Staff reported that many inmates simply do not have their needs addressed because the staff is stretched too thin.
- The vast majority of staff showed a positive staff attitude and commitment to their jobs.
- Some staff relayed willingness to work into a second shift in order to provide needed inmate services, such as library use, to a greater number of inmates.
- Staff relayed that they forego their lunch and other breaks in order to try to meet the requests and needs of the large number of inmates.
- Case managers are reportedly maintaining their offices on units so as to better address inmate concerns promptly and effectively.

Mission

- Staff relayed that many do not understand that reception inmates have many more issues to be addressed than inmates at non-reception parent institutions. They reportedly have far more immediate concerns and needs that only staff can address.

Staff Morale

- Based on communication from staff, indicators of morale were mixed. Officers expressed concern regarding “conditions” created by overcrowding and work overload. Some seemed to be in excellent spirits, most notably a particular entry officer who was the most friendly of any encountered in the prison system. He maintained professionalism and enforced security procedures, but did so in a kind and pleasant manner. At least one of the nurses in the medical area seemed frustrated that they must work with medical records on their lap in the hallway without any counter on which to put the records. The

records were actually sitting on a narrow table up against the wall in the hallway, leaving no work space for the record being reviewed.

Female Staff Frustration

- Female staff relayed frustration with the verbal sexual harassment by inmates who yell out of the windows at them as they cross the compound. Staff relayed that they are working on the problem by having a particular staff person approach the yelling inmate with a verbal reprimand, but it reportedly is not stopping the behavior. There is reportedly no known way to identify the inmate so that conduct reports can be issued to the wrongdoer.

Serious Inmate Misconduct

- Security staff expressed the need to create more disciplinary options for those who throw urine and feces at staff and for those involved in predatory gang activity, such as the Heartless Felons who reportedly thrive on intimidation and “don’t play fair.” While some staff cited the urine and feces throwing as a major problem, others relay that the frequency of occurrence is only about three incidents per month. Security staff relayed that the ones who exhibit such behavior are not mentally ill, that the mental health staff reportedly do an excellent job of attending to the mentally ill. The ones who prompt concern are reportedly those who throw the substance out of meanness and defiance.
- It was suggested by one staff person that posters could be created as a warning of the possible criminal prosecution and additional prison time that can result in a “harassment” conviction if an inmate throws urine or feces on a staff member. It was suggested that such posters could be displayed in Receiving and Discharge as well as throughout the institution.
- Officers spoke of the changes seen in the intake population, with increased numbers of young inmates who hate authority figures and therefore prison staff, and who are boldly disrespectful and predatory toward inmates and staff.

Sanitation Problems Overview

- In addition to the problems concentrated in food services, the overall facility including the housing units, appeared to be in need of a cleaning regimen, including bedding and frequent, routine sanitation of mattresses.
- With the massive idle population, it is suggested that consideration be given to assigning reception inmates to a sanitation/cleaning crew to ensure that every corner of the facility is scrupulously clean and sanitized on a daily basis.
- It is also suggested that the MRSA poster that reportedly is available through central office, be displayed throughout the food service area and living quarters to serve as a powerful motivator to keep the facility clean.
- The bathroom off of the chow hall was dirty and the kitchen was in bad need of cleaning, with built up dirt on floors and walls. Textured kitchen floor surfaces held dirt that had built up over time, even though at least some section of the kitchen floor did get rinsed from water spillage that occurs in an institutional kitchen.
- Inmate workers placed bins of ready to be served food on wet but dirty side counters.
- Food preparation area contained open tubs holding raw garbage from previous meals, and flies and gnats were observable around these tubs.

- Walls surrounding the area where clean food trays were stacked were visibly dirty with built up soil.
- There was some food spillage on the floor and around the loading window of the food tray washer.
- A broken food/garbage disposal made elimination of food scraps impossible, resulting in the presence of tubs holding raw garbage sitting around the kitchen.
- A significant number of reports were received regarding the presence of mice and/or rats outside the kitchen and inside as well. Mice reportedly get into the bread racks and break open loaves of bread before it is served at meals.
- Continuous use of the kitchen has reportedly created little to no time for thoroughly cleaning and disinfecting the area between meals.
- Inmate kitchen workers in the pot cleaning assembly line were provided with aprons, but were not provided with protective gloves or water repellent shoes so that their clothing was becoming soiled and wet as they worked. Pots were left to air 'dry' after reportedly being rinsed and sprayed with a disinfectant solution. Within close proximity however were the open tubs of garbage and flying insects.
- The showers on the living units were infested with tiny fruit flies and some larvae were present as well.
- Showers contained mold in areas where the grout was damaged or missing.

Food Services

Kitchen Maintenance

- A plumber who was highly praised by staff for his skills and work ethic, was observed snaking out a backed up floor drain in the kitchen during the meal period.

Kitchen Equipment and Supplies

- Reportedly, there is only one working kettle in the kitchen. Three kettles were requested for purchase, but only one was approved.
- The hot boxes are reportedly broken, so that they no longer keep hot food hot and do not operate at the correct temperature.
- The ice machine is reportedly broken, causing an inability to keep cold food cold.
- They reportedly are short on brooms, yet an inmate used a dust pan to scoop pudding-like food from a plastic tub. Staff relayed that they only have a "buffer to clean the floor."
- The walk in cooler and freezer are broken. The front cooler registered 60 degrees on both thermometers inside and outside the cooler. The back freezer was working properly.
- There was no soap in the soap dispenser in the bathroom off of the chow hall. Staff relayed that they only have dish detergent to wash the floors which does not get them clean.
- Staff relayed difficulties getting cleaning supplies, including chemicals, and they "can't order bleach."

The Meal

- Inmates entered, ate, and left the chow hall continuously during the meal period of the inspection. Considering the constant flow of inmates using the chow tables, the rate of

tables being wiped clean between inmates was inadequate resulting in debris being left behind from one inmate to the next.

- The whole kitchen appeared to be wet, even the food trays dripped with water as they were used to serve the food.
- Portions were adequate, and the taste was palatable. A dead gnat was in the white rice portion on one of the CIIC team's food tray.
- The facility has two dining rooms with a capacity of 220 and 132 respectively. The staff dining room was shut down in the fall of 2008.
- Many inmates relayed serious concern about the hours between meals, due to the length of time needed to feed 2,000+ inmates. For example, between 2:30 and 3:00 p.m. some inmates were still waiting to go to lunch.
- With the new practice of merging breakfast and lunch in a later brunch meal on weekends, inmates relayed that they have gone 18 hours without any food and are hungry. This was identified as one of the burning issues among inmates. They relayed that many reception inmates have no money in their account to buy food in the commissary. Staff and inmates relayed concern that this situation provides motivation to rob and steal from others.
- Staff relayed that they are unable to comply with the ACA standard. Standard 4-4328 requires that at least three meals including two hot meals are provided at regular meal times during each 24 hour period, with no more than 14 hours between the evening meal and breakfast. The standard does allow variations on weekend and holiday food service provided that basic nutritional goals are met.

Rodents and Insects

- Although extermination services are reportedly provided once per week, one second shift food service staff person employed for years at the facility, relayed that he has never seen an exterminator.
- Concerns were expressed regarding rats and mice in the food preparation area, with mice reportedly eating the bread while stacked on an open metal cart. The mice reportedly eat the bread through the plastic sack exposed above them in the slotted shelves. Reportedly, "hundreds" of rats and mice feast on the food scraps including from the pots and pans due to the broken disposal.
- The air was musty and had a foul odor in the kitchen. Foul odor permeated the back dock.
- Gnats were swarming around the uncovered trash bin in the kitchen filled with food garbage out in the open in the food preparation area.
- Gnats were flying around the plastic pan of canned peaches left uncovered on the wet serving counter ready for the next load of inmates. The plastic lid was laid loosely on top at an angle, with inches of free entry space by insects.
- A huge kettle-like pan of pink icing sat totally uncovered in the kitchen during the entire inspection of the area. On exit, an inmate used his bare hand, though covered with a thin disposable plastic glove, to plop the icing on the cake and spread it around.
- Caked dirt under the food line appeared to include rodent feces.
- Mice are reportedly prevalent in the kitchen and have been observed by staff "all around." They reportedly get in the blender and make nests.

- Gnats or fruit flies and houseflies were seen in the kitchen and in the broken cooler, which reportedly enter through the drains. Some staff relayed that this has been a problem since construction.
- Gnats were observed in the dry storage area which was also musty. Gnats swarmed outside the cooler.
- Puddles of standing water were observed throughout the kitchen, ideal for insects. Flies were thick on the food serving line which was in need of cleaning.

Food Services Inmate Workers

- Staff relayed that 35 to 40 inmates work in the kitchen and that they have a problem getting inmate workers. Other staff indicated that work cadre is wanted in food services, but they are needed elsewhere. Short term offenders are used in food services instead, with the negative aspect of constant training of new workers due to frequent turnover.

Housing Areas

Bedding, Uniforms

- Staff relayed that 400 mattresses were just purchased, and staff are identifying those most in need of replacement. Inmate concerns about the mattresses were major. Mattresses were observed with virtually no stuffing, on top of bed springs which had gaping holes approximately 12 by 20 inches where there were no springs. The mattresses were the subject of many complaints, and were considered one of the burning issues in the units.
- Mattresses were observed to be severely damaged, worn, and dirty. Staff relayed that they are taking steps to create usable mattresses from the salvageable portions of multiple other mattresses, to save money and minimize waste.
- Concerns were relayed about unwillingness to replace extremely worn sheets and ill fitting uniforms. For example, one inmate held up his “white” sheet that was gray from presumably lack of laundering, and that was no larger than a crib sheet due to ripped off missing portions.
- Bunk beds were in poor condition, most with paint chipped and some with springs loose so that the wire was detached from the frame.
- Inmates relayed they were unable to get adequate soap and several inmates during the inspection were asking for toilet tissue.
- The majority of units were filled to capacity with bunk beds in the dayroom.

Cleaning Supplies

- Reportedly, there are inadequate cleaning supplies or cleaning products on the units. However, in one of the units, porters relayed that they have no problem obtaining cleaning supplies and credited their regular officers for getting what they need. They added that they “do not do showers.”

Insects

- Gnats were observed in the showers in the housing areas, including tiny worms or larvae on the shower floors. This was a burning issue to inmates in the housing areas, with a multitude of unsolicited reports of bugs in the mattresses and insects swarming in the

open unscreened windows at night, causing an inability to sleep. The insects were the subject of many complaints, and were considered one of the burning issues in the units.

Maintenance

- In at least one unit, inmates relayed that their “hot water is off” and their ice machine has been broken for over a week.

Overcrowding

- Living units were originally built to house 62 inmates in single-occupancy cells. On the inspection date, most living units were housing more than 180 inmates. Officers reported that units house 195 to 200 with 70 or 80 in bunks on the dayroom floor.
- In order to accommodate the larger number, the majority of inmates on units must live outside a cell, on double bunks, lined in rows, in the open dayroom of the units. Inmates are within an arm’s reach of each other.
- Due to overcrowding, inmates reportedly experience much required confinement to their bunks, with only bathroom and meal breaks permitted. There is much idleness for long periods of time, reportedly with no programs or activities available to inmates.
- Inmate comments indicated a preoccupation with their hunger and the length of time they must wait for meals, the invasion of insects on the units, unsanitary conditions in the showers, and a grievance system that is reported to be totally dysfunctional due to the absence of responses to kites and informal complaints in some cases, with some units reporting that they cannot even access kite or informal complaint forms. Although there was serious upset among the inmates regarding conditions, they seemed to regard the grievance procedure as irrelevant. Some clearly did not file any complaint out of fear of reprisal. Staff relayed that few grievances are filed. With the preponderance of concerns, low usage cannot be interpreted as demonstrating the presence of few problems, concerns or complaints.
- Crowded housing areas were observed, with cells full and bunk beds in rows on what should be a dayroom area in between cells. There were virtually no tables or chairs for inmate use.
- Inmates relayed that they feel safer sleeping in the open dayroom than those in cells who are locked in cells with those with documented violent histories.
- Officers relayed concerns about “conditions,” citing the need for “less inmates and more staff.” It was noted that two officers are posted in each housing area of 195 to 200 inmates, with 70 to 80 inmates bunked on the day room floor.

Idleness

- Although successful efforts have reportedly been made to move the level three (close) reception inmates out quicker, compared to a previous backlog of inmates waiting in reception for nearly a year, the remaining reception inmates wait in reception for three to four months. Concerns were expressed by inmates and staff that that they have no programs and nothing to do.

50+ Recreation

- During the walk through the outside recreation area, it was noted that on Mondays and Thursdays inmates aged 50 and over may recreate exclusively, to give them a break from

the younger inmates. Although the activities were not organized, staff relayed that they appreciate the chance to just be alone.

Education and Programming

- Although the website reports that the facility has academic programs that include Career Technical (Fiber Optic, Coaxial Cable Wiring), Fast Track GED and Career Scope, reported concerns were expressed about the alleged absence of academic programming except for the GED track. The reason for the limitation was reported to be that the institution serves as a reception center and only cadre inmates remain there for their sentence duration.
- Although the website reports that the facility has vocational programs for cook, baker and janitor, reports were received that no vocational programming is available.
- A math class that serves as part of the GED program was observed, with the instructor using lecture as his delivery style. During the period, there was no interaction among inmates, or between the instructor and the inmates.
- Staff continue to relay the repeated concern about the mandatory education requirement. While some cite the need to work with and motivate those who require adult basic education or GED preparation, others cite the fact that a long list of motivated inmates are on the waiting list, unable to participate. Many staff have expressed the belief that the scarce resources should be given to the motivated first.

Unique Programs

Short Term Offender Program

- Short term offenders relayed that the STO program has little if any value in preparing them for success on release. One inmate did indicate that it focuses on learning a good “work ethic.” The website states that the program is designed to target offenders serving 90 days or less, that it prepares the offender for a successful, law-abiding life in the community by providing meaningful work assignments, quality programming specific to the needs of each offender such as Financial Peace University and People Skills. The program also offers tools such as community resource information, DRC linkage opportunities, job readiness workshops as well as Alcohol and Other Drug Education and Self-Help Modules. The program goal is a successful return of the offender from prison to Ohio communities.

Returning Home Reentry Program

- The Returning Home community reentry program is also listed on the website as one of the unique programs at the facility, and is impressively described. However, this program was not observed or mentioned during the inspection.

Library

- Inmates and staff relayed that reception inmates are not permitted to read any hard back books from the library for “security reasons.” Their only option is the paperback collection which reportedly consists of fiction and has no black history books, a source of interest among the population.

- Reception inmates relayed concerns about reportedly only having access to the library once per month, though the library staff relayed that weekly access is provided according to the schedule.
- The library was observed as primarily a law library, with very few books available in the fiction or non-fiction genres. The librarian relayed a desire to offer extended library hours and services because the current library availability does not fill the need that inmates have for these services.
- Concerns were expressed that there reportedly are no library books available of an academic nature.
- Reportedly, inmates are only permitted access to legal books for legal work at certain times, and there are certain times that they are restricted to non-legal books and work. Shelves of books were observed covered with cardboard sheets and tape to prevent access.

Overview of Inmate Problems, Issues, Concerns

- Mental and physical idleness among inmates and boredom was pervasive due to overcrowding and confinement to bunks or cells for the majority of every 24-hour period.
- Reports were received of increased frustration regarding the longer-than-normal periods of time that inmates must wait for their assignment to their parent institution, known as length of time to class-out.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the absence of recreation, inside or outside, except for two one-hour sessions per week.
- Physical ailments or physical health regression related to the requirement to remain sitting or lying on a bunk mattress for extended hours at a time, except for bathroom breaks and meal breaks.
- Mental ‘breakdown’ and anxiety attacks were reported from inmates who have psychological limitations on their ability to remain mentally unaffected by the crowded ‘herd’ living requirement placed upon them without any relief.
- Food quality and portions, including the first weekend brunch meal served to inmates, were identified by inmates as poor and sparse.
- Meat protein was reportedly minimal or absent from many meals, and not in compliance with posted menus.
- The length of time between meals was reportedly too long, encompassing up to seven or eight hours in some cases, due to the overpopulation of inmates for the size of the institution.
- Inmate preoccupation with food and their hunger, reportedly cultivates a climate for theft among inmates.
- Inmate frustration was expressed with the violation of an ACA standard regarding the food they are provided.
- Concerns were expressed about the close proximity, within an arm’s reach, of bunk beds and the large number of inmates confined to the bunk beds in the dayroom of living units, creating a climate for potential anger and disruption among inmates due to the elimination of any personal space.
- Concerns were relayed about the absence of money to purchase commissary and the fear of theft of property if an inmate does not have any funds to purchase commissary.

- Concerns were expressed about the absence of kites and Informal Complaint forms on the units such that inmates are left without a means to communicate concerns to staff.
- Concerns were relayed about a reportedly slow response time from staff when inmates relay a question or problem.

Receiving and Discharge and Sexual Threats

- The first room in which new arrivals are escorted by local law enforcement and turned over to the custody of the prison contains stacked cardboard boxes approximately five to six feet high. On the side of the boxes, a black marker was used to write “Get ready to be gay” and other similar warnings of reportedly impending sexual assault. The tone of the messages appeared motivated to scare and frighten the new arrivals. Reception inmates already include a large number of persons who are afraid of the unknown and/or panicked from the crisis of their incarceration. Reception facilities have tended to be vulnerable to suicides and suicide attempts. If staff wrote the messages on the boxes, it is of more concern than if an inmate porter perhaps obtained access to a marker and the entry room. However, if an inmate(s) wrote the sexual threats, staff who use the room should have immediately observed the disturbing messages and removed them from sight of any incoming inmate.

Suicide Prevention Pilot

- Lorain and Grafton Correctional Institutions are the site of a pilot suicide prevention program in which inmates were recruited and trained to be Offender Observer Aides to the suicidal, if assigned by the mental health staff. Reportedly eight work cadre inmates have been trained, but a few were removed due to rule violations, since excellent conduct is part of the criteria. While the administrative staff are extremely supportive of the program, an Aide has only been used once, reportedly because the psychology staff are skeptical and reluctant about using inmates in the role. Reportedly, officers had some reservations initially, due to previous misinformation that led them to believe that their job of watching inmates on suicide watch was threatened. With the strong administrative support, and the reported cooperation of security staff, it is difficult to understand why mental health staff would not embrace the additional tool to help suicidal inmates.
- In speaking to one of the mental health professionals on site, it was explained that mental health staff see so many who are truly manipulating the mental health system, that it is an ongoing challenge to not miss the one who truly needs their intervention.

Physical Plant Deterioration

- Overcrowding combined with overuse and aging of the facility has accelerated the rate of observable plant deterioration. The continuous and heavy use of certain basic areas of operation, such as the food preparation area, was seen as responsible for a sub-par level of cleanliness and disrepair. Reduction in state funding to address repairs and replacement of the physical plant has resulted in an infrastructure and environment that ranges from unpleasant to a potential threat to safety and security for both inmates and staff.
- Deterioration from age, stress and strain was observed in the physical aspects of the facility.

- The facility has an unmet need to replace hundreds of doors, including those to the housing units, which were observed as eaten away in part by rust. Steel doors throughout the institution were in poor condition and in need of repair or replacement for dents, missing hinges, misalignment within the frame, peeling paint, and structural damage that can no longer be repaired.
- Ceiling tiles were broken throughout the institution in living units, hallways, chow hall, library, classrooms, and other community areas.
- Windows in the cells on living units of the reception population were without screens, allowing inmates to intake fresh air, but also allowing insects to enter the institution and also allowing inmates to lean into the window between the steel bars and verbally communicate to other inmates and also to passersby.
- Wall sections at the entrance of units showed peeling paint and disrepair, which was reportedly exacerbated by inmates who pull off strips of paint as they await entry to the unit.
- Windows throughout the institution are reportedly in need of replacement.
- Capital expenditures were being applied to the institution's roof, which has become the first capital priority.
- Shower stalls contained many broken tiles and worn out or missing grout and caulk. Some shower stalls did not have any privacy curtains. Officers relayed that inmates misuse the shower bar as an exercise apparatus, reportedly justifying removal of the curtains.

III. CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The statute requires the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee to attend a general meal period and to attend an educational or rehabilitative program during inspections. Further, through the encouragement of the CIIC Chairman, Representative Tyrone K. Yates, inspections include a review of the library, which has great and often untapped potential as a valuable tool to rehabilitation. It has been suggested that libraries include books of interest to all cultures and ethnicities, and a section for African American literature, a section for Hispanics, as well as biographies and classics which motivate and inspire.

The requirement placed upon CIIC to attend meals and programming is statutorily established pursuant to Section 103.73 (A) (1) and (2) of the Ohio Revised Code. This section of Ohio law states that the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee shall establish and maintain a continuing program of inspection of each state correctional institution used for the custody, control, training, and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime. The statute also requires that the Committee shall inspect each correctional institution "each biennium," and further, that *each inspection shall include attendance at "one general meal period" as well as attendance at "one rehabilitative or educational program."* Relevant to inmate programming, the statute requires the Committee to "*evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition and operation of correctional institutions.*"

ATTENDANCE AT GENERAL MEAL PERIOD

The lunch meal consisted of “sloppy joe” mixture of beef and tomato sauce, white rice, hot kernel corn and chopped peppers, hot green mixed vegetables, two slices of wheat bread, cold sliced peaches, and a juice pouch. Food temperatures were appropriate and seasoning was adequate. Food portions were adequate. Inmates relayed that components of meals are often not served even though they are listed on the menu. Also, inmates relayed their belief that there is a shortage of meat proteins as a part of the nutritional composition of the meals. The process of serving meals to the large inmate population at Lorain Correctional Institution allows for very little time between the daily meals. The food preparation area and the dining hall are continuously in use as inmates are served meals throughout the day. Based on observation during the inspection, the kitchen and dining hall were in need of additional cleaning due to continuous and virtually uninterrupted use.

Food Services

Inspection of food services revealed concerns about the level of sanitation in the kitchen, storage, and dining hall. Institutional administration also reported their own level of concern and challenges regarding the operation and condition of the food services department.

The clean-up area in particular was observed to be dirty. Within the area, some preparation for the dinner meal was underway at the time of the inspection. An inmate was observed spreading frosting on sheet cakes using his hands inside a plastic glove, rather than with a spatula. In the clean-up area, flies were drawn to open garbage tubs, and the inmates reported that mice have access to the bread racks. The floors were wet in areas that would normally be kept mopped during periods of food preparation and clean-up, and various tubs and carts, some with uncovered garbage, were ‘parked’ randomly around the area, nearly becoming obstacles, and creating a disorganized environment. Uncovered tubs of food garbage in the kitchen and also in a hallway adjacent to the dumpster were swarming with gnats and causing a foul odor which was also present on the back dock. A garbage disposal reportedly was out of service, accounting for the use of the garbage tubs full of food. Inmate workers relayed that the dumped garbage has attracted hundreds of mice. A floor drain was reportedly clogged and a plumber was attempting to unplug the clog of backed up water during the inspection. Textured surfaces of the kitchen floor showed evidence of dirt that had not been adequately cleaned.

Among the basic food service appliances, two large steel kettles and one convection oven were in disrepair or out of commission. Basic other kitchen tools were kept in orderly fashion in a locked tool cage, using a chit system.

In the clean-up area of the kitchen, the large steel food service pans were washed by hand and left to air-dry. Inmates washing serving pans were provided with aprons, but no gloves or rubber boots. At the opposite end of the kitchen, soiled food trays were scraped by a gloved inmate worker, and then placed into a large tray of a commercial dishwasher. A huge garbage can of tray scrapings was overflowing and debris was on the floor. While the interior racks within the tray of the washing machine were inspected and seen as acceptable,

the walls surrounding the area where clean trays were stacked appeared to be unclean, with accumulated dirt in the textured surface of the wall.

Cold food and beverage storage is maintained in coolers and freezers. Gnats were present outside the coolers. Trays of “72-hour” foods are kept in the freezer for emergency use in the event of a problem with any meal. One of the freezers was reportedly not functional and not in use. A back freezer was working, while the front freezer was broken, registering 60 degrees. There were temperature logs kept for the two freezers and six coolers, but the logs had to be requested and were not posted next to the cooler doors. Produce appeared to be in good condition in the coolers. In one cooler, there was leakage from one of the milk bags observed, and water from the cooler’s condenser had caused a puddle in the back of the cooler. A date stamp was noted on a milk rack, but reportedly the date was not an expiration date. Staff reported the use of beverages in bags as ideal for the reception center as it eliminates the need for drinking cups, but inmates shared complaints about the difficulty in trying to drink from a plastic pouch.

The dry food storage room appeared unclean and some food components were observed on the floor, prompting the potential for rodent and vermin infestation. Reportedly, mice (or rats) have been observed within the food preparation and dry goods storage area, but an exterminator treats the area weekly. Gnats were observed and the dry storage area was musty.

An inmate badge scanner is used to identify inmate attendance at meals, but the scanner was reportedly broken on the inspection date. The food serving line is separated from food preparation by a full glass wall. Flies were observed in the serving line area, which was not clean. A significant amount of debris and dirt were observed under the counter where food is served to inmates. The debris appeared to include rodent droppings. A bin of uncovered peaches was near the pan scrubbing area.

At the entrance of the dining hall, there were separate locked boxes for inmates to deposit kites, Informal Complaint Resolution forms, outgoing mail, and requests for sick call.

Staff relayed that the facility has two dining rooms, one that seats 220 and one with a 132 seating capacity. In the dining hall, bench-style steel dining tables were observed in constant use by incoming inmates throughout the inspection, but the porters were not quickly responsive to cleaning debris from the tables between inmate use; and the staff reportedly have not been active in ensuring that porters engage fully in this duty. Reportedly, part of the problem is that the food service porters are selected from the short term offender population, who were described as not engaged with a full and committed attitude to their job assignment. However, at the time of the inspection, inmate workers were busy.

The restroom off of the dining room was observed to be dirty and also out of soap.

Food Services: *Expectations* Questions and Responses Regarding from Lorain Correctional Institution

1. Are prisoners offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements?
There is a five week cycle menu that offers a variety.
2. Is food prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes**
3. Do all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to relevant food Safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes**
4. Are religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving, fully observed and communicated to prisoners? **Religious diets are communicated through the religious services.**
 - a. Are Halal certificates displayed where prisoners can see them? **No**
 - b. Are appropriate serving utensils used to avoid cross-contamination? **Yes**
 - c. Do kitchen staff make special arrangements for different types of food, and special dietary requirements for e.g.

Pregnant inmates? **NA**
 Specific religions? **Only when approved by the proper authority.**
 Prisoners with disabilities? **Yes**
 - d. Do Prisoners who are on special diets have confidence in the preparation and contents of the meals? **Yes**
5. Are all areas where food is stored, prepared and served properly equipped and well managed? **The areas are managed well.**
6. Are prisoners and staff who work with food, health screened and trained, wear proper clothing, and prisoners are able to gain relevant qualifications?
Yes, ServSafe certification for all staff and safety and health training for prisoners.
7. Do medical clearance forms exist on food service workers, and are training courses offered? **Inmates are given medical restrictions but I am not aware of a medical clearance form and safety and health training is given for prisoner workers.**

7. Are prisoners meals healthy, varied and balanced and always include one substantial meal each day? **Yes, menu is set by the state dietitian.**
8. Are prisoners encouraged to eat healthily and are they able to eat five portions of fruit or vegetables a day? **Yes, menu set by state dietitian.**
 - a. Are all menu choices provided to the same standard? **Yes**
 - b. Are options for religious or cultural groups open to all, and not just those who practice their religion officially? **No**
9. Are prisoners consulted about the menu, and can they make comments about the Food? **Menu set by the state dietitian.**
10. Is the breakfast meal served on the morning it is eaten? **Yes**
11. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm
Lunch is between noon and 4 pm and Dinner is from 5pm 8 pm.
12. Do prisoners have access to drinking water (including at night time), and the means of making a hot drink after evening lock up? **They do have access to water in their cell, but not hot water machines or microwaves.**
13. Are prisoners able to eat together (except in exceptional circumstances)?
Yes
14. Does staff supervise the serving of food in order to prevent tampering with food and other forms of bullying? **Yes the food service staff does.**
15. Where prisoners are required to eat their meals in their cells, are they able to sit at a table.
The only inmates that are required to eat in their cells at LorCI are housed in the Special Management Unit, Infirmary and Mental Health Crisis Cells. All the Special Management cells have a built in table and chair unit. No Mental Health Crisis Cells have a table and/or chair.
16. Do pregnant prisoners and nursing mothers receive appropriate extra food? **NA**

ATTENDANCE AT EDUCATIONAL OR REHABILITATIVE PROGRAM

The inspection included observation of a mathematics class, offered as part of the General Education Diploma (GED) academic program. Instruction was delivered as a lecture, with some responses invited from students. Inmate involvement appeared to be minimal during the observation period. Educational staff reported that the GED program is the primary academic program at Lorain Correctional Institution, citing that the facility is a reception center and therefore, the majority of inmates live there for only a brief period of time. Inmates relayed that the absence of academic and vocational programs is a significant factor in the idleness and restlessness experienced among inmates.

Educational Center

The education center at the Lorain Correctional Institution was somewhat small compared to other institutions, yet it reportedly has shown success in the volume of inmates who have earned the General Education Diploma (GED). Staff indicated that in the current year, there were 52 inmates who took the GED test, and 41 inmates passed the examination, for a 78.9 percent pass rate. Reportedly, in the preceding year, 92 percent of Lorain Correctional Institution inmates taking the GED test passed the exam, giving the Lorain institution status with the highest GED pass rate among DRC institutions. Staff indicated there is a 63 percent national pass rate for the GED exam.

There has been an effort to provide GED studies as independent self-study modules as a way of providing education to a larger number of inmates and also as a means of eliminating inmate idleness. Budget reductions have reduced the institution's ability to purchase desired instructional materials for a keyboarding class.

The low motivation level among some inmates toward education was identified by educational staff, who reported late inmate arrivals to classes. During the inspection, one inmate did arrive late to a math class. The administration relayed particular appreciation for the educational staff in their efforts to work with short-term and less-motivated offenders, identifying the staff's excellent work in the area of guidance counseling in pre-release and re-entry skills. Educational staff relayed that job fairs are also periodically provided for inmates.

Education and Programming Data

Monthly data on educational and vocational programming at the Lorain Correctional Institution for July 2009 shows **student census of 74 in academic courses for the month, with a total of 830 inmates on waiting lists to enter an academic program.** Lorain Correctional Institution offers academic programming in the following courses: Literacy, Adult Basic Literacy and Education (ABLE), General Education Diploma (GED), the Pre-GED, a GED evening track, and High School Options.

- *Among the options, there were zero ABLE classes provided, yet 495 inmates were on the Waiting List for the ABLE course.*

- *There were 18 inmates engaged in the Pre-GED course, with 250 inmates on the Waiting List.*
- There were 52 inmates taking the GED evening course, with zero inmates on the Waiting List. *For the daytime GED course, there were four students enrolled and 85 on the Waiting List.* For the month of July 2009, there were eight inmates who completed the GED requirements and all eight inmates passed the GED test.
- The July 2009 data reveals zero Career-Technology programs were offered.
- There were nine inmates receiving Special Education services and 108 inmates on the Special Education Waiting List.
- There were 38 inmates who completed and received the Career Enhancement skill enhancement program during July 2009. During July 2009, there were 38 Career Enhancement Certificates awarded.

Educational and Programming Services

The dominant educational programming consists of the *General Education Diploma (GED)* track. The website also lists *Fiber Optic* and *Coaxial Cable Wiring* as an academic track, and vocational training in food preparation (cook, baker) and janitorial services. The short-term stay of reception inmates makes long-term or in-depth educational programs less feasible than some of the programs found in parent institutions. In spite of time limitations, the Lorain Correctional Institution reportedly leads the state in GED completions, an accomplishment that was attributed to the commitment and quality of the educational staff.

Lorain Correctional Institution's website lists two unique programs: the *Short Term Offender Program (STO)* and the *Returning Home* program. The *Short Term Offender* program is designed to target offenders serving no more than 90 days and is designed to prepare offenders for a successful and law-abiding life within a community through work assignments, inmate-specific programming, inmate connections to community and DRC resources, job readiness workshops, substance abuse education and self-help modules.

The *Returning Home* program is a community reentry program sponsored by a county entity known as the Center for Families and Children. This program focuses on relationship and life skills, recidivism prevention, gaining access to financial assistance, and provides enhanced visitations.

Expectations

The Lorain Correctional Institution staff responses to the education-related questions in the British *Expectations*, are provided below. Responses of particular significance communicate that there is *idleness among the reception inmates, lack of activity space and access limitations for reception inmates, lack of facilities and resources for learning, skills and work for reception inmates, and that the facility is 282.53 percent over their rated capacity.* According to the responses:

- Sufficient purposeful activity is available for the cadre/short term offender, but there is a great deal of idleness with the reception inmate population.

- There are sufficient activity places to occupy the cadre/short term offender population purposefully during the core working day, but not for the reception population.
- All short term offender/cadre are assigned. Reception population is not assigned.
- Based on the rated capacity compared with the current population, the facility population is **282.53%**.
- All Cadre/Short term offenders have jobs.
- Facilities and resources for learning and skills and work are appropriate, sufficient and suitable for the purpose for Cadre inmates, but not for Reception inmates.
- All prisoners are not able to access activity areas due to division of cadre/reception.
- Systems in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities include: Incentive programs such as hygiene kits, job or cell change, etc.

Learning, Skills, and Work Activities: *Expectations* Questions and Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution

1. Are prisoners encouraged and enabled to learn, and do they have access to good library facilities? **Yes**
2. Is sufficient purposeful activity available for the total prisoner population? **Yes for cadre/short term offender. There is a great deal of idleness with the Reception Inmate Population.**
3. Are all prisoners assessed to provide a clear understanding and record of their learning and skills needs including literacy, math, and language support, employability and vocational training, and social and life skills? **Yes**
4. Is the learning and skills and work provision in the prison informed by and based on the diverse needs of prisoners and provides prisoners with both the opportunity of and access to activities that are likely to benefit them? **Yes**
 - a. Does provision meet the needs of older, younger adult and disabled? **Yes**
5. Are there sufficient activity places to occupy the population purposefully during the core working day? **Yes for cadre/short term offender. No for reception population.**
 - a. How many prisoners are locked up during the day? **Reception-varies Cadre/Short Term Offender -none**
 - b. How many are formally registered as unassigned? **All Short term offender/Cadre are assigned. Reception population are not assigned.**
 - c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population? **282.53%**

- d. How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job? **All Cadre/Short term offenders have jobs.**
6. Are activities which fall outside the learning and skills provision purposeful and designed to enhance prisoners' self-esteem and their chances of successful reentry? **Yes**
7. Are facilities and resources for learning and skills and work appropriate, sufficient and suitable for the purpose? **Yes (Cadre) No (Reception).**
8. Are all prisoners able to access activity areas? **No, due to division of cadre/reception.**
- a. Is there access for older and disabled prisoners? **Yes**
- b. Are there any inaccessible areas because of poor mobility and insufficient help to get to them? **No**
9. Is every prisoner who wishes to, able to engage fully with all prison activities offered, and is no one excluded from participation other than as a result of a disciplinary punishment? **Yes**
- a. Is a full schedule of activities available to all prisoners? **Yes**
10. Is allocation to activity places equitable, transparent, and based on identified reentry planning needs? **Yes**
11. Can prisoners apply for job transfers and are they given written reasons for any decisions? **Yes**
- a. Does case management link with the reentry planning process? **Yes**
- b. Do prisoners with identified learning needs work in low-skilled, production line work, rather than relevant classes? **Yes**
- c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures? **Offenders with specific skills are given interviews.**
- d. Is there any favoritism or line jumping? **No**
12. Do local pay schedules provide disincentives for prisoners to engage in education or training activities? **No**
- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities. **No**

13. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay? **Yes**
14. Do prisoners who are unemployed through no fault of their own or who are exempt from working unlocked during the day and provided with access to the library and other activities? **Yes**
15. Does the prison have an effective strategy to ensure that learners are able to regularly and punctually attend those activities which meet their needs and aspirations? **Yes**
 - a. What systems are in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities? **Incentive programs such as hygiene kits, job or cell change, etc.**
16. Are all prisoners given accurate information, advice and guidance about prison activities, which support their learning and sentence plans and link to their reintegration into the community? **Yes**
17. Does the assessment and provision of individual learning and skills form an effective part of prisoners' reentry plans and are they used effectively to record and review overall progress and achievement? **Yes**
18. Do work placements provide purposeful and structured training for prisoners? **Yes**
 - a. Wherever possible, can vocational qualifications be obtained alongside their work? **Yes**
 - b. In the absence of such qualifications, are developed skills recognized and recorded? **Yes**
19. Are prisoners helped to continue on their courses when transferred or to progress to further education, training or employment on release? **Yes**
20. Does the prison accurately record the purposeful activity hours that prisoners engage in, excluding non-purposeful activities in their calculations? **Yes**

ASSISTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENTS

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

The Library: Creation or Expansion of Minority Book Sections

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

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

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

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

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

Inmates in segregation have limited access to the library. Those in Local Control are in segregation for up to six months. Those in “4B” and above are effectively in isolation indefinitely, sometimes for years. If they were provided with good biographies and even good self-help books, at least the isolation would be filling their mind with something

positive that may make a difference in their life. Reading can keep them sane, as well as make them think, which ultimately affects their actions.

The LORCI Library

One full-time librarian and one library aide operate the Lorain Correctional Institution's library. Reportedly, the addition of a second shift would offer more inmates greater access to the library. The library was observed to be primarily a law library, with access to print volumes and Westlaw on the single computer, available upon request to the librarian. The vast majority of inmates reportedly seek case-specific reference materials from the law library, but the library's network is not able to retrieve court data from every county within Ohio, which leaves some inmates without help in studying their case. The library may hold up to 20 inmates at one time, which accounts for the desire to extend library services into a second shift. Inmates may access three typewriters within the library. The librarian relayed a desire for a larger number of fiction and other reference books.

The librarian's preference for additional literature genre is in agreement with the CIIC recommendation to develop additional collections of books that include biographical and ethnic materials, self-help materials, and other transformational and inspirational reading.

The DRC Administrative Rules were observed in the library, bound in new binders and available to inmates. Some rules did not appear to be current, and most of the pages appeared to have seen little use. Reportedly, the institution follows DRC policy by providing administrative rules to inmates in local control, protective control, or segregation upon inmate request, reportedly through a kite to the librarian.

The Lorain Correctional Institution library was observed to be small and somewhat cramped for space. Literature with an ethnic orientation was not found prevalent among the available literature. The stacks contained predominantly legal material, with a minimal quantity of fiction or educational genre. The librarian relayed a desire to expand the library in the hours of operation, services available to inmates, and the quantity and variety of literature. The librarian's desire to offer a wider variety of reading materials is aligned with the thinking of the CIIC Chairman.

Inmates in the medical area relayed their concern that reception inmates have no black history books, and that they reportedly only have library access once per month. In the discussion with the Library Assistant during the inspection, it was relayed that reception inmates only "have access to paperback books." However, work cadre reportedly have access to "everything." The staff person's understanding is that the restriction to paperback books for reception inmates is for "security reasons." In light of the need to combat idleness especially among the reception inmates, it is strongly recommended that this paperback book restriction be reassessed.

Based on information provided on site, "Regular (lending) library times are 8:00 a.m./9:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m./1:00 p.m." The Lorain CI Library Schedule effective December 17, 2008 which was provided during the inspection is as follows:

Table 1. Library Hours at the Lorain Correctional Institution

| Day | 8 a.m./11 a.m. | 12 p.m./3 pm | 5 p.m./7:15 pm |
|------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Monday | 7A | 7B | Closed |
| Tuesday | 4A | 10A | Cadre |
| Wednesday | 8A | 8B | Closed |
| Thursday | 3A | Discretionary | Cadre |
| Friday | 9A | 9B | Closed |
| Saturday | Closed | Closed | Closed |
| Sunday | 3B | Discretionary | Closed |

Library: *Expectations* Questions and Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution

1. Does the prison have an effective strategy for maximizing access to and use of a properly equipped, organized library, managed by trained staff? **Yes**
 - a. How do prisoners with mobility problems get accessed? **Through formal and/or informal channels.**
2. Are the library materials broadly reflective of the different cultures and needs of the prison population, including Braille, talking books, and foreign language books? **Yes**
3. Do all prisoners have access to a range of library materials, which reflect the population's needs and support learning and skills? **Yes**
4. Does this include:
 - a. Literacy? **Yes**
 - b. Math? **Yes**
 - c. Language **Yes**
 - d. Employability? **Yes**
 - e. Vocational training? **Yes**
 - f. Social and life skills? **Yes**
5. Do library materials include a comprehensive selection of up-to-date legal textbooks and DRC Administrative Rules and DRC policies? **Legal textbooks are no longer mandated to be kept current since the introduction of WESTLAW to Ohio institutional libraries. WESTLAW is always current. DR&C AR's and Policies are also current.**

IV. FACILITY PROFILE

Lorain Correctional Institution opened in 1990, as the reception center for the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Northern Region. It also is the parent institution for some cadre inmates serving multiple years, as well as some short-term offenders with no more than 90 days on their sentences. Intake or reception status inmates currently average approximately 87.3 percent of the total inmate population at the Lorain Correctional Institution. Cadre inmates and short-term inmates together currently comprise approximately 12.7 percent of the total inmate population at Lorain Correctional Institution. The remaining inmates are transferred to their parent institution as soon as a bed is available, following completion of the classification process in which they are designated either level one (minimum), level two (medium), level three (close), level four (maximum) or level five (Administrative or Super Maximum), and assigned to a specific prison as their "parent institution" by the Bureau of Classification at the DRC Central Office.

Property Description

Lorain Correctional Institution is located on 111 acres, and is comprised of multiple housing units, program and inmate services buildings, administrative offices, and an entrance building in a campus arrangement. Multiple outdoor walkways connect buildings. A roadway and double barbed fence surround the entire perimeter of the facility. Security vehicles and security staff patrol the perimeter road.

Core Function

The core purpose of the Lorain Correctional Institution is to serve as the northern reception center, receiving inmates who are entering the system from the local jails while they are classified and until they are assigned to a parent institution. Inmates arrive and are processed through the reception center at an average rate of 47 inmates per day, yet the intake number may vary from 19 to 110 inmates from day to day.

In addition to the intake role, the institution houses inmates serving less than 90 days in a *Short Term Offender* program and cadre inmates in a *Returning Home* program. Work Cadre inmates are needed at reception centers to fill essential inmate job assignments which cannot be given to new inmates in reception.

Budget

The Lorain Correctional Institution's website reports their funding from Ohio's General Revenue Fund (GRF) on a biennial budget of \$34,216,643, with a daily cost per inmate of \$54.06, housing 2,122 inmates as of August 2009. By comparison, the budget for the Correctional Reception Center, serving the DRC Southern Region, is greater than that for the Lorain Correctional Institution. The Correctional Reception Center website reports a GRF Budget of \$36,604,177, with a daily cost per inmate of \$67.99, to serve an inmate population of 1,382 as of September 2009 as shown below. The fact that Lorain CI does not a

Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally ill that is in operation at the Correctional Reception Center, possibly accounts for a portion of the funding differential.

| <u>Reception Center</u> | <u>Population</u> | <u>Funding</u> | <u>Cost per Inmate</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Lorain CI | 2,122 | \$34,216,643 | \$54.06 |
| Corr. Reception C | 1,382 | \$36,604,177 | \$67.99 |
| Difference | 740+ at LORCI | \$2,387,534+ at CRC | \$13.93+ at CRC |

The Lorain Correctional Institution's roof, plumbing, and other infrastructural components, such as hundreds of doors and windows, are experiencing increased rates of deterioration due to age, wear, and over population. Staff relayed that a private-sector plumber provided quality work in replacing boilers quickly, reducing the impact of not having hot water for inmates and staff to use. Cost-savings measures include use of long-life light bulbs as replacements for less efficient filament bulbs.

Staff Demographics

The institutional website as of August 9, 2009, shows 420 staff employed at the institution, with 252 or 60 percent working as security staff. A system-wide practice of unpaid days off or "cost savings days" was reported during the inspection as favorably contributing to cost containment, but it also reportedly impacts stress, morale and staff levels.

The ODRC Workforce Composition data of October 1, 2009 shows that Lorain Correctional Institution has 420 staff, including 252 officers. Male staff total 287, comprising 68.3 percent. There are 59 black male staff and 30 black female staff, a total of 89 black staff, comprising 21.2 percent of their total staff. There are 18 "other" male staff and three "other" female staff, a total of 21 "other" staff, comprising five percent of the staff. Combined, racial minorities comprise 26.2 percent of the staff.

Inmate Population and Race

According to the institution's website, the population totaled **2,122 inmates** as of September 1, 2009, comprised of:

| <u>Race</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Black | 1,173 | 55.3% |
| White | 890 | 41.9 |
| Other | 59 | 2.8 |
| Total | 2,122 | 100 % |

The distribution of inmate security levels on August 9, 2009 was shown to include 266 at level one (minimum), 276 at level two (medium), 1,573 at level three (close), seven at level

four (maximum), and no inmates at level five (administrative maximum). The large number of Close security is believed to include those who are still in reception status, awaiting classification determination.

| <u>Security Levels</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Close | 1,573 | 74.12% |
| Medium | 276 | 13.00 |
| Minimum | 266 | 12.54 |
| Maximum | 7 | .33 |
| Total | 2,122 | 100% |

The following statistics for July 29, 2009 were provided during the inspection and are shown in the table below.

Table 2. Inmate Population on July 29, 2009 at Lorain Correctional Institution with Breakdown by Short Term Offenders, Work Cadre and Reception Status

| Inmate Status | Reception Inmates | Short Term Offender (STO) Inmates | Cadre Inmates | Reception Inmates | Total Inmates |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| At Institution | 1746 | 147 | 108 | 1746 | 2001 |
| Absent at Count (Away With Leave) | 76 | 2 | 0 | 76 | 78 |
| Total | 1822 | 149 | 108 | 1822 | 2079 |
| Percent | 87.6% | 7.2% | 5.2% | 87.6% | 100% |

Length of Stay

During the inspection, it was noted that DRC tries to process inmates classified at levels one or two to their parent institution in less than 90 days, but the average has become three to four months. Inmates classified at level three reportedly are moved from reception to parent institution in a speedier manner, favorably impacting the Lorain Correctional Institution. The transfer of inmates with security classification level of three (formerly close) has historically created the most frequent backlog. Level three inmates have reportedly waited for a year before they were transferred to their parent institutions. The Lorain Correctional Institution administration praised the hard work of the Bureau of Classification in shortening the length of time to reduce and process inmates at level three, so that level three inmates do not remain at the reception center any longer than necessary.

Administrators provided data for July 21, 2009, when 631 inmates representing all security classifications, were ready to transfer to their parent institution. Among the 631 inmates, there were 171 inmates ready to transfer to close security prisons, with 53 inmates scheduled

for transfer to Trumbull Correctional Institution and 118 inmates assigned to Mansfield Correctional Institution.

The shortage of bed space in parent institutions is a major barrier in the speed at which inmates may be transferred. Reportedly, inmates at levels one and two take the least amount of time, usually three to four months, to transfer from reception to parent institution; but even level one and two inmates have on occasion remained at the Lorain Correctional Institution for longer periods of time.

Use of Force Data

The most recent monthly institutional data on Use of Force at the Lorain Correctional Institution was submitted for July 2009. The data indicates that during July 2009, there were 40 use of force incidents recorded, with 24 incidents involving black inmates, 15 incidents involving white inmates, and one incident involving an inmate in the 'other' category. *Of the total 40 incidents, 35 were determined to require "No Further Action," and five were assigned to a Use of Force Committee.* Of the five incidents that were assigned to a Use of Force Committee, one incident involved a black inmate and four incidents involved white inmates. Discussion is included in the staff communication section of this report regarding the subject of OC spray. Wardens have the discretion to expand the authorization of staff carrying OC spray. It is regarded as positive that the administration is carefully weighing the potential benefits as well as potential negative consequences to any such expansion.

Rated Capacity and Percent of Crowding

Due to increasing intake numbers and other factors, the Lorain Correctional Institution is experiencing the highest rate of overcrowding among all of Ohio's adult prisons. The sheer number of intake inmates arriving at the Reception Center, the length of time to classify and transfer inmates to their parent institution, and the availability (shortage) of beds at parent institutions are all factors that have contributed to the current overcrowded conditions at the Lorain Correctional Institution, which was designed to house approximately 33 percent of the current volume of inmate residents; thus, based on the population on September 22, 2009, the Lorain Correctional Institution has an approximate **297.5 percent rate of overcrowding.**

The *rated capacity* of each institution, according to the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Central Office, is based on the number of beds in the initial design plus modifications from remodeling or renovation. By comparing the *rated capacity* with the *inmate count*, the *percent of crowding* is derived. Among all DRC institutions as of December 29, 2008, the average *percent of crowding* was shown at 133 percent.

As noted in the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee's *Biennial Report to the 128th General Assembly* of March 2009, **the rated capacity for Lorain Correctional Institution as of December 29, 2008 was 756 inmates**, based on data from the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. With an *inmate count* on that date of 1,985 inmates, the Lorain Correctional Institution's *percent of crowding* was **263 percent**. LORCI housed **1,229 inmates beyond its rated capacity.**

A comparison of these statistics with those for DRC's second reception center for men, Correctional Reception Center that serves the Southern Region, shows that on December 29, 2008, the *rated capacity* was 900 inmates at Correctional Reception Center. With an *inmate count* on that date of 1,640 inmates, the **Correctional Reception Center percent of crowding was 182 percent**. CRC housed *740 inmates beyond its rated capacity*.

Lorain Correctional Institution continues to lead all other DRC institutions in inmate overcrowding. The facility's website data for **end-of-August 2009** shows Lorain housing 2,122 inmates with their *rated capacity* of 756, for a **percent of crowding of 281 percent**, reflecting an **increase of 18 percent in crowding over the eight-month period from December 29, 2008 to the end-of-August 2009**.

In contrast, the website for end-of-August (or early September) 2009 for the Southern Region reception center, Correctional Reception Center, shows that CRC houses approximately 1,382 inmates with a *rated capacity* of 900, for a *percent of crowding* of **154 percent**, reflecting a *decrease of 28 percent in crowding over the approximate eight-month period* beginning with December 29, 2008.

Lorain CI staff relayed that they have their maximum number of beds on the floor space between the cells which is supposed to serve as dayroom space for out of cell time for the inmates. Staff indicated that usually their population numbers are down in May, but there was no such drop. Last year, they were able to remove 20 beds from the floor (dayroom space). However, they had to start putting the beds back on the floor last September and October. Intake Monday through Friday averages 47, though they have had as high as 110. Staff relayed that there had been a backlog of level three (close) security inmates who were at Lorain CI almost a year, the Bureau of Classification has been helpful in moving them out quicker. The average length of stay for level two inmates is three to four months. The length of stay is reportedly supposed to be 90 days.

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

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

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

V. INSPECTION

Entrance Grounds and Entry Building

The Lorain Correctional Institution exterior grounds were clean at the entrance and throughout the compound. An attractively landscaped pond and stone fountain were located at the entry building. Two inmates were working on a landscaping project at the entrance putting in bushes. The entrance lobby included restrooms, vending machines, a pay phone, chairs, and lockers for visitor use. The entry process was notably courteous, efficient, and followed protocol for metal detection and identification verifications.

Receiving and Discharge

The Receiving and Discharge Center at the Lorain Correctional Institution serves as the receiving site for individuals entering the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's prison system in the Northern Region. These individuals arrive from the local jails. Also, inmates who are leaving the system through the Lorain Correctional Institution or otherwise transferring to another prison, go through the discharge process in the R and D Center.

Individuals usually arrive at Lorain Correctional Institution for intake processing on weekdays between 7:30 and 11:30 am, and again after 2:30 pm. The jails generally follow an unofficial schedule for delivery of inmates on certain days of the week to the Lorain Reception Center. The volume of arrivals reportedly increased during the summer months of 2009, during a time of the year that normally experiences a decrease.

The Receiving and Discharge Center is in a building structured with a separate door and sally port for use by local law enforcement in the delivery of offenders to reception. Intake inmates are taken through a 90 minute process that includes the removal of restraints, strip search and issue of jumpsuit and shower shoes, hair cut by a cadre inmate-barber, interview and records check, identification card issue, second strip out to note tattoos and body markings, medical evaluation by a registered nurse for history and current health status, drug and alcohol screening, and placement in a holding cell until the inmates are taken to a unit.

Additional inspection observations of the receiving area included a jumpsuit storage area where orange jumpsuits appeared dirty, personal property room where inmate property at intake is inventoried and kept in brown paper bags to be retained by the inmate or sent home at the inmate's expense, and an adjacent hallway where the numerous cuffs, shackles, and restraints are kept on wall-mounted boards along a long wall. The area includes a barber for haircuts as well as two medical rooms staffed with nurses.

Based on a discussion with four new arrivals in a holding cell, three had been in prison either once, twice or four times in the past. One indicated that he is a Heartless Felon. All spoke lightheartedly about their prison sentence, even laughing about it. As noted in the inspection summary, black marker writing on boxes stacked in the receiving room included disturbing sexual threats.

Unit 4B – Initial Reception Housing Unit

Housing Unit 4B serves as the initial unit where intake inmates are given a bunk, reportedly for seven to ten days, prior to being relocated to another unit within the Lorain Correctional Institution until they are transferred to their parent institution. Overcrowding has created the need for inmates to be placed on bunk beds within the dayroom in 4B, where there were 28 bunks occupied by 56 inmates. The total inmate count at inspection was 141, with 49 on the upper range, 36 on the lower range, and 56 inmates on the dayroom floor.

The sanitation conditions on the unit were observed as satisfactory, with showers seen as clean, reportedly having been repaired within two previous years. The unit environment is maintained with minimal furnishings, yet provisions include one microwave oven, four payphones, three wall-mounted fans, and three floor fans. Inmate possessions, including personal hygiene products, were sparse because there is minimal space for inmates to store any items. Unit security measures reportedly do not include cameras, which are only placed in the segregation unit.

During the initial days, inmates are reportedly restricted to their bunks for 18 to 20 hours per day. Staff relayed that ‘bunk restriction’ provides for no recreation and allows an inmate to leave the bunk only for meals and to use the restroom. Intake inmates are reportedly permitted to have only a Bible or religious reading materials in their possession.

During initial housing, inmates are screened by classification staff to identify those who may qualify for the Intensive Program Prison (IPP). Reportedly, eight to ten percent of inmates are accepted into the Intensive Program Prison. Due to staff reductions, staff members working on Unit 4B reportedly assume multiple job duties, sometimes taking on responsibilities of case manager and correctional officer.

The close proximity of bunks in the dayrooms was observed during the inspection. Bunks were close enough that some inmates could reach out and touch a neighboring inmate. Inmate concerns relayed from the initial group included:

- Length of time between meals
- Slow and nonresponsive nature of medical staff
- Idleness
- Psychological and physical stress of being confined to either sitting or lying on a thin mattress on a bunk continuously without mental or physical variation.
- Concerns about health risks due to infections of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) that they believe come into the institution with inmates from the county jail system; although inmates are reportedly provided with some education on the signs and handling of symptoms of the infection during their medical briefings.
- Not having commissary or library privileges while on the unit
- Questions about sentence computation
- Requests for protective control (PC) placement.

Unit 3B and Mental Health

Unit 3B is one of two units at the Lorain Correctional Institution without bunk beds on the dayroom floor. The unit has a capacity for 74 inmates. On the inspection date, there were 61 inmates in residence.

The unit contains the crisis cells for the institution, and reportedly 30 to 40 percent of Unit 3B inmates are on the mental health caseload. Inmates may be on either close or constant watch, or under basic mental health observation, while in the single crisis cells on Unit 3B. DRC policies for constant and close watch are followed on the unit. During the inspection, one constant watch inmate was engaged in an interview with mental health staff. The mental health staff who serve inmates on Unit 3B maintain their offices on the unit, while additional mental health staff maintain offices in the main mental health services department.

An officer in the area relayed concerns about “conditions,” citing the need for “less inmates and more staff.” Two officers reportedly are assigned to 195 to 200 inmates, with 70 to 80 bunked on the floor between the cells.

Inmates on Unit 3B communicated that staff show disrespect to inmates through the use of profanity, denial of recreation and showers, and by banging on cell doors. Inmates relayed their belief that they are the brunt of staff inappropriate supervision because most Unit 3B inmates are on the Mental Health Caseload.

Physical conditions on Unit 3B on inspection were cool and quiet, with lights dimmed, creating a relaxed environment. The showers and cells were very clean. One shower was reportedly out of service, and several of the showers were missing a shower curtain. The empty suicide cells were very clean. The unit is built with both upper and lower ranges and has a laundry center.

The Unit 3B bulletin board was full of institutional information, schedules, policies, legal information, court addresses, and posted memorandums, including the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee (CIIC) memo that explains the CIIC purpose and how staff and inmates may reach the office. The CIIC memo was observed posted in all units.

Mental Health Caseload

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

Table 4. Mental Health Classifications with Definitions

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

According to the data, 17.7 percent of the prison population was on the mental health caseload. Oakwood Correctional Facility which includes mental hospital beds for inmates in need of such care, had the highest percentage of inmates on the mental health caseload with 56 percent of their 2008 inmate population, followed by the Franklin Pre-Release Center with 50 percent, the Northeast Pre-Release Center with 49 percent, and the Ohio Reformatory for Women with 41 percent. *By comparison, the Lorain Correctional Institution ranked 29th with seven percent of their 2008 population on the mental health caseload. Because Lorain Correctional Institution is a reception center, the low percentage on the caseload is likely due to the fact that many have not yet been assessed by the mental health staff, which is part of the reception process.*

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

Table 5. Percent of Prison Population on the Mental Health Caseload by Institution

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

The following table provides the monthly average of inmates on the mental health caseload in 2008. The data represents approximately 91 percent of 2008 monthly data as approximately nine percent of the data was not available. *The Lorain Correctional Institution ranked 25th in 2008 with an average of 116 inmates per month on the Mental Health Caseload.*

Table 6. Monthly Average on Mental Health Caseload by Institution and Mental Health Classification in 2008

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

Suicide Attempts

Data received for the period January through June 2009 indicates that there have been *no inmate deaths at the Lorain Correctional Institution, suicide or otherwise*

System-wide, there have been 57 suicide attempts from January through August 2009. Of that number, *two suicide attempts occurred at the Lorain Correctional Institution, with one in February 2009 and one in July 2009.*

Pilot Suicide Prevention Program – Offender Observation Aides

Program Status: A pilot program underway at Grafton Correctional Institution and Lorain Correctional Institution has reportedly progressed so that inmates were recruited and trained to be Offender Observation Aides, available to be assigned to a suicidal inmate by mental health staff. Lorain CI staff relayed that the suicide prevention program engages select cadre inmates who are trained by mental health staff. Reportedly 14 cadre inmates were recruited from the work cadre at Lorain CI and eight inmates completed training in suicide prevention counseling conducted by an institution psychologist. Staff relayed that there are good conduct requirements to be maintained as an Aide, and several inmates were removed due to rule violations.

Staff Support: Administrative staff expressed strong support for the pilot project. The pilot project was termed the “greatest thing since sliced bread.” Officers reportedly became supportive after they realized that the Observation Aides will not replace the Officers’ function during suicide watch, and understood that the Aide merely augments the process. However, the mental health staff have only used this resource one time as of the date of the inspection. Mental health staff on site discussed their reservations about using inmates in such a role.

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

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

The beauty of involvement of carefully selected inmates as helpers in this process is that it counters the dangers of isolating one who is suffering from suicidal depression. In addition, a trained inmate has the knowledge and the time to be a good, caring listener. The Aide position provides a meaningful role for inmates to fill their need for a sense of purpose, and to experience the satisfaction of helping another. The greatest benefit, however, is believed to be the inmate with suicidal thoughts, and the mental health staff (at Grafton CI and Lorain CI). However, no benefits will accrue if this new option is not used, and lack of use may stall the opportunity for other prisons to expand their suicide prevention options.

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

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

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

Informal Inmate Support: Question 14.b below asks *if prisoners are encouraged to identify their own support needs and if they are able to draw on opportunities for informal support from other prisoners if they wish*. The Lorain CI staff response was, “**LORCI is a Reception Institution, therefore interaction with other offenders is not seen as being security minded. In most cases, continued contact becomes disruptive for the institution.**” Although the security reference is fully understood, this internationally based *Expectation* is based on the known value of “informal support from other prisoners.” The Offender Observation Aide concept recognizes the value of prisoner support, while providing training, structure, monitoring and supervision to address the cautions and concerns.

Question 13. Below asks *if prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm are held in a supportive and caring environment with unhindered access to sources of help including peer supporters*.

The Lorain CI staff response was, **“Yes, with various watches available, the offender is placed in the least restrictive environment. The Offender Observation Aides Policy 67-MNH-28, allows for the use of Cadre Offenders who have been trained to conduct Close or Observation Watches act as a coach or peer support for that offender. LORCI and GCI were selected at the Institutions for this pilot project.**

Question 13.a asks, “Is a care suite available to support the work of the Listeners?” The response of the Lorain CI staff was, **“Yes, there will be periodic meetings as well as training for the Cadre who work as Observation Aides. This will be conducted in a group setting in 5B, Mental Health.”** Question 13.b. asks, “Is there access to a counselor, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times?” The Lorain CI staff responded, **“There are volunteers working with the Chaplain during all hours of operation. Mental Health is available seven days a week during regular business hours (first shift and part of second shift).”**

The British *Expectations’* section on *inmate self-harm and suicide is provided in full below*. The questions and responses from Lorain Correctional Institution staff on this subject are provided in bold.

Self-Harm and Suicide: *Expectations* Questions and Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution

1. Does the prison work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach? **Yes, the whole-prison approach is accomplished through several modes of operation which are monitored closely by the Mental Health Administrator and who is responsible for ensuring that LORCI is compliant with all policies, Post Orders and Directives.**
 - **Mental Health provides Two (2) Day Specialized Mental Health Training every quarter for the cluster, which includes Lorain Correctional Institution (LORCI). Per Policy 67-MNH-09, Crisis Management & Suicide Prevention, this training is to include all Mental Health staff, medical, custody staff (including relief officers) assigned to special housing areas, i.e. segregation, infirmary etc, within their first six (6) months of assignment to the designated area. Mental Health works closely with custody and non-custody to ensure that as many staff as can, are granted permission to attend. Our last quarterly training was held 6-1-09 and 6-2-09 and was hosted here at LORCI. We had 17 staff attend this session. It is LORCI’s belief that every employee has the potential to have contact with a Severely Mentally Ill (SMI) offender, therefore our goal is to have every employee trained.**
 - **In addition, Policy 67-MNH-09 mandates an annual In-Service training taught by Mental Health staff addressing Suicide Prevention, Cut-Down practice, and other areas of Mental Illness. All staff are required to attend this course.**

- **Suicide Drills are completed two (2) times a month on each shift and reports are written. These drills are discussed at the quarterly Suicide Prevention and Review Team (SPART). The reviews discuss the management of suicide incidents, close and constant watches, restraints, assaults, prolonged threats, and death of an offender or staff member. The SPART team meets quarterly, however can convene if special incidents occur. The team is comprised of administration, security, mental health and medical services.**
- **Mental Health and security have a good working relationship. Each depends upon the other to relay needed information that will ensure safety for the offender as well as for staff. Mental Health and security developed a reporting method for offenders who are on watch and are an Assault Risk for staff.**
- **Security working in R & D identifies offenders coming from county who have had suicide attempts while in the county jail. The Lieutenant immediately notifies Mental Health and places that offender on watch. When the offender has been processed he assigns a C/O to escort to Mental Health for a Risk Assessment.**
- **If a family member or outside person contacts LORCI indicating a concern for an offender's safety, Mental Health is immediately contacted and speaks with that person to elicit more information and then calls custody to escort the offender to Mental Health for a Risk Assessment.**
- **Existing staff and all new staff are given a laminated (ID badge size) card with Suicide Risk Factors, Warning Statements, Signs an Offender Might Be Suicidal and "What Can You do?" information. The card ends with "If an offender is actively attempting suicide or making threats, do not leave the offender alone". These cards are to be carried at all times behind the ID badge for quick access. The cards are given at the time the new employee receives Mental Health orientation.**
- **Security, maintenance, and mental health worked together to create Lexan Doors for several of the Crisis Holding Cells located in 3B and Segregation. These doors allow Officers greater visibility while conducting watches, as there are no blind areas in the cell because the entire door is clear.**

2. Are prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide identified at an early stage, and is care and support plan drawn up, implemented and monitored? **Yes, all staff, especially security are vigilant to identify any signs and symptoms of offenders that might lead to self-injurious behaviors. If they are identified during Mental Health working hours, the C/O will contact Mental Health directly and either a Psychiatric Nurse or a Psychologists will triage/assess for Suicide Risk and develop a plan to either place on watch and create a Treatment Plan or release back to General Population with a Treatment Plan that will address his needs. All Mental Health Staff involved are then notified. If the situation occurs after Mental Health hours, the C/O will contact the Shift Captain, who will in-turn place the offender on watch in 3B. Incident Reports, e-mails and the Authorization for Watch are all completed and forwarded to the Mental Health Supervisors to ensure the offender will be seen within 24 hours of being placed on watch. In addition, the Shift Captain calls the MHA via telephone. The R & D identification process has been addressed in question #1.**
3. Are prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity? **Yes, Policy 67-MNH-09 allows for an offender to be placed on Mental Health Observation in 3B housing unit. This allows for gradual return to general population by increasing his movement into various activities and allowing more personal property. Mental Health contact is made at the discretion of the Authorized Independently Licensed Mental Health Professionals (AILMHP).**
4. Are all staff aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, appropriately trained, and have access to proper equipment and support? **Yes, this was addressed at great length in question #1.**
5. Is there a safer custody strategy that recognizes the risks to prisoners, particularly in the early days of custody, and sets out procedures, which help to reduce the risk of self-harm? **Yes, R & D custody staff are very aware of signs and symptoms of offenders coming in from the county jails who are at risk to harm themselves. We receive transfer summaries from the county jail prior to the offender walking in the back door. Custody and the medical screening nurses carefully review these summaries. Any concerns are immediately discussed with Mental Health and plan of action is put into place. Per Policy 67-MNH-02, Mental Health Screening and Assessment Activities, an Initial Medical, Mental Health and Substance Use Screening in completed by a medical nurse within 8 hours of the offender's admission to reception. Any concerns are brought immediately to Mental Health to conduct a Risk Assessment. LORCI's Lieutenant is excellent with identifying offender needs and placing an Officer with that offender until he can be escorted to Mental Health.**

- a. Are the specific needs of different prisoner groups recognized, as are the levels of risk in different areas of the facility? **Yes, Custody identifies any offender who requires PC screening or who are gang affiliated. Mental Health is part of the PC committee. In addition, Segregation is a high risk area for self-injurious behavior. Custody in this area received the 2 day SMHT and Mental Health makes Segregation Rounds at least 2 times per week. However, the visits may be daily if an offender in on watch in Segregation.**
- b. Does the strategy recognize the special needs of the population e.g. Women and minority groups, those with substance misuse problems, and those not on normal location? **Yes, any offenders with gender identity concerns are seen immediately by Mental Health. If an offender is identified with substance misuse problems, they are referred to Recovery Services. If the offender has any mental health issues, in addition to substance abuse, he is referred to Mental Health's Dual Diagnosed program. Furthermore, if an offender is identified as possible MR/DD, that offender is seen immediately by Mental Health and cell placement is discussed with custody. Mental Health then administers further testing.**
- c. Is staff training appropriate? **Yes, Mental Health training not only occurs in the class room but on a daily basis. Custody has no problem calling Mental Health if a question or concern arises with an offender.**
- d. What is the availability and use of safer cells, particularly in areas of the prison where risks of self-harm are higher? **LORCI has 12 safe cells. Eight (8) are located in 3-B housing unit and 4 are located in Segregation. The last statistics published indicate that General Population is at risk just as much as Segregation or other areas of the institutions. It appears that 50% of the completed offender suicides have taken place in each location. The same would be true for self-injurious behaviors. The safe cells are searched prior to and immediately following an inmate being placed on watch. In addition, the SPART committee completes a safe-cell inspection of each cell on a quarterly basis.**
- e. Does the protocol in place recognize the need for continued interaction, and avoid an over reliance on the safer cell as a preventative measure? **Yes, per policy, Mental Health must make at a minimum of daily contact with those offenders on constant watch and close watch. In addition, other staff may be assigned to be part of the interaction/treatment process. Safe cells *are never* the only means for reliance on preventative measures.**

6. Does a multi-disciplinary committee effectively monitor the prison's suicide prevention policy and procedures? **Yes, the Crisis Management and Suicide Prevention Policy, 67-MNH-09, is closely monitored by two committees. The CQI committee is mandated in the Mental Health Continuous Quality Improvement Policy, 67-MNH-17. This committee is comprised of medical, Mental Health, Recovery Services, custody, case management and other staff as needed. The other committee is the SPART which is mandated by 67-MNH-09 policy. Both of these committees meet quarterly, unless a special circumstance arises.**
7. Is the committee chaired by a manager responsible for the policy and does membership include prisoners, staff representatives from a range of disciplines, and a member of the local community mental health team? **Yes, the CQI committee is chaired by the Mental Health Administrator and the SPART committee is chaired by the Deputy Warden and the Mental Health Administrator. No, the committees do not include offenders because confidential, sensitive materials and security issues are discussed. Yes, a representative from all disciplines is present. And no, local community mental health teams are not included, because LORCI is a Reception Center, long term treatment and establishing a therapeutic relationship is not possible. We are at the stage of requesting and gathering information from outside communities. We do have telephone contact, if the Release of Information has been signed. In most cases, the offender has been transferred before we receive the information. We forward it to the parent institution. Even when an offender is identified as MR/DD and we communicate with the Community Mental Health Services, we are verifying information to expedite a transfer to an appropriate institution.**
8. Are prisoners' families, friends and external agencies encouraged, through local arrangements, to provide sources of information which may help identify and support those prisoners likely to be bullied or who have a history of self-harming behavior? **Yes, Mental Health receives calls and faxes from family members, friends, clergy, attorneys and other sources who can provide information that will help identify those offenders who may be vulnerable. At no time is anyone discouraged from supplying Mental Health information.**
- a. Are there posters in the visiting room about who to contact with concerns, and is that information send out with visiting orders alerting families to the help available?
Yes, there are posters in visitation and brochures that can be taken home that provide family and friends with the necessary contact information. This writer does not know if information is sent out to family alerting them with available help. LORCI does have a web-site with valuable information for family and friends.

9. Is there a detailed care and support plan prepared with the input from the prisoner, which identifies needs, as well as the individuals responsible, including a key worker? **Yes, Mental Health develops Treatment Plans for each offender placed on the caseload and Crisis Treatment Plans for those who have been on watch. The offender is present during this process and signs at the end verifying that he understands and agrees to the plan. A Mental Health Liaison is the key person who creates the Treatment Plan and engages in on-going contact. The Psychologist is the key person who prepares the Crisis Treatment Plan.**
10. Are personal factors or significant events which may be a trigger to self-harm identified? **Yes, these triggers may be identified during the initial screening or within 14 days of arrival when receiving the Detail Mental Health Screening. If an offender notifies custody or kites Mental Health, they are passed to the liaison responsible and information is elicited that may help gain insight for his triggers.**
11. Do regular reviews take place involving staff from a range of disciplines and family and friends as appropriate, which provide good support and care for all prisoners at risk? **Regular reviews take place with appropriate disciplines, however there are limited occasions when family members or others support are present. Psychologists take great caution when allowing contact even through visitation. At times, the visitor may be the trigger. The Parole Board and Adult Parole Authority have been helpful in the past by supplying prior history and current observations. Reception is a time for giving the offender every screening and test from every department so that when he is transferred out his various charts are a testimony of his life.**
12. Are arrangements in place for following up after a care and support plan has been closed? **LORCI rarely closes a Mental Health case. There is simply not enough time to discharge an offender from the caseload. Therefore, this is the responsibility of the parent institution.**
- a. Do unit officers have knowledge of policy and support plans? **Yes, policies are part of their post orders and are to read on a daily basis. Policies are also available through the DRC home page or on the LORCI Web site. Every staff at LORCI has access to a computer. Unit staff are notified, when appropriate, of behaviors to be aware of on the offender's housing unit, recreation, recovery services or religious services.**
 - b. What level of training have they had? **It is mandatory that every staff member attend In-Service Training on an annual basis. It is also mandatory that custody attend the 2 Day Specialized Mental Health**

Training as soon as possible.

13. Are prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm held in a support and caring environment with unhindered access to sources of help including peer supporters? **Yes, with various watches available, the offender is placed in the least restrictive environment. The Offender Observation Aides Policy 67-MNH-28, allows for the use of Cadre Offenders who have been trained to conduct Close or Observation Watches act as a coach or peer support for that offender. LORCI and GCI were selected at the Institutions for this pilot project.**
- a. As a care suite available to support the work of the Listeners? **Yes, there will be periodic meetings as well as training for the Cadre who work as Observation Aides. This will be conducted in a group setting in 5B, Mental Health.**
 - b. Is there access to counselor, the chaplaincy team, listeners and Samaritans at all times? **There are volunteers working with the Chaplain during all hours of operation. Mental Health is available seven days a week during regular business hours (first shift and part of second shift).**
 - c. Are appropriate free telephone help lines/interventions available, in particular, to address aspects of women's prior victimization such as rape crisis, domestic violence and others? **LORCI is a male Reception Institution.**
14. Are prisoners encouraged to express any thought of suicide and/or self-harm, and encouraged to take part in all purposeful activities as part of the support plan? **Yes, from the minute they walk in R & D, they are encouraged to talk about thoughts of suicide or thoughts of self-harm.**
- a. Are prisoners given the opportunity and assistance to make a written contribution to their review? **Yes, offenders are invited and encouraged to take part in their treatment reviews.**
 - b. Are prisoners encouraged to identify their own support needs and are they able to draw on opportunities for informal support from other prisoners if they wish? **LORCI is a Reception Institution, therefore interaction with other offenders is not seen as being security minded. In most cases, continued contact becomes disruptive for the institution.**
15. Are all staff, including night staff, fully trained in suicide prevention and clear on what to do in an emergency? **Yes, all staff, including third shift have attended the same mandatory In-Service and Two-Day SMHT. In addition, Mock Suicide drills are conducted randomly throughout the institution and is conducted on all three shifts.**

- a. Is there a program of refresher training in place? **Yes, annual In-Service training includes a two-hour refresher on Mental Health, Restraints and Suicide Prevention.**
 - b. Do staff have access to first aid kits and shears? **Yes, each housing unit has a first aid kit and each officer has a cut-down tool that is passed from one shift to the next along with their keys.**
 - c. If facility does not have a first night center, do night staff know where first night prisoners and those at risk are located? **Yes, most definitely. If any offender displays signs and symptoms of suicidal behavior or expresses suicidal thoughts, the Shift Captain is immediately notified and the offender is escorted to 3-B, placed in a safe cell and placed on Constant watch until a Mental Health professional see him for a Risk Assessment. Per Policy the Mental Health professional must see the offender within 24 hours of being placed on watch. In cases of emergency, the officer pushes his/her man-down unit and control announces it. All yard and available officers respond. In cases of medical emergency, medical is also notified and per policy must respond within three minutes.**
16. Are incidents of self-harm closely monitored and analyzed at regular intervals to establish any trends and to implement preventive measures? **Yes, absolutely. CQI and SPART committees are called the next business day to discuss any serious attempts of self-harm where the offender was sent out to the hospital for treatment. A Health Care Occurrence is reported by Mental Health and an investigation conducted. This report with conclusion, recommendations, and plans for correction are submitted to central office. The HCO are again discussed at the quarterly CQI and SPART meetings. The committee looks at any trends and environmental factors that might surface.**
 17. Are serious incidents properly investigated to establish what lessons could be learned and to promote good practice? **Yes, this was answered in question #16.**
 18. Where appropriate, are family or friends of the prisoner informed through a family liaison officer? **On some occasions, the family members may be notified, if it is determined by a Mental Health Professional to be therapeutic and not damaging.**
 19. Is an action plan devised and acted upon promptly as a result of an investigation into an apparent self-inflicted death? **Yes, without question. A complete suicide investigation is conducted by an outside team.**

- a. Is this reviewed following subsequent findings of an investigation? **Yes, the action plan is developed by the Mental Health Administrator and monitored at 30-60-90 day intervals. The onus to ensure the action plan is carried out falls on the Mental Health Administrator. Custody plays an important role with assisting where applicable.**
 - b. Are there attempts to understand underlying causes and/or trends? **Yes, the Bureau of Mental Health Services (OBMHS) and ODRC compile statistics in an attempt to gather as much information as possible for preventing future suicides.**
 - c. Have there been any reviews of recommendations from previous deaths in custody? **Yes, several years ago.**
20. Is all information about prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide communicated to people who are able to offer support in the community? **Yes, if an offender is released from LORCI back into the community and he is on the Mental Health Caseload, Community Linkage Workers assist with placing the offender into community treatment services. These services will be briefed regarding the suicide risk of the offender.**

Compound and Walkways

There was good inmate movement observed on the yard. Staff relayed that inmates are now being escorted to meals and movement is modeled after the Correctional Reception Center, which has long been praised for their controlled inmate movement that seems to go hand in hand with safety and security. The movement was cited as an area that has improved, yet some indicated further improvements could be made.

Unique to the inspection of the Lorain Correctional Institution were audible shouts from inmates relaying comments and asking questions of the inspection team. Due to the absence of screens in the windows of some housing units, the inmates were able to lean between the vertical security bars inside the window frames and communicate to staff and other inmates on the compound. Staff reported that shouts to female staff are offensive and vulgar, and the problem has become a challenge to stop because it is difficult to know which inmate is guilty of the comments. In cases where the abuser becomes known, the inmate is charged with a rule violation.

Medical Services Department

The Medical Services Department includes a dental clinic, five infirmary cells, two negative air flow cells, the pill call window, an x-ray room, an eye exam room, and general exam rooms which were observed as clean. On occasion, the infirmary cells may be used as

segregation cells, with a capacity for 10 inmates. (These 10 cells constitute the difference between the institution's definition of their rated capacity at 746 and the DRC's definition of the Lorain institution's rated capacity at 756.)

Non-medical staff relayed that the medical staff are "good staff" and "hard workers." The intake process is reported to be a challenge for them to complete it all in a timely manner. The lab technician is reportedly "overloaded." The x-ray technician reportedly serves inmates from both Grafton and Lorain Correctional Institutions. The x-ray equipment, which is located at the Lorain facility, appeared comparatively outdated, without digital imaging technology.

Two nurses were seated at chairs, working on medical records in a corridor or hallway in the medical area. One relayed the need to have a counter with space to review files rather than having to review them on their lap.

The Lorain Correctional Institution uses the centralized pharmacy services of the agency and also receives pharmaceutical services from a local pharmacy for immediate needs. The air temperature within the medical unit were observed to be notably cold during the inspection, and staff relayed that an exterior door within the unit was open to allow for fresh air to enter the unit. The medical unit uses a motorized transport cart when necessary to reach and respond to emergencies as needed.

Dental services are provided by one full-time dentist and several part-time dental hygienists and dental technicians. Two inmate patients were receiving services with two dental staff present. The area was observed as clean.

System-wide budget reductions have reportedly prompted judicious analysis and conservative decisions regarding suggestions or requests for expanded medical services, especially when the institution is facing the simultaneous need for serious infrastructural repairs associated with safety and security.

Recent medical data provided to CIIC from the Lorain Correctional Institution for June 2009 is shown in the following table.

**Table 7. Medical Department Services for June 2009
Lorain Correctional Institution**

| Service Delivered | | Quantity |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Sick Call | | |
| | Nurse Intake Screening | 958 |
| | Doctor H & P (initial History and Physical of inmates) | 944 |
| | Doctor Sick Call | 845 |
| | Nurse Sick Call and Assessments | 224 |
| | Nurse Referrals to Doctor | 87 |
| | New Intakes Referred to Physician | 37 |
| | Doctor No Shows | 0 |
| Emergency Triage | | |
| | Inmate Emergencies Treated On Site | 343 |
| | Staff Treated | 42 |
| | Sent to Local ER | 11 |
| | Sent from Local to OSU | 3 |
| | Sent to OSU ER | 1 |
| | Visitors Treated | 1 |
| Infirmary Care | | |
| | Bed Days Used for Medical | 85 |
| | Bed Days used for Security | 48 |
| | Bed Days Used for Mental | 0 |
| Dental Care | | |
| | Total Dental Visits | 376 |
| | Scheduled Visits | 253 |
| | Emergency Visits | 123 |
| | AMAs (dental amalgam fillings) | 48 |
| | No Shows | 0 |
| Pharmacy | | |
| | Total Prescriptions | 5731 |
| | Medical New Prescriptions | 3178 |
| | Mental Controlled Prescriptions | 1433 |
| | Medical Refills | 1120 |
| | Mental new Prescriptions | 986 |
| | Mental Refills | 447 |
| | Medical controlled Prescriptions | 11 |

Recreation

Inmates at the Lorain Correctional Institution are permitted two recreation sessions per week, and may use either outdoor or indoor equipment. Outdoor recreation is provided through access to two baseball fields, basketball courts, a large running/walking track, and multiple sets of pull-up and dip bars, push-up apparatus, and inclined planes. Approximately 15 picnic tables and benches are available to inmates during their outdoor recreation periods. Indoor equipment includes two basketball courts, a volleyball net/court, and ping pong tables. A separate room adjacent to the indoor gymnasium held several treadmills, which were in use by inmates during the inspection.

During the inspection, an inmate recreation period was in progress just for inmates aged 50 and over. This recreation period, offered twice per week for two-hours each, is designed to allow older inmates a chance to be away from the younger inmates and share time with other older individuals. One younger inmate, working as a recreation aide, was actively engaged in the duties of his job, which requires that he mop floors, remove trash, and wash down equipment daily. His brief conversation was respectful and indicated that he enjoys his job assignment in recreation.

Segregation Unit

The segregation unit includes a laundry unit and an interior recreation cage equipped with dip bars and pull-up bars. At the time of the inspection, there were 56 inmates in segregation, with four new inmates scheduled for admission. Seven segregation inmates were housed in Protective Control Investigation, while the remaining segregation inmates had cell-alone status due to their levels of violence or other need for separation.

The segregation unit includes sides A and B. The environment on A side of the segregation unit became observably noisy as inmates became aware of the presence of the CIIC team. Inmates on A side engaged in loud shouts, door-banging activity, and questions about when they would go to their Rules Infraction Board (RIB) hearings. Some segregation inmates were observed displaying 'acting-out' behaviors, which included slamming the cell in anger, throwing things, and trying to break things within the cell. In contrast, the environment and inmate behavior on B side of the segregation unit was comparatively quiet.

Comments relayed by segregation inmates during the inspection included *allegations* of:

- Staff unauthorized and excessive use of force, physical harm and verbal abuse
- Extended time in segregation
- Unsanitary cell conditions, worms near plumbing
- False allegations of gang affiliation, and
- Inappropriate pairings of inmates in cells.

Unit 7B

Inmates in Unit 7B are reportedly those with violent crimes or those who have escaped in the past. The unit is designed for 62 single-celled inmates, but on the inspection date there were 187 inmates on the unit. Reported high counts for the unit have reached approximately 200 inmates on occasion.

One officer who has worked at Lorain CI for four years, described the observed changes over that time period as increased overcrowding, and increasing number of youth who “hate authority figures.” Staff relayed that inmates do not have a problem accessing the toilet and that once they call to report the need, “repairs are quick.” Inmate communication included the following reported concerns and allegations:

- High level of anxiety related to *overcrowding*, being confined to small spaces, being overwhelmed by the close proximity to other people, cockroaches in the showers, and the constant and inescapable noise. The inmate indicated that he suffers from a form of mental illness with a low anxiety threshold, which is exacerbated by the unit *conditions*.
- *Overcrowding, “We’re too packed”*
- Degree of sweating inmates were experiencing and related *ill-tempers* due to their *close proximity* and the *inability to maintain personal hygiene*.
- Not receiving enough *soap and the absence of ventilation and air flow*
- *Broken bedsprings* adding that anyone “can make a knife” with the broken parts
- *Tiny worms* were pointed out in the showers,
- “Bugs and worms in the showers,” bugs and spiders in the cells
- *No cleaning supplies*
- No toilet paper
- Due to the *brunch* on the weekends, going *18 hours without eating*.
- Reduction of inmate-free postage paid envelopes only once a month instead of one free envelope per week.
- Inmates alleged that the block has *no kites, no informal complaint forms and that they have “no access to the law library.”* Some inmates relayed that the officer provides kites and informal complaint forms, but “they’re usually out.”
- Laundry room with one broken and one operable dryer.

Unit 8A

Unit 8A was quiet upon entry during the inspection. Administrators reported that the demeanor of the 8A staff is routinely ‘laid back’ and this supervisory demeanor helps to cultivate a quiet, relaxed unit environment.

The unit was constructed to house 62 single-celled inmates, but on the inspection date there were 187 inmates living on the unit: 62 on the upper range, 54 on the lower range, and 84 assigned to bunks on the dayroom floor.

Inmates on the unit relayed concerns about the brunch meal, which was recently implemented Department-wide, in which breakfast and lunch are combined on the weekends when meals are provided only twice per day. The purpose of the brunch is reportedly to save money by not requiring food service and corrections staff to cover the breakfast meal.

Complaints were that the quality of food is very poor, there are inadequate portions, and inmates had to wait far too long to receive their tray. *Inmates reported that brunch service begins at 11:30 a.m. However, the last inmates are reportedly not served until approximately 6 pm. Other inmates relayed that on weekdays they have breakfast at 6:30 a.m. and lunch at 2:30 p.m., an eight hour span.* Other comments regarding the food included: “Our biggest problem is waiting for the food.” “The food is bland.” “The food is horrible.” “There’s not enough food.”

Additional complaints were heard about the conditions of the showers. Some alleged that there are “bugs in the showers.” Upon inspection, the showers were found to be in poor condition, fruit flies were flying from the sewer drains, some ceramic tiles were cracked and missing, mildew stains were spotted in the grout, paint was peeling in some areas, and there were no shower curtains on all except one shower stall. One shower stall had no light and was not in use.

Staff relayed that inmate porters do not try to thoroughly clean the showers because they see themselves as ‘short-timers’ and take no pride or vested interest in the quality of their work or in maintaining a clean facility. On the other hand, inmates reported that there are not enough cleaning chemicals to last the week, so by the end of the week, the showers just stay dirty. Other inmates reported that the overcrowded conditions and the fundamental disrepair of the showers, serves as a prompt to inmates who see their cleaning efforts as pointless and useless. Inmate porters assigned to cleaning the rails, stairs and phones relayed no problem with cleaning their areas.

- Inmates relayed that “Most inmates want the floor. If you’re in a cell, you’re locked up with somebody violent.”
- Some inmates alleged that “some CO.s treat us like trash. It’s how they talk to us.”
- Inmates also relayed that the “Hot water is off,” and the “ice machine has been broken for over a week.”

Unit 10 A - Short Term Offender Program

Living unit 10A is dedicated to housing inmates in the Short Term Offender Program. Reportedly, the short term offender unit is comprised of inmates who are serving 90 days or less, and there is always a waiting list of inmates to enter the program. The Short Term Offender housing unit does not have inmates bunked in the center of the dayroom. Inmates assigned to the Short Term Offender Program are reportedly derived from individuals who may be first-time offenders and/or those who have violated their parole. The dayroom includes a television, two microwave ovens, an ice machine, 10 tables, an exercise ‘pull-up’ apparatus, and card games. Two of the four showers on the unit had curtains, but the other

two stalls did not. Flying insects were observed around the shower drains. Bed sheets were observed as soiled

An officer in the unit wore plastic gloves while sorting mail. Staff relayed that they took the initiative and arranged for local church representatives to come to the institution as members of the outside community reaching to the inmates and their families. Staff relayed that one of their fundamental goals is for each inmate to define and create a solid plan for their lives upon release. Comments of inmates included:

- “They make us work in the kitchen.”
- “At night we can’t sleep because of the bugs. We have no screens on the windows.”
- “We can’t order shoes.”
- “We can’t change our visiting list.”
- “They treat us like reception inmates!”
- Some inmates held up their sheets, showing their third to half size sheets due to being torn.
- “It took me three weeks to get the right uniform size.”

Inmates also relayed the following concerns:

- Inmate grievance procedure takes too long to get a response and they fear being removed from the Short Term Offender Program if they file a grievance.
- Too few library passes
- If an inmate is asleep when his visitor arrives, he may lose the visit because some unit officers will not wake up the inmate.
- They voiced their opinion that cell isolation would be a better disciplinary option than removal from the program.
- Not enough recreation
- Not having movies

Unit 10B - Cadre

Historically, there were four pods for work cadre at the Lorain Correctional Institution, but the number was reduced to the current single pod (10B). On the inspection date, there were 106 inmates living on the unit, which was built with 62 cells, but may hold up to 122 inmates if they are double-celled.

For the cadre, Lorain Correctional Institution is their parent institution Cadre inmates are reportedly selected from inmates with five to ten remaining years prior to release eligibility, preferably mature individuals over 30 years of age, with five to 10 years to serve before release. All are close security (level three). Staff indicated that they are a selective group and work in maintenance and as cooks. The current cadre reportedly has an average of four years before release eligibility. Inmates historically covet the cadre status and usually become the better workers in the institution as a means of assuring continuation of their cadre status.

Cadre inmates are provided certain amenities, including an ironing board and iron, ping pong table, seven tables and benches in the dayroom, card and board games, two microwave ovens, and an ice machine. *The cadre unit environment was clean, without odor, and there was evidence of detailed attention as observed in polished door handles. During the inspection, one inmate was polishing the unit floor with a polisher/buffer.* Cadre inmates were playing cards, chess, or board games. The cadre unit hosts a dog program for greyhound rescue, with four dogs in the care and training of four cadre inmates.

An Officer relayed that he picked the post assignment in the Work Cadre unit because it is “*not overcrowded and they’re well behaved.*” Staff relayed that previously the short term offenders were in the unit, housed on the bottom range, with the cadre on the top range. It reportedly did “not work” and resulted in “conflict.”

Cadre inmates relayed:

- *Discontent with the inmate grievance procedure, allegations that responses to Informal Complaints and Grievances are ignored or late in being provided.*
- Discontent regarding an absence of *education* programs other than the GED
- There generally are not enough *work or leisure activities to fill their time.*
- Inmates relayed their desire for *programs* with therapeutic value including *music.*
- *Mail* moves slow, taking up to 12 days for delivery of mail to inmates.
- One inmate was allegedly “fired from working too hard in food services.” He relayed that he now is a porter in the chapel.
- An inmate reported having only cold water available.
- Last, an inmate relayed frustration about a cell-lock practice of being locked out of his cell for 45 minute periods of time on second shift.

As part of the inspection, numerous housing units were observed and inspected. The British *Expectations* questionnaire includes three sections on housing topics: Residential Units Overview, Residential Units Clothing and Possessions, and Residential Units Hygiene. The following three ruled boxes display the questions and institutional responses of three sections of the British *Expectations*. These three sections probe into issues related to residential living units. The responses supplied by the Lorain Correctional Institution staff to each of these sections are shown in bold type.

Residential Units: Overview

***Expectations* Questions and Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution**

Residential Units: Overview

1. Do prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions? **Yes**
2. Are cells and communal areas (blocks, dorms, dayrooms) light, well decorated and in a good state of repair? **Yes**

3. Do all prisoners occupy accommodation that is suitable for the purpose and for their individual needs?
 - a. Are there cell sharing risk assessments? **Yes**
 - b. Are cells sufficiently warm in winter and cool in summer? **Yes**
 - c. Are cells ventilated and do they have sufficient daylight? **Yes**
 - d. Do prisoners have their own bed, corkboard, lockable cupboard/locker box, and use of a table and chair? **Yes**
 - e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks? **Yes**
 - f. Do shared cells have screened toilets? **No**

4. Are reasonable adjustments made to ensure that prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems can access all goods, facilities, and services? **Yes**
 - a. Do prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems have ease of access to different locations and services? **Yes**
 - b. Are older, infirm and disabled prisoners assigned to landings, which hold most of the communal facilities? **Yes**

5. Is there a system whereby nominated volunteer prisoners on each residential unit are trained to help less able prisoners and they are paid for this work? **Yes**
 - a. How are volunteers identified, trained and assigned? **Sign up, screened and receive medical training.**

6. Are residential staff aware of prisoners within their care with disabilities and their location? **Yes**
 - a. Are safe evacuation procedures in place to assist those prisoners who may need help in an emergency? **Yes**
 - b. Are there visible markers on cell doors? **No**
 - c. What system is in place to highlight to other staff that any prisoners with disabilities and/or mobility problems may need assistance in an emergency? **Designated cells.**

7. Do prisoners have access to drinking water, toilet and washing facilities at all times? **Yes**
 - a. Is water in the cells certified as drinking water, if used in this way for prisoners? **Yes**

8. Are age-appropriate risk assessments in place to ensure the safety of young adults from any other prisoners? **Yes**
 - a. Are there single cell risk assessments? **Yes**

b. What are procedures in any case where young adults are identified as posing a risk to others? **All juvenile offenders are celled together or single celled and placed on watch with priority to ride out to appropriate facility.**

9. Do all prisoners have access to an in-cell emergency call button/bell that works and is responded to within five minutes? **No**

10. Do observation panels in cell doors remain free from obstruction? **Yes**

11. Is there a clear policy prohibiting offensive displays, and is it applied consistently? **Yes**

12. Are prisoners' communal areas (activity and shower areas) clean, safe, meet the needs of the prisoner population, and effectively supervised by staff? **Yes**

a. Are there adaptations for older, infirm and disabled prisoners? **Yes**

13. Do prisoners feel safe in their cells and in communal areas of the residential units? **Yes**

a. Is there a suitable design of residential units e.g. good sightlines, and supervision in high-risk areas? **Yes**

14. Are notices displayed in a suitable way for the population? **Yes**

a. Is adequate provision made for any prisoners who cannot read notices because of literacy, language, or eyesight problems or any other disability? **Yes**

15. Are residential units as calm and quiet as possible to avoid incidents and to enable rest and sleep, especially at night? **Yes**

Residential Units: Clothing and Possessions
Expectations Questions and Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution

Residential Units: Clothing and Possessions

1. Do prisoners have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs? **Yes**

a. Are older prisoners provided with additional clothing and bedding, if required, without the need for medical permission? **No**

2. Do prisoners have at least weekly access to laundry facilities to wash and iron their personal clothing? **Yes – cadre**
 - a. Do they have access to laundry/exchange facilities outside the weekly rotation? **Yes**
3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request? **Yes**
4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage? **Yes**
5. Is there a standard list detailing the possessions that women prisoners are allowed to keep and used across all women’s prisons? **N/A**
 - a. Is there a standard list also employed for male facilities of the same security category? **Yes**
6. Are suitable clothes and bags available to discharged prisoners who do not have them? **Yes**
7. Are facilities available before discharge to launder clothes that have been in storage for long periods? **Yes**

Residential Units: Hygiene

***Expectations* Questions and Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution**

Residential Units: Hygiene

1. Are prisoners encouraged, enabled and expected to keep themselves, their cells and communal areas clean? **Yes**
 - a. Are older and disabled prisoners enabled to keep themselves and their cells clean? **Yes**
2. Do prisoners have ready access to both communal and in-cell toilets, baths and showers in private? **Yes**
 - a. Are screened toilets in shared cells? **No**
 - b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles? **Yes**
3. Are prisoners able to shower or bathe daily, and immediately following physical activity, before court appearances and before visits? **Yes-cadre daily, recep x 5**

- a. Is there access at any time during the day? **Cadre**
- b. Are older, less able or disabled prisoners helped to have a bath or shower every day? **No**
4. Do prisoners have access to necessary supplies of their own personal hygiene items and sanitary products? **Yes**
- a. Is fresh laundered bedding provided for each new prisoner on arrival and then on at least a weekly basis? **Yes**
- b. Is there a system for the replacement of mattresses in operations? **Yes**
- c. Are clean pillows available for new prisoners as well as other bedding? **No, mattresses have built in pillows**
- d. Is a prisoner's valuable property routinely security marked before it is issued? **Yes**

VI. STAFF COMMUNICATION

The CIIC Director requested that the Warden gather a small group of a variety of staff positions and departments together so that the CIIC team could meet with them. The meeting was attended by a range of staff members representing a variety of positions and levels of service within the institution.

The attitude and commitment of the Lorain Correctional Institution staff to their positions and to each other, as well as to the optimal operation of the institution was observed as high, revealing mutual appreciation and collaborative support among staff and administration for their collective efforts to address challenges. Staff acknowledged that they often completed job duties associated with their own as well as other staff positions in order to assure that inmate needs are handled. There was pride in the staff, citing their maturity, their ability to deal with people, and as the driving force of the facility. Education and Short Term Offender Program staff also received praise from other staff for doing a "great job."

Staff collectively voiced the difficulties relevant to **inmate/group management** under the constraints of recent staff reductions, the overcrowded living conditions within the institution, and also the extreme problems created by younger inmates with flat/definite sentences, with a release date unaffected by rule violations.

- **OC Spray:** Considering the temperament displayed by some of the younger inmates, including an increase in predatory gang activity, some staff advocate an expansion in the number of staff with training and authority to carry and use OC spray as a management tool. Only certain supervisory staff are permitted to carry

OC spray. Its use is reportedly authorized on the yard, segregation, recreation and on transport, thus there remains a debate associated with this issue.

- **Escort to Chow:** Staff relayed that inmates are now lining up and being escorted to chow, in a similar manner as the Correctional Reception Center, which is regarded as a significant improvement in inmate movement.
- **Inmate Disrespect and Harassment:** Concerns were expressed from numerous staff about offensive and unacceptable inmate behaviors, such as throwing urine or feces at staff, or shouting profane or vulgar comments at staff, especially female staff.
- **Loss of Release on Parole as Management Tool:** There was staff consensus that the absence of consequences that are meaningful to the inmates serving a flat or definite sentence with a fixed outdate, has reduced the ability of the staff to maintain a safe, secure, controlled environment of transformation and respect.
- **Loss of Good Time and Bad Time as Management Tool:** Staff indicated that the former practice in which an inmate's misconduct could result in loss of "good time" or additional time added to one's outdate, formerly termed "bad time," was effective. However, the options are no longer available as a management tool due to legislative changes to promote truth in sentencing, and due to a court ruling in which "bad time" was deemed unconstitutional. Both issues could be addressed through legislative changes.
- **Security Threat Groups:** There was also consensus that greater awareness of gang presence, influence, and dynamics has evolved over time and must continue. Assurances from administrative staff were provided that the effort to address gang presence and specific members will continue at the highest administrative level. Staff relayed that multiple fights involving the Heartless Felons began in August 2007. It was noted that they do not fight one on one and "They don't fight fair." Staff relayed that Lorain CI experienced a "rash of Heartless Felons" with active recruitment at the facility, resulting in eight or nine in segregation for gang activity, with most being transferred to Mansfield Correctional Institution or otherwise recommended for level four (maximum) security. Staff relayed concern over the current fights between the young and old over theft. The young reportedly kick in other's locked boxes to steal their property, and "the older inmates are fed up with it."
- **STG Records Sharing:** Concerns were expressed regarding the reported inability to obtain Security Threat Group records from the Department of Youth Services. STG staff relayed that it would help them immensely if such records would be shared. In follow-up, the CIIC Director relayed the concern to the DYS Director and DYS Assistant Director during a meeting on September 9, 2009. The DYS Assistant Director relayed that DRC has access to such records. The CIIC Director contacted the DRC Assistant Director on October 6, 2009, requesting information when available on how STG staff at the DRC prisons are to access such information. Communication was also initiated by the CIIC Director with the DRC STG Coordinator. In the follow-up communication from the DRC STG Coordinator, it was relayed that he has no issues obtaining or accessing STG records from DYS. Lately, DYS has reportedly let him know when youth are entering the prison system with STG affiliation, and that information is forwarded to the prison, usually the

Correctional Reception Center or Lorain Correctional Institution. If any of the STG Coordinators need DYS STG information, they may email or call the DRC STG Coordinator, Vinko Kucinic, who “will work on getting them that information or point them in the right direction.” ODRC STG Intelligence Coordinators reportedly already know they can contact him to obtain STG information, and they reportedly receive calls or emails all the time from the staff requesting such information. If they do not have the information, they “always reach out to local, state, federal law enforcement agencies and get them the information.”

- **Unit Staff:** The reduction of four Case Managers to the current six (including one vacancy) is a 40 percent reduction. Staff relayed that with the Case Manager loss, the remaining five took on larger loads.
- **Medical Staff:** Some of the most stressful staff shortages have reportedly impacted the medical department, which has redistributed remaining staff after reductions were made, in order to cover required schedules and the increased volume of inmates.

There was collective concern about the institution’s inability to maintain institutional **operations** at the highest possible level.

- **Cleaning Products:** Staff from various parts of the institution relayed that the absence or inadequate provisions of cleaning products, including bleach to kill gnat larvae in the kitchen and shower drains, was an indicator of how the budget reductions have impacted their most basic operational level.
- **Cleaning Supplies:** The absence or shortage of brooms, mops and deck brushes to clean the floors was mentioned as another example of a limitation on both staff and inmates’ ability to maintain operations at a desired level.

Staff members were in agreement that there is a need for **capital projects and repairs** to parts of the institution’s infrastructure, yet there was full acknowledgement and appreciation for the challenges to the administration in addressing these concerns, due to reductions in the institution’s budget.

- **Renovation/Repair Needs:** Architectural and building components such as the roof, doors, windows, showers, and the overall drainage system serving the institution were mentioned in the list of areas in need of repair or replacement. Funds to pay for supplies needed to make plumbing repairs were cited as a problem.
- **Improvements:** A roof replacement project is in the second phase with completion of this phase scheduled by September 2009. Several boilers have been replaced since March 2008, at a cost of approximately \$6,500 for each boiler.
- **Food Service Equipment:** The need to upgrade or replace basic food service appliances and components was acknowledged by administration and staff, who mentioned the deterioration of items as the ice machine, hot boxes and cold boxes, the coolers and freezers, and the garbage disposal system. Due to the large number of inmates, heavy use of the kitchen and dining hall cannot be avoided.
- **Medical Upgrades:** Medical upgrades were suggested as a priority among the capital upgrades needed.
- **Doors:** Doors throughout the institution including inmate housing buildings are in need of replacement as many have rusted or broken beyond repair. The sally port

doors in the Receiving and Discharge Center were mandated by the DRC Central Office for repair prior to placing any funds into the replacement of unit doors. The replacement of unit doors will be a sizable undertaking because there are so many of these doors throughout the institution. Fire Exit doors are reportedly not in need of repair or replacement due to their very minimal use.

- **Brunch and Court Ordered Deductions:** Some staff agreed that the continuous **meal schedule** that must be followed to feed the large number of inmates at the institution, which was not designed to accommodate the number of inmates living there, and the new **brunch plan** on weekends should be adjusted. Some relayed a preference to feed earlier. Staff acknowledged that the uncommonly long periods of time between meals negatively affects inmate temperament and demeanor, due to inmate hunger and having no means to purchase commissary snacks. Staff relayed that many of their inmates have no commissary funds, so there is motive, opportunity and fear of thievery. It was noted that there is no limit on the amount of funds that may be kept in one's personal account, but for those who owe the court, all but \$15 per month goes to the court. *This is an area in which DRC administrative action as well as legislative action could be taken to research and address the problems, which have been reported by staff and inmates alike nearly system-wide.*
- **Second Shift Stress over Meals:** There is extra stress placed on second shift staff, who must assure that the second half of the lunch meals and all of the dinner meals are served to inmates within the shift timeframe.
- **Medical Costs:** Staff voiced concerns about rising **costs of providing certain medical and pharmaceutical** services to inmates at an increasing rate and at earlier ages than in past years. For example, staff relayed that individuals in their 20s and 30s have been given EKGs, when the majority of people who are not incarcerated will not receive an EKG until they are in their 40s or 50s. Also, the disproportionately high percentage of individuals who are receiving medications, which was relayed as 20% of prison population, was a subject of concern, as it directly impacts the increase in costs to operate the prison.

The following is a summary of individual comments made by staff during the group session:

- **Yelling out the Windows, Harassing Staff:** Security staff relayed the concern of female staff who are subjected to "inmates yelling out of the windows" at the women. Incident reports and conduct reports are written. However, it was relayed that it is difficult to identify the person doing the yelling.
 - Classification staff relayed that staff are united and supportive of one another. Concern was expressed about the inmates yelling out of the windows. Staff are trying to determine how best to address the problem.
 - Harassment out of the windows was also cited as a concern by unit staff. It reportedly occurred to the staff person seven times that one day. It was noted that you "can't see who they are."
- **Second Shift Difficulties:** Security staff on the yard relayed that with the number of staff per inmate at the Lorain CI, staff do an excellent job and are pro-active. All staff

reportedly are having problems, but “We’re handling the numbers.” Second shift is reportedly having a difficult time with the feeding, handling a lot of movement.

- **Food Service Problems:** Food service staff relayed needs in maintenance and in equipment. A walk-in cooler and freezer is down. Mice are prevalent all around the kitchen. There is a need to use glue traps. Mice make nests in the blenders. They are short a manager, short of brooms, and cannot order bleach. Gnats are in the drains. On second shift, they have never seen an exterminator. Cleaning is the worst problem. They only have a buffer to clean the floor. The ice machine is not operable, so they are unable to keep cold food cold. One of the problems is getting inmate workers. There are 35 to 40 people in the kitchen. Hot boxes do not operate at the correct temperature. There is no garbage disposal. Money is the big issue.
- **Staff Overwhelmed, Overcrowding:** Security staff relayed that they have 2,000 inmates and staff are “overwhelmed” and they are “not pleased with the status quo.” It was noted that 180 inmates are in each unit, with 90 inmates on bunks on the floor. It was noted that cells are reserved for the violent.
- **Inmate Disrespect, Rebellion and “Good Time/Bad Time” Revisited:** Security staff relayed that the young inmates entering the prison are full of “rebellion,” “rotten” and have “no respect.” *It was recommended that loss of “good time” and/or adding “bad time” be reinstated so that staff are able to make an impact when rules are broken.* Staff would like to “train the inmates on how to act.” Reference was made to the number of beds in segregation, and that some of *the inmates “laugh at what we can do.” Staff relayed the need for additional tools that will be effective with the flat timers.*
- **Poster on Criminal Harassment (throwing bodily substance) Proposed:** It was noted that during roll call, staff see the effective poster of former corrections professionals who are now inmates due to their misconduct. *It was suggested that a similar concept could be used to create posters to warn inmates of possible consequences for their misconduct.* For example, it was noted that “staff endure urine and feces” being thrown on them. *It was suggested that since this is criminal conduct per the statute, the warning of consequences of prosecution and additional sentence may be effective if posted in Receiving and Discharge for all inmates to see as they enter.*
- **Prosecution of Harassment:** Security staff relayed that just because it is in the Ohio Revised Code, does not solve the problem. It also needs to be enforced. Such criminal cases within prisons are investigated by the Highway Patrol who submit their findings to the local Prosecutor who decides whether or not to prosecute. Allegedly, *only one out of ten cases is prosecuted.*
- **Proposed Removal of Mandatory Education for Unmotivated, Resistant:** A GED teacher relayed that he/she is limited and could teach more inmates if the state would remove the “mandatory” requirement that forces those to school who do not want to

be there, taking up precious space that could be occupied by those on the waiting list who are sincerely motivated to learn. The GED pass rate at Lorain CI was 90.8 percent, “beating everybody.” The recommendation was to “*get the right guys in there,*” so that the teachers can help those who want to learn. It was also noted that the air conditioning in the school is broken, that the floor requires maintenance. There is one porter in the school, plus one porter is used as a clerk. Eight inmates are assigned to the library.

- **Caseload of 600 with Burning Issues:** A Case Manager relayed that Unit Secretaries have been cut, so “we are understaffed everywhere.” He/she has a caseload of 600 inmates. Central Office staff reportedly do not understand how different and difficult it is to work with reception inmates who are new and who have many immediate issues. It was added that when the person goes into the unit, “They swarm you with issues.” It is reportedly a major difference from a caseload of inmates at a non-reception center.
- **Staff Pride, Importance of Re-entry Programs:** Unit staff relayed that they are proud of the staff, that in spite of the heavy budget cuts, all are willing to do double duty. The importance of providing employment skills and education to inmates was stressed, noting that “we don’t want them to come back.” It was also noted that we “need to motivate.”
- **Records Office:** Staff in the records office relayed that staff involved in the intake process “do a great job processing and a great job with problems that occur.” They stay very busy.

**Staff-Prisoner Relationships: *Expectations* Questions and Responses from
Lorain Correctional Institution**

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | Are prisoners treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions? Yes |
| 2. | Is there a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness? Yes |
| 3. | Are all prisoners treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the person? Yes |
| a. | Is staff aware that the prison has a duty of care for all prisoners, to ensure no prisoners are at risk of physical or emotional abuse by staff or prisoners and that prisoners are to be held in decent and humane conditions? Yes |

4. Are staff aware that they should set a personal example in the way they carry out their duties at all times? **Yes**
5. Are staff always fair and courteous in their day to day working with prisoners? **Yes**
6. Do staff positively engage with prisoners at all times? **Yes**
7. Is interaction between staff and prisoners encouraged by the senior management team? **Yes**
 - a. Does staff help and encourage older and less able prisoners to participate in and access all facilities offered across the prison? **Yes**
8. Does staff routinely knock before entering cells, except in emergencies? **No**
9. Are prisoners encouraged by staff to engage in all activities and routines promoting punctuality, attendance and responsible behavior? **Yes**
 - a. What methods are used to encourage prisoners to get involved? **Posting within the Housing Units.**
10. Is inappropriate conduct on the part of prisoners challenged? **Yes**
 - a. Do staff demonstrate skill in confronting low level disputes without using official disciplinary measures? **Yes**
11. Are prisoners encouraged and supported to take responsibility for their actions and decisions? **Yes**

**Security and Rules: *Expectations* Questions and Responses from
Lorain Correctional Institution**

1. Are security and good order maintained through positive staff-prisoner relationships based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters? **Yes**
2. Are rules and routines well publicized, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behavior? **Yes**
3. Are categorization and allocation procedures based on assessment of a prisoner's risks and needs? **Yes**

4. Are they clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed? **Yes, staff routinely work with the inmates to assure they understand.**
5. Are there any obvious weaknesses or anomalies in the physical and procedural security of the facility? **Yes, physical, this facility was not made to house this many inmates.**
6. Are the elements of “dynamic security” in place:
 - a. Are staff-prisoner relationships positive? **Yes**
 - b. Do prisoners receive personal attention from staff? **Yes**
 - c. Is there constructive activity to occupy prisoners? **Yes for cadre. A great deal of idleness for the reception population.**
 - 1) Do staff cluster during association? **Human nature tends to dictate this trend. Our supervisors correct this when they come across it.**
 - 2) Are there enough staff in dorm/block areas to facilitate good officer work? **Yes**
7. Does effective security intelligence safeguard prisoners’ well-being? **Yes**
 - a. Do staff comply with security requirements in terms of filing reports? **Yes, our supervisors are on top of them in this regard.**
 - b. Are there recent incidents where security reports have led to action? **Yes**
8. Is prisoner’ access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessary restrictive approach to security? **No, we strive to balance the two without compromising security.**
9. Is strip and squat-searching of prisoners carried out only for sound security reasons? **Yes, we would not tolerate any other reason.**
10. Are prisoners strip or squat searched only in the presence of more than one member of staff, of the same gender? **Yes, this would only be deviated from under extreme critical incident type situations.**
 - a. If squat searches are used, does their incidence and authorization need to be logged and regularly checked? **N/A**
 - b. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances? **N/A**

11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available? **Yes**
 - a. Are the visitors subjected to bans or restrictions reviewed every month? **Yes, every time the visitor comes the records are checked.**

Rules

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas? **Yes**
 - a. Are rules and routines posted/ distributed on unit/block/dorms? **Yes**
 - b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs? **Those that are not an inmate mentor assists those who fall into this category.**
2. Are rules and routines applied openly, fairly and consistently, with no discrimination? **Yes**
3. Does staff use only the level of authority necessary to ensure a prisoner's compliance with the rules? **Yes, our policies are explicit in this regard.**
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned? **Yes, in most instances where security is not a major concern.**
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoner, are appeal arrangements explained and made available? **Yes In every instance.**

Bullying and Violence Reduction: *Expectations* Questions and Responses from the Lorain Correctional Institution

1. Does everyone feel safe from bullying and victimization (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault)?
Offenders are notified during their orientation of the grievance procedure which includes the informal complaint process. Administrative Rules are available in the Library that address Appropriate Supervision, Discrimination and Racial Issues. Offenders are given a sexual assault pamphlet which outlines procedures to follow should an offender become sexually assaulted.

2. Are active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation known to staff, prisoners and visitors? **Yes Offenders know that it is a rule violation to commit an act of violence against another offender or staff member. The rules of conduct are posted in the housing unit and found in the inmate handbook. Offenders are told that they shall not be subject to intimidation by staff through the grievance process. This information is also stated in the Administrative Rule, 5120-9-04 “Appropriate Supervision, Discrimination & Racial Issues.”**
3. Has the prison developed an effective strategy to reduce violence and intimidation, which has earned the commitment of the whole prison and has drawn on multi-disciplinary consultation including feedback from prisoners? **The Institutional Inspector has Office hours where offenders can go to him privately about institutional concerns. Offenders are encouraged to address their concerns whether it be intimidation or any other concern to the Unit Case Manager or Unit Manager during office hours or by request when an emergency exists.**
- a. Is the violence reduction strategy widely publicized? **Office Hours for Institutional Inspector, Case Manager and/or Unit Manager is publicized in the Housing Units.**
 - b. Is monitoring part of the strategy and as a minimum, does it cover feelings of safety among prisoners, incidents of bullying(verbal and physical), number of assaults, number of racist incidents, location of incidents and action taken? **This is monitored by the number of incident reports written, number of assaults reported, and number of complaints and/or grievances of racist incidents amongst staff filed with the Institution Inspector. The Warden or his Administrative Assistant or Labor Relations Officer would know if any action was taken.**
 - c. Do staff understand their duty to maintain a safe environment and what they do to promote this? **Yes, staff are trained annually during in-service at the institution. They are also told about their duty to maintain a safe environment during in-service and training at the Reginald A. Wilkinson Training Academy after they are hired.**
 - d. Are staff alert to threats to a safe environment, and do they confront all forms of victimization? **Yes, staff are aware of the procedures of notification when victimization occurs which is to secure the area, contact their Shift Supervisor who in turn contacts the Institutional Investigator and the appropriate Victim Support Person assigned to the institution.**
 - e. Are prisoners consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance?
No

- f. How effective is the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction? **I find that the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction is effective as it reaches all staff by discussing this matter during our annual in-service training.**
4. Are prisoners consulted and involved in determining how their lives in the prison can be made safer, how bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence are confronted, how conflicts can be resolved and what sanctions are appropriate? **When inmates are interviewed concerning such issues the information is taken into consideration.**
- a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months? **Very frequently in the reception process.**
- b. Has an annual confidential survey to all prisoners about bullying been undertaken? **No**
- c. Are there wing representatives? **No**
5. Do staff supervise and protect prisoners throughout the prison from bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence? **Yes**
6. Are staff consistent in challenging these behaviors? **Yes**
- a. How many incidents occurred in the last six months? **Unable to determine a number. Staff handle minor infractions informally.**
- b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying? **Not aware of any specific areas.**
- c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners? **DRC Protective Control Policy**
- d. Do staff lead by example in the way they treat their colleagues/prisoners, and understand that their duty is to foster a safe environment, by confronting unacceptable behavior quickly and fairly? **Yes; staff know to be firm, fair and consistent and when offenders are not behaving as expected, they have been trained to address it in a professional and appropriate manner.**
- e. What are the arrangements for movement, exercise, mealtimes and discharge, especially for those who are considered vulnerable? **The arrangements are outlined in a Correction Officer's Post Orders. Meal times are posted in the Housing Units and in Food Service. Exercise is posted in the Housing Units as well. These items are given to those inmates who are considered vulnerable also.**

- f. Is particular attention given to prisoners who have asked for protection from other prisoners for those who may be victimized because of the nature of their offense or other individual circumstances? **Yes, these offenders can request Protective Custody and are housed in a separated, isolated area and/or unit. Staff may place an offender whom they feel is vulnerable in this status as well.**
7. Are prisoners' families and friends encouraged to make suggestions about how the prison could better protect prisoners from victimization and to provide information to help identify those prisoners likely to be at risk? **No**
- a. Are prisoners' families encouraged to come forward if they feel are being bullied to bring drugs into prison? **There are posters in our Entry Building and in the Visiting Area that list Employees Who Use to Be Employees and state they were caught breaking the rules and convicted. It is also known that conveying drugs into a prison is a felony and that they are not allowed on our premises.**
- b. Is a visitors' survey distributed systematically? **No**
- c. Do visiting families know about reporting procedures and do they think that visiting staff are approachable and sympathetic? **I believe that the visiting families think that the visiting staff is approachable and can be sympathetic at times. The staff that are assigned to the visiting desk are usually the same staff and they become familiar with those family members that visit on a regular basis.**
- d. Are there posters in visiting rooms? **Yes**
8. Is an effective strategy in place to deal with bullying which is based on an analysis of the pattern of bullying in the prison and is applied consistently throughout the prison? **No**
- a. Has a strategy been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison?
No
- b. Is a central log of bullying kept, and are incidents of bullying reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee? **No**
- c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization? **Staff are trained to confront all forms of victimization.**
- d. Are all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. used for evidence of bullying/intimidation? **Yes**

- e. How do staff contribute to the strategy? **By reporting incidents immediately and completing accurate, clear and concise reports.**
 - f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments? **Yes, all Departments follow the same reporting procedure.**
9. Are allegations of bullying behavior treated consistently and fairly?
- a. Are they investigated promptly? **Yes, they are reported to an immediate Supervisor and given to the Institutional Investigator for further investigation.**
 - b. Are outcomes of investigations recorded and is the prisoner who reported the bullying supported? **Yes, the investigations are recorded in various documents and recordings and the offender is supported by a Victim Support Person who is an employee and is trained to address these kind of situations.**
10. Are prisoners made aware of behavior that is unacceptable through a well-publicized policy and are made aware of the consequences of bullying? **The Administrative Rules/Polices are available in the Library.**
11. Is appropriate behavior consistently challenged?
- a. Are there bullying posters throughout the prison? **Not that specifically states bullying.**
 - b. What information is distributed to new arrivals? **Information on Sexual Assault Awareness, Inmate Grievance Procedure; Orientation Form listing the various Departments and Services Provided at the Facility which is signed after a view of the slide presentation with institutional information is shown.**
 - c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners? **Usually when an inquiry is made.**
 - d. Are staff aware of both direct and indirect forms of bullying? **Yes**
12. Do anti-bullying measures support the victim and take the victim's views about their location into account? **The only anti-bullying measures that are available are those found in print in our policies and procedures**
- a. Do staff understand the link between bullying and aggressive and disruptive behavior generally? **Yes**

13. Are appropriate interventions in place to deal with bullies and support victims?
- a. What interventions are available to challenge bullies and to support victims of bullying? **Investigations are conducted; Documentation reviewed; Offenders and/or Staff interviewed to determine who the bully is. Steps are taken to ensure the victim is no longer bullied and assistance given if needed such as Mental Health intervention.**
- b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior? **Yes**

VII. INMATE COMMUNICATION

While numerous and specific inmate comments have been reported elsewhere in this report, a concise summary of inmate concerns is shown in the following bulleted list.

- Poor food quality, quantity, and timeliness of meal service.
- Absence of adequate sanitation in the kitchen, dining hall, and on certain units.
- Inadequate sanitation and cleaning supplies, particularly regarding unit showers.
- Absence of educational and vocational programming.
- Absence of library resources.
- Poor provisions of bedding and personal hygiene items.
- Absence of any activities while on bunk restriction.
- Disrepair of buildings, such as windows and doors.
- Insect and rodent infestations.
- Lack of access to staff; yet, inmates also acknowledged that staff are working very hard and handling multiple duties for other staff whose positions have been removed.
- Presence of inmate theft.
- Concern for potential inmate violence, particularly associated with younger inmates and among inmates who reside on the dayroom floors.
- Prevailing poor personal hygiene in overcrowded conditions, inadequate means to maintain personal cleanliness and lack of privacy on certain units without shower curtains.
- High anxiety levels frequently and continuously experienced by many inmates resulting from the closeness 'forced' upon inmates due to overcrowded conditions, the absence of any personal space for extended periods of time, and continuous noise.
- Lack of response to requests for Administrative Rules and legal assistance while in the segregation unit.
- Inappropriate supervision directed toward inmates on the Mental Health Caseload.
- Problems with the mail system and slow delivery of mail to inmates.

VIII. INMATE CONTACTS/CONCERNS

Throughout the year, inmates write to the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, to relay their concerns and issues associated with the incarceration experience. In addition, the families of inmates and institutional staff may write or call the CIIC office. The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee maintains a database of the contacts and the concerns that are relayed within each contact.

During the period January 1, 2008 through August 24, 2009 of the 128th General Assembly, inmates, family, or staff either wrote or called the CIIC office on fourteen separate occasions, creating 14 records of contact pertaining to the Lorain Correctional Institution. Within these 14 contacts, there were 41 concerns relayed to CIIC. The types of concerns are shown in the following table with breakdown by the number of times each concern was brought forward.

**Table 8. Inmate Contacts and Concerns Relayed to CIIC
Lorain Correctional Institution
January 1, 2008 through August 24, 2009**

| Type of Concern | Number of Concerns |
|--|---------------------------|
| Non-Grievable Matters | 7 |
| Supervision | 7 |
| Health Care (*3 health contacts were about one inmate) | 6 |
| Staff Accountability | 4 |
| Institutional Assignment | 4 |
| Mail/Package | 2 |
| Inmate Relations | 2 |
| Inmate Grievance Procedure | 2 |
| Food Service | 2 |
| Personal Property | 1 |
| Education/Vocational Training | 1 |
| Recreation | 1 |
| Records | 1 |
| Housing Assignment | 1 |
| TOTAL Contacts & Concerns: 1/1 08 – 8/24/09 | 41 |

Letters of Inquiry

The CIIC submits **inquiries by phone or as a written memorandum to the institutions** when an inmate's concern is of a priority nature due to its potential to impact the safety or health of the inmate, staff, or the institution. Among the total 14 contacts received during January 1, 2009 through August 24, 2009 regarding Lorain Correctional Institution, the CIIC office submitted two **written inquiries** to the Warden's office at the Lorain Correctional Institution. One of the two written inquiries pertaining to a medical round trip received a response from the Warden, while the second written inquiry on food services, personal property, and supervision is, as of this writing, awaiting a response from the Warden.

IX. INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The Institutional Inspector in every institution plays a pivotal role in the inmates' ability to address the concerns and issues they may experience while incarcerated, especially as inmates use the inmate grievance procedure.

Monthly data provided to CIIC for the month of July 2009 within an *Inspector Activity* report reveals that during July 2009 at Lorain Correctional Institution, there were 973 inmates who received orientation to the inmate grievance procedure. Other July 2009 activity within the Institutional Inspector's office included receipt of 70 kites (a form of inmate written communication to and from staff), two Court of Claims investigations, one approved Administrative Rule 5120-9-32 inmate property claim settlement, one outside agency contact, and four outside contacts from family or friends of inmates.

The Inmate Grievance Procedure is the sole channel for inmates to use in documenting and addressing concerns they have while incarcerated. Three sequential steps comprise the inmate grievance procedure: filing an Informal Complaint Resolution form, filing a Notification of Grievance form, and last, filing an Appeal to the Office of the Chief Inspector. All steps are detailed in the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Administrative Rule 5120-9-31. The procedure is designed to cause a review, investigation, and potential resolution of the concerns that are brought forward by inmates.

Of the total concerns that were brought to the attention of the CIIC through contacts to the CIIC office between January 1, 2008 and August 24, 2009, there were two criticisms pertaining to the Inmate Grievance Procedure. The two criticisms dealt with an *alleged lack of response to Informal Complaints* that one inmate reportedly filed and an *alleged lack of access to Notification of Grievance forms from the office of the Institutional Inspector*.

The staff and administration shared their opinion during the inspection that the inmate grievance procedure actually is handled *effectively and timely, and that the Institutional Inspector does not receive or handle many grievances each month*. The staff consensus is that the first staff to receive and address Informal Complaints do so with *speed and effectiveness so that issues do not commonly progress to the fullest possible degree*. With inmates transferring out of the institution, numerous complaints are reportedly not grieved by inmates because they are no longer at the Lorain Correctional Institution and issues are no longer of concern to them. Kites are reportedly answered on a daily basis or as soon as possible.

However, during the inspection, some inmates relayed *dissatisfaction with the inmate grievance procedure, suggesting that it is not handled as well as staff indicated*. Staff and administration acknowledged there have been numerous inmate complaints about the newly implemented brunch program, and that steps were being taken to address the new weekend schedule for providing food to inmates.

Regarding the subject of inmate use of an inmate grievance procedure, the *British Expectations* includes a section of questions on the subject. The questions found in the

questionnaire and the responses by Lorain Correctional Institution staff are provided in the following table on Complaint/Grievance Procedure.

Complaint /Grievance Procedure: *Expectations* Questions on Responses from Lorain Correctional Institution

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are there effective complaint procedures in place that are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely response? Yes 2. Do prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are they aware of an appeal procedure? Yes 3. <i>Is information about the grievance procedure reinforced through notices and posters that are produced in English and other languages and displayed across the prison? No</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Are posters in prominent places on all residential units, including for those with literacy problems and those with disabilities so that they can understand and are able to access the procedure? No</i> b. Since some prisoners, e.g. Foreigners may need to be specifically told about the whole process, is there a single channel of contact or clear information on how to make a complaint? Yes c. Is information on units/blocks always displayed and do prisoners understand it? Yes d. What are the procedures for blind prisoners? When inmates with vision problems enter the institution they are evaluated by the medical department during their initial evaluation. All orientation information is given to the inmate in audio form and a staff member is present to address any questions. If an inmate needs help to completing specific forms or documents, a staff member will assist them. If an inmate with a vision problem needs to file a complaint, he can meet with the Institutional Inspector and he will assist him through the process. If the inmate requires special accommodations, they will meet with the ADA coordinator, and their needs will be addressed. 4. Are prisoners encouraged to solve areas of dispute informally, before making official complaints? Yes 5. Can prisoners easily and confidentially access and submit complaint forms? Yes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are forms required to access complaint forms? No. Kites and Informal Complaint forms are available in all inmate housing units. |
|---|

b. Are there forms, and at least one kite box on each block/dorm?

No. Kites and Informal Complaint forms are available in all inmate housing units. Kite boxes are not maintained in each housing unit. However, general population inmates do have access to kite boxes in centrally located areas (chow halls) and inmates who are not in general population have access to kite boxes in their unit (Infirmary and Special Management Unit).

c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer? **Yes, the mail room staff.**

d. Are form dispensers always stacked with forms? **Yes**

e. Are informal complaints and grievances files secured on a limited access basis? **Yes**

6. Do prisoners make use of the procedures, and are they free of pressure to withdraw any complaint or grievance? **Yes**

a. What are the procedures for prisoners with learning or other disabilities? **If an inmate with learning or other disabilities has a complaint, they will meet with the Institutional Inspector. The Inspector will provide an evaluation of their situation and provide assistance as needed (i.e. complete forms, make phone calls, etc.)**

7. *Are all complaints and grievance, whether formal or informal, dealt with fairly and answered within three days, or 10 days in exceptional circumstances, with either a resolution or a comprehensive explanation of future action?*
No. Informal Complaints are answered within 5 business days and Grievances are answered within 10 business days. The inmate is given a notice of extension, if more time is needed to investigate the complaint.

a. Are complaints resolved? **Yes**

b. *Are complaints answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstance?* **No**

c. *Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure?*
Yes

d. *Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner?* **No**

e. Are target return times recorded? **Yes**

- f. Are letters of complaints/concerns from third parties, such as legal representatives, family or voluntary organizations, logged and answered? **Yes, they are answered and filed.**
8. Do prisoners receive response to their complaints / grievances that are respectful, legible and address the issues raised? **Yes**
9. Are formal grievances signed and dated by the respondent? **Yes**
- a. Regarding the quality of response, is there a quality assurance system in place? **Yes, all complaint responses are reviewed by the Inspector of Institutional Services.**
- b. *Does the staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly print their name on the response?* **No**
- c. Are staff responses to confidential complaints returned in sealed envelopes? **Yes**
10. Do prisoners feel able to ask for help in completing their complaint or grievance form and in copying relevant documentation? **Yes**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for help with forms? **Yes**
- b. Are translation services provided for those who need them? **Yes**
- c. What are the arrangements for prisoners with literacy problems, and for those who are blind? **The Institutional Inspector will meet with the inmate and provide any assistance needed (i.e. complete forms, copies, phone calls, etc.)**
11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered? **Yes**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for urgent help? **Yes**
12. Are prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners protected from possible recrimination? **Yes**

- a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice?
Depending on the severity of the complaint, staff and inmates may be separated or arrangements may be made for minimal contact. All staff are educated annually about the grievance process and the zero tolerance for recrimination. Inmates are informed during their intake orientation about the grievance process and the zero tolerance for recrimination. Inmates who make complaints against other inmates are placed in separate housing units to minimize contact.
- b. Are responses objective and factual, and conclusions based on evidence rather than supposition? **Yes**
- c. What are the adverse effects of filing complaints? **None, inmates are encouraged to use the complaint process.**
- d. Do prisoners know that there are protection measures if they complain about staff or other prisoners? **Yes**
13. Do prisoners know how to appeal grievance decisions? **Yes**
- a. Are appeals dealt with fairly, and responded to within seven days?
Appeals are responded to fairly. The Chief Inspectors office has 20 working days to respond to an appeal.
- b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms? **Yes**
- c. How many have appealed in the last six months? **Nine (9)**
- d. What was the outcome and how promptly were they answered? **Six (6) of the nine (9) have been affirmed. The remaining three (3) are pending disposition.**
14. Do all prisoners (and staff) know how to contact members of the Ohio General Assembly's Correctional Inspection Committee, and can they do so in confidence? **Yes**
- a. Is CIIC contact information posted in the dorms, blocks, library and other areas to ensure that staff and inmates are aware of how to contact CIIC? **Yes**
- b. Are there any difficulties with access to the CIIC? **No**
15. Do prisoners receive help to pursue complaints and grievances with unit managers, prison administrators, or other central office staff, if they need to? **Yes**

16. Do all prisoners know how to contact the Inspector and Chief Inspector?
Yes, during the initial orientation, all inmates are given oral and written instructions on the grievance process. The information is also available in the inmate hand book.
- a. Do blocks/dorms have contact details and information? **Yes, all units have inmate handbooks for the inmates to review, and the information is in the inmate handbook.**
17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need help? **Yes**
- a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisors or making direct applications to the courts? **Yes**
- b. In the last six months, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector? **Four (4) grievances and Nine (9) appeals.**
- c. What do they tend to be about? **Non-grievable – RIB/Hearing Officer decisions and Property loss.**
- a. *What proportion are generally resolved? **All were denied***
18. Do prison Managers analyze complaints (both granted and denied) each month, by ethnicity, disability, block/dorm/unit, prisoner type, etc. and if necessary, make any appropriate changes? **Yes**
- a. Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge? **Yes**

X. CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The full set of **Faith-Based Questions** is provided below, including the institution's responses to each question. Responses are in bold type.

Questions and Responses to Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force Recommendations

INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Is DRC/DYS being encouraged, wherever practical, to use faith-based and community programs that address documented criminogenic needs? How? By whom?

DRC has implemented many programs and initiatives that encourage the Faith Based community to address the incarcerated and criminogenic aspects. How? All FB programming must include community justice elements DRC : 04--CMJ-02, e.g., victim empathy, inmate accountability, community service. By Whom? All volunteer screened at LorCI are encourage to address the holistic person, i.e., spiritual, psychological, sociological, and physical. In addition, the Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force (2006) was established by the Ohio General Assembly to examine faith-based initiatives in institutions and the community that provide services to adult and juvenile offenders. The Task Force conducted a needs assessment in all institutions based on the universal needs of inmate jobs, family, shelter. Additionally, a Leadership Forum was conducted in August 2007 which included participants from the religious community, including REP White. Inmates, inmate families, formally incarcerated, and DRC staff conducted a questionnaire to determine the greatest needs of those being released into society.

- a. Is DRC/DYS in conjunction with the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, making available to the faith community, examples of evidence-based programming shown to impact offenders' lives? What examples? How are they being made available?

This question should be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC), and Ed Rhine, Deputy Director, Best Practices. However, this is a joint effort from the DRC, to the governor's Faith Based office and the institutional chaplains. I cannot answer for the faith community; however, I do believe the community needs more training in terms of criminogenic needs and evidence based programming. The programs that are effective are the re-entry mentorships programs and religious programs which emphasize forgiveness, and living responsibly. How are they being made available? By the institutional chaplains and unit management staff.

b. Is information being used and disseminated to faith-based and community organizations so that they provide programs that are evidence based and can truly impact the lives of ex-offenders and their families?

This question should be referred to: Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC); Ed Rhine, Deputy Director; Evelyn Parks, Chief Bureau of Planning and Evaluation; and Steve VanDine, Chief, Bureau of Research. Institutional Approved Reentry Programs are only approved if they are based on research, based on theory, or are documented in a professional journal. Additionally Faith Based organizations cannot emphasize enough the effectiveness of the Faith and belief in the Divine in itself as an “evidence based practice”. In other words, Faith works when the offender applies it sincerely and responsibly.

c. What is in place to ensure that the recommendation is implemented? **Dialogue with the formally incarcerated, their families, chaplains, and DRC staff is always a affective medium.**

This question should be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC); Ed Rhine, Deputy Director; Evalyn Parks, Chief, Bureau of Planning and Research; and Steve VanDine, Chief, Bureau of Research. Again, institutional approved Reentry Programs are only approved if they are based on research, based on theory, or are documented in a professional journal.

d. What methods of program evaluation are being explored to further document program success? What methods are in place? **Program success rates, volunteer feedback, inmate feedback, formally incarcerated feedback, dialogue with community, judges, lawyers, etc. What methods are in place? Volunteer feedback, inmate feedback, formally incarcerated feedback. Additionally, This question should be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC); Ed Rhine, Deputy Director; Evalyn Parks Chief, Bureau of Planning and Research; and Steve VanDine, Chief, Bureau of Research. At RCI a Client Satisfaction Survey is conducted every two years (the last one was completed in 2006 and the next one will be done in 2008).Unit Management conducts an Annual Needs Assessment.**

2. Is the DRC/DYS Director working with wardens/superintendents to develop programs that will facilitate a cultural change in institutions to encourage collaboration with faith-based and community service providers? How? What programs have been developed?

The volunteer policy has been revised 71-SOC-01, which helps provide a seamless transition for offenders to transition to society. The Faith Based community now can visit any institution by appointment in the State and maintain in their possession a Volunteer State ID badge. Additionally this question should be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC) for a comprehensive response.

- a. Is the culture within the institution continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers? Explain.

Yes, the Warden, Deputy Warden of Operations, Chaplains and unit staff conduct outreach to the community in a variety of ways. Ohio benefits bank, Community Circle, Re- entry Court; however, not all community volunteers are a “good fit for the institution”. Therefore a necessary screening process is important for volunteers, not only back ground checks, but also skills analysis’, etc. This process may not seem as an evolvement of community volunteers, but in fact DRC staff should recruit the best possible volunteers, not a multitude of volunteers with no useful resources. The door is still open for some, but applicants are still scrutinized.

- b. How is the warden/superintendent supporting and encouraging a cultural shift and institutional change as a day-to-day practice to encourage community volunteers?

By implementing and supporting the volunteer policy 71-SOC-01 that allows volunteers to visit Statewide under one training and carry their own ID badge. The LorCI Warden also approves a variety of events to encourage a cultural shift by encouraging volunteers to participate in all religious services, all Christian and Catholic Services Latino services; Guadalupe Celebration; Black History Month Activities; week long revivals; Islamic services; sporting Faith Based events, concerts, Jehovah’s Witnesses; Jewish Services; weekly Prayer meetings; Bible Studies; Advanced Bible Studies; etc. Drama and fine arts, MIME and praise dance, Faith Based anger management, grief counseling, one on one counseling, Additional volunteers support programming by providing special events during the year (Bill Glass Ministries, Week Long Revival, Christmas Programming, etc.)

- c. How is the DRC/DYS administration working with wardens/superintendents to collaboratively develop protocols that will proactively assist with changing the culture?

Policy reviews, Faith Based forums involving the Faith Based community and DRC staff, in service training, volunteer appreciation services, and dialogue with Chaplains. This question should also be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC) for a more comprehensive response. Additionally, the many focus groups that evolved from the Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force continue to look at faith based policies, procedures, and community involvement. DRC has initiated the following: and electronic volunteer tracking system to document volunteer visits; provide volunteer training; discuss and give each volunteer a copy of Rules of Conduct for Volunteers and; improving the volunteer process for entry into prisons, etc.

- d. Have such protocols been developed? **Yes and in process**
- e. What are they? **Faith Based forums involving the Faith Based community, and policy reviews. Volunteer appreciation services all augment protocols being implemented.**

This question should also be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator, for a more comprehensive response. However, all institutions enter approved volunteers into the DOTS Portal. Once a volunteer is entered, he/she does not have to go through the process again if they wish to volunteer at a different institution (all institutions have access to the DOTS Portal). The volunteer policy (Recruitment, Training, and Supervision of Volunteers for Institutions-71-SOC-01) is reviewed annually for any revisions and staff and community input is encouraged.

- f. Have policies been reviewed to determine if they might inhibit use of community volunteers, and have necessary changes been made accordingly? **Yes, additionally, the formally incarcerated are given a fair chance to visit institutions once they meet a certain criteria – this is outlined in 71-SOC-01 volunteer policy.**
- g. What policies have been reviewed? By whom?

Volunteer Policy (Recruitment, Training, and Supervision of Volunteers for Institutions-71-SOC-01). Policies are reviewed annually and all staff may provide comments year round on policies. The Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force, community volunteers, Citizen Circles, and Faith Based Focus groups assisted in the review of policy.

- h. What policies have been changed so that they do not inhibit use of community volunteers? **71-SOC-01, reviewed May 8th. 2008. Volunteer Policy Recruitment, Training, and Supervision of Volunteers.**
3. Has DRC/DYS developed a marketing plan to assist in recruiting volunteers from the community and faith-based institutions?

This entire section should be addressed to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator, DRC, for a comprehensive response. However, RCI continues to remain successful in recruiting volunteers (with more than 200 regular volunteers).

- a. Does the plan discuss educating volunteers about the justice system?

Yes, via training, volunteer training and orientation coupled with practical experience in the prisons supervised by chaplains and staff. This is completed during volunteer training provided by LorCI staff.

- b. Is there a need to increase programming for incarcerated offenders to improve the likelihood they will be reintegrated into the community successfully upon release from prison? **Yes - Absolutely – more relevant programming is needed. We have a great deal of programming, relevant to offenders needs. What programming exists? “Going home to stay” Prison Fellowship, Anger management, Fast track GED, NA, AA, Act Up, Iron Sharpens Iron, Financial management, cognitive therapy, victim awareness, Latino services; Guadalupe Celebration; Black History Month Activities; Mothers and fathers day celebrations, Islamic services; Jehovah’s Witnesses; Jewish Services; weekly Prayer meetings; Bible Studies; Advanced Bible Studies; all Christian and Catholic Services; etc. Drama and fine arts, MIME and praise dance, Faith Based anger management, grief counseling, one on one counseling, Additional volunteers support programming by providing special events during the year (Bill Glass Ministries, Week Long Revival, Christmas Programming, etc.)**

What programming is needed? What is needed is more time for the chaplain to aid and supervise programming.

- c. Is the faith community being encouraged to volunteer to provide programs and services to assist offenders in both the institutions and the community? **Yes How?**
(1) Recruitment, Training, and Supervision of Volunteers for Institutions DRC-71-SOC-01; (2) Citizen Circles; (3) Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force; and (4) Leadership Forum (August 2007).

- d. Has a marketing plan been developed to overcome the public's misperceptions of offenders?

While attempts are being made to overcome public opinions on misperceptions of offenders, we have a long way to go. Sensationalist media movements do not always lend to an understanding of the complexities of incarceration and the offenders sometimes complex past. This question should also be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator.

- e. Has DRC developed an educational program to motivate the faith community to get involved in volunteering, including a video to educate volunteer groups about offenders and their needs in institutions? **Yes, this question should also be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC).**
- f. Is information provided on how individuals and groups can volunteer in the prisons? **Yes**
- g. Does the marketing campaign include information on the needs of the adult/youthful offenders, information on how the justice system works, and information on the different ways to volunteer? **This question should also be referred to Gary Sims, Religious Services Administrator (DRC).**

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

Explain. Recruitment, Training, and Supervision of Volunteers for Institutions DRC-71-SOC-01, and DRC's Standards of Conduct for Contractors/Volunteers.

- a. Does the program include information on:

1. Ethics of working with offenders? **Yes**
2. Confidentiality issues? **Yes**
3. Ensuring safety and security of volunteers? **Yes**
4. Working with volunteers? **Yes**
5. Rules and regulations for volunteers? **Yes**

- b. Does the program include information to volunteers on the security requirements for the institution, why the requirements are in place, and how to properly work with offenders? **Yes**
- c. Has a standardized training program been developed for volunteers to facilitate their work in institutions? **Yes (Recruitment, Training, and Supervision of Volunteers for Institutions DRC-71-SOC-01) and DRC's Standards of Conduct for Contractors and/or Volunteers.**

- d. Has DRC/DYS established an orientation program for volunteers, held at preset intervals to allow community organizations to plan for the training as part of their program planning? **LorCI works with volunteers to meet their schedules; for some programs orientation dates may be preset. Regional clusters share their training dates.**
5. Has Ohio law been revised to remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions which inhibit offenders' successful reentry? **This section should be addressed by Ed Rhine, Deputy Director. Additionally, I have heard a great deal of discussion in Faith Based forums, but no definitive answers as of yet.**
6. What improvements have been made regarding communication about programs and services between
- Staff and volunteers?
LorCI and the volunteers enjoy a positive relationship. As explained, LorCI has a huge contingency of regular volunteers. In addition, guest volunteers and special programming augment faith-based services. Additionally, by implementing and supporting the volunteer policy 71-SOC-01 which allows volunteers to visit Statewide under one training and carry their own ID Badge.
 - Staff and the community? **An electronic volunteer tracking system to document volunteer visits has been implemented in DRC. In addition, once a volunteer is approved and entered into DOTS, he/she does not need to "redo" the process since DOTS is at all the institutions.**
 - Other parts of the criminal justice system and the community? **Citizen Circles include representatives from the prisons, APA, Courts, and the Community. Some of our volunteer at LorCI work with Re-entry courts, Ohio benefits bank (Chaplains and unit management), and job and family services.**
- a. What improvements have been made in effectively communicating among staff within the facilities, as well as with the community?
The process of entering volunteers in the DOTS eliminates the need of reapplying at other institutions. Additionally, by implementing and supporting the volunteer policy 71-SOC-01 which allows volunteers to visit Statewide under one training and carry their own ID Badge. In service Training also is very a informative medium to instruct staff.
- b. Has an improved communication mechanism been developed in order to ensure these efforts? **Yes DOTS Portal; Citizens Circles; and Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force.**
- c. Has the system been developed collaboratively with staff and volunteers to address observed problems? **Yes**

ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION

7. Has the statute been revised to increase judicial use of community options for non-violent offenders so prison space can be reserved for violent offenders? ***This entire section should be addressed by Deputy Director, APA, and staff.***
 - a. Working with faith-based and community service providers, have programs been developed in the community to effectively provide treatment while protecting public safety?
 - b. Has the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission reviewed additional options to encourage judges to use these community options rather than sending non-violent offenders to limited prison space?
 - c. Have local probation departments prepared a listing of community options currently available for judicial use?
 - d. Have faith-based and community programs contacted local probation departments through the Juvenile Court, Common Pleas Court, and Municipal Courts to inform them of programs and services available? Explain. This section should be addressed by Deputy Director, APA, and staff

8. Are faith-based and community programs being encouraged to supplement existing community and diversionary programs for offenders and to provide services that are not currently available? How? **This section should be addressed by Deputy Director, APA, and staff.**
 - a. Is DRC/DYS working with community organizations and probation departments to expand services available for offenders? **Yes, with community organizations, especially Faith Based communities. The probation aspects should be addressed by Deputy Director, APA staff.**
 - b. Has a community model been created that will help meet the basic needs of offenders within the community? **Many models are complete such as City Mission in Cleveland, others are fluid and in process; however Kahil Osiris has by far (in my opinion) the most effective programming in the prison system. http://thekhalilosirisproject.com/Home_Page.php**

9. Has DRC/DYS taken a more active role in linking with the faith-based community to develop programs to meet the gaps in services to adult and juvenile offenders? How?

The Faith Based Task force identified some of the universal needs among inmates, shelter, jobs, and family. Additionally the Citizen Circles and the 2007 Leadership forum had healthy dialogue. However, this section should be referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, and to the Deputy Directors, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

- a. Has DRC/DYS reviewed current grant or subsidy programs to determine eligibility for faith community programs, in order to increase the number of faith-based and community programs available to judges for sentencing?

This section should be referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, and to the Deputy Directors, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

- b. Following identification of funding sources, is DRC/DYS actively working with the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives to provide information to these organizations on funding availability? How? What is in place?

This section should be referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, and to the Deputy Director Ed Rhine, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

- c. Is the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives providing technical assistance to the faith community to assist them in developing competitive applications for state and federal funding?

This section should be referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, and to the Deputy Director Ed Rhine, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

10. Has DRC/DYS, and Job and Family Services expanded efforts in partnership to work with employment centers and the faith community to increase practical employment opportunities for offenders in the community? Explain.

Yes "Towards Employment"- Job and Family services, Ohio benefits Bank and community contacts provide employment. This section should also be referred to Gwen Woods, Executive Assistance, Office of Policy, Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, and to the Deputy Director Ed Rhine, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

- a. Has a job placement program been implemented? **In process**
- b. Does it provide:
- Information on job fairs to ex-offenders? – **Done by Unit management at LorCI**
 - Education of businesses/employers on the benefits of hiring ex-offenders? **In process**
 - Incentives for employers to hire ex-offenders (i.e., tax breaks)? **In process**
 - Increased involvement of faith-based and community groups? **In process**
- c. Is there collaboration between the DYS, DRC and Job and Family Services who started the employment centers in Ohio? In what way? **This section should be**

referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, and to the Deputy Director Ed Rhine, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

- d. Has a program been implemented with the goal to get jobs for offenders upon release, and also to match them up with jobs of interest to the offenders, specifically ones at higher wages and skill levels, if possible? Explain?

This section should be referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, Deputy Director Ed Rhine, and Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

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

This section should be referred to Gary Sims, Regional Administrator, Deputy Directors, Greg Landsman, Director of the Ohio Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and Ed Rhine.

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMMING

11. Is DRC/DYS working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions? **Yes**
- a. Do current programs include the following? Are they being developed? Are they being expanded?
- Life skills? **Yes**
 - Financial management and budgeting? **Yes**
 - Personal hygiene? **Yes**
 - Family programs including: **Anger management, "Total care" Reentry program**
 - **(Re-entry program in process of developing for Short term Offenders) – a four tier system of care.**
 - Family and community-based orientation? **Yes**
 - Family mediation? **Yes**
 - Family education and orientation program? **Yes**
 - Transportation and video conferencing for visitation? **Yes**
 - Parenting? **Yes**
- b. Dynamic risk factors that impact offender behavior and risk of reoffending include: antisocial personality, companions, interpersonal conflict, social achievement, substance abuse, and criminogenic needs. Treatment programs can influence and change offender behavior during the time they are in an institution. Programs that address criminogenic needs are programs designed to change

offender attitudes, cognitions, behavior toward authority, employment instability, and education, housing, and leisure time.

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

Yes LorCI engages all offenders to self introspection and living responsibility. This Philosophy of care is integrated in all religious services and theories and taught the Faith Based community.

- c. Have specific life skills programs been developed in the following areas?
- Budgeting? **Yes**
 - Parenting? **Yes**
 - Job searches? **Yes**
 - Anger management? **Yes (Anger Management and Cage Your Rage is Reentry Program Approved) -Faith Based Anger Workbook**
 - Appropriate leisure-time activities? **Yes**
- d. Is emphasis centered on using a mentor-type relationship for such training?

Reentry Mentors are being utilized at LorCI - an ambitious plan is being researched that will utilize Faith Based mentors per religious organizations and geographic. The philosophy of care at LorCI is centered in discipleship and mentorship (living responsibly). “Total care” Reentry program (Re-entry program in process of developing for Short term Offenders at LorCI) – a four tier system of care. The four tier system involves “in care and after care”. The reentry program will be designed to address holistic needs of offenders during their stay at LorCI and their release into the community. The programs is geared toward programming while incarcerated, partnering with reentry mentors in the community, and transitioning into the Faith Based community. When released- the Faith Based community will aid in providing the universal needs of the formally incarcerated, i.e., shelter, jobs, and family support (HB 113). A representative from DRC, chaplain, case manager Warden, etc can check into the “after care” life of the formally incarcerated for moral support to encourage them to not re-offend and move forward in life. (Reentry research in process for the above.)

- e. Has legislation created a new community-based reorientation program whereby non-violent offenders could be released to the community up to 30 days prior to the expiration of their sentence to arrange for suitable employment, housing, treatment services, etc.?

This is probably a question for APA supervision – I am not familiar with this.

- f. Have video-conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders, been expanded? Are they used as an incentive program?
Not at LorCI at this time. However, DRC is visiting this issue.
- g. Do volunteers facilitate the improvement of family relations through coaching in basic relational skills or involvement in family mediation programs? **Yes**
12. Has DRC/DYS expanded partnerships with national organizations including faith-based and community organizations to provide programming in state institutions? Explain.
Yes, Prison fellowship along with DRC, especially in the NE cluster of chaplains have devoted their philosophy of care to “after care”. The Gideon’s are actively involved in Bible distribution and mentorship and The Bill Glass Ministries is also a national bi- annual Christian event in many states.
- a. Does DRC/DYS have a stated plan for the extent of their involvement in prison programming that specifies any limitations seen as necessary? What is it?
There are some limitations for violent sex offenders, however, this question should be present to Gary Sims, Administrator, Religious Services.
13. Does DRC/DYS involve the faith community when appropriate, in the development of release plans for the offender that flow from the institution to community reentry? Explain. **Yes, via Citizen Circles, City Mission , Bondage Breakers, Akron Bible Church, Mates in Ministry, and Re- entry court, “Total care” Reentry program (Re-entry program in process of developing for Short term Offenders at LorCI) – a four tier system of care. The four tier system involves “in care and after care”. The reentry program will be designed to address holistic needs of offenders during their stay at LorCI and their release into the community. The programs is geared toward programming while incarcerated, partnering with reentry mentors in the community, and transitioning into the Faith Based community when released- the Faith Based community will aid in providing the universal needs of the formally incarcerated, i.e., shelter, jobs, and family support as outlines in House Bill 113.**

- a. Are community actors and organizations a part of reentry planning for those offenders who will shortly be returning home? Explain.

Yes, via Citizen Circles, APA, release prep planning/working, video job conferencing, and Annual Reentry and Job Fair Day. Conducted by unit management - "Total care" Reentry program (Re-entry program in process of developing for Short term Offenders at LorCI) – a four tier system of care. The four tier system involves "in care and after care". The reentry program will be designed to address holistic needs of offenders during their stay at LorCI and their release into the community. The programs is geared toward programming while incarcerated, partnering with reentry mentors in the community, and transitioning into the Faith Based community when released- the Faith Based community will aid in providing the universal needs of the formally incarcerated, i.e., shelter, jobs, and family support as outlines in House Bill 113.

- b. The best ideas and programs will serve no purpose in helping offenders live out productive lives after their release if there is no effective community follow-through. Is there effective community follow-through? **Yes, but needs to improve.**
- c. Is there a mentorship program for offenders at your facility?
Yes, and more in Process - "Total care" Reentry program (Re-entry program in process of developing for Short term Offenders at LorCI) – a four tier system of care. The four tier system involves "in care and after care". The reentry program will be designed to address holistic needs of offenders during their stay at LorCI and their release into the community. The programs is geared toward programming while incarcerated, partnering with reentry mentors in the community, and transitioning into the Faith Based community when released- the Faith Based community will aid in providing the universal needs of the formally incarcerated, i.e., shelter, jobs, and family support as outlines in House Bill 113.
- d. Are faith-based and community volunteer groups actively developing such a program for participation by offenders at your facility? Explain.

"Total care" Reentry program (Re-entry program in process of developing for Short term Offenders at LorCI) – a four tier system of care. The four tier system involves "in care and after care". The reentry program will be designed to address holistic needs of offenders during their stay at LorCI and their release into the community. The programs is geared toward programming while incarcerated, partnering with reentry mentors in the community, and transitioning into the Faith Based community when released- the Faith Based community will aid in providing the universal needs of the formally incarcerated, i.e., shelter, jobs, and family support as outlines in House Bill 113.

RE-ENTRY PROGRAMMING

14. Have methods been developed to increase and encourage the involvement of the faith community in various reentry efforts, and to encourage collaboration among faith groups? What are they?

Yes, the Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force (2006) was established by the Ohio General Assembly to examine faith-based initiatives in institutions and the community that provide services to adult and juvenile offenders. The Task Force conducted a needs assessment in all institutions (2006) and the community to provide a basis for a series for faith-based focus groups which are on-going. In addition, a Leadership Forum (August 2007) was conducted in August 2007 which included participants from the religious community, two legislators (While and Kerry), Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, Governor's Office, etc, The Forum addressed volunteer issues and ways to improve volunteer participation, APA, Institutional Staff, Community leaders and others participate in Citizen Circles.

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

See above.

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

See above.

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

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

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

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

- g. Has an easily visible section been added to the DRC (or DYS) web site for the faith community that identifies different programming opportunities for volunteers? **Not sure.**

- h. Does the section contain volunteer opportunities linked to specific communities in Ohio, including contact information for volunteer coordination within each department or institution as needed? **Not sure.**

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

Yes, offenders are informed of various housing options through contact with their respective institutional case managers, chaplains, and during release prep programming (6 to 8 months prior to release.) We are also working with the Faith Based community regarding housing, jobs, and family support.

- a. Although the offender is no longer in prison, he/she is still subject to housing restrictions due to the crime committed (i.e. sex offenders), which creates more difficult circumstances and specialized needs. Are seminars, with free legal or consultation services provided, along with increased involvement of the faith community? **Not aware, however we do have legal aid, Ohio benefits bank which provides tax help, community support, and financial support.**
- b. Is legal advice in these situations available? Have partnerships been formed with local law schools to achieve this end? **Not aware.**
- c. Are presentations by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development provided to ex-offenders to provide information on their options upon leaving prison, and knowing how to navigate through the many restrictions placed on them? **Not aware – we do have Ohio benefits bank which provides tax help, community support, financial support.**
- d. How has DRC/DYS made better use of existing federal programs that aim to address the issue of housing? **Not aware - we do have Ohio benefits bank which provides tax help, community support, financial support This question should be presented to Gary Sims. Administrator, Religious Services, DRC.**

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

Yes, the Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force (2006) was established by the Ohio General Assembly to examine faith-based initiatives in institutions and the community that provide services to adult and juvenile offenders. The Task Force conducted a needs assessment in all institutions (2006) and the community to provide a basis for a series of faith-based focus groups (which include community volunteers) which are on-going. In addition, a Leadership Forum religious community involving two legislators (White and Kerry), Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, Governor's Office, etc was formed. The Forum addressed volunteer issues and ways to improve volunteer participation. APA, Institutional Staff, Community leaders, and others participate in Citizen Circles to address volunteer issues.

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