

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE
REPORT ON THE INSPECTION AND EVALUATION
OF THE
MADISON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

March 29, 2010

Prepared and Submitted by
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE STAFF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INSPECTION PROFILE	7
Date of Inspection	
Type of Inspection	
CIIC Member and Staff Present	
Facility Staff Present	
Areas and Activities Included in Inspection	
Introduction to the Questionnaires	
Expectations.....	8
INSPECTION SUMMARY	9
Sanitation and Conditions	
Institutional Atmosphere: Staff and Inmate Communication	10
Food Services.....	13
Services for the Visually Impaired Inmates.....	14
Recreation	
Inmate Idleness.....	15
Staff/Inmate Relations and the Inmate Grievance Procedure	16
Library.....	17
Special Management Housing Unit.....	18
Medical	19
FACILITY PROFILE	22
Capital Budget Plan	
Projects Completed	
Projects in Progress	
Requested Capital Projects	23
Staff Data	
Table 1. Total Staff by Gender and Race	
Table 2. MaCI Correctional Officers by Gender and Race	24
Use of Force Data	26
Table 3. Use of Force Incidents by Race, January 1, 2009 to October 31, 2009.....	27
Inmate Resistance Incidents	
Table 4. Level of Injury to Staff Person: January 1, 2009 to October 31, 2009.....	28
Inmate on Staff Assaults	
Table 5. Assaults on Staff, January 1, 2009 through November 2, 2009	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Expectations Questions and Responses: Good Order - Security and Rules</i>	29
Inmate Data	31
Table 6. Number of Inmates by Security Level at MaCI.....	32
Table 7. Number and Percentage of Inmates by Race at MaCI	
Security Threat Groups	
Table 8. Inmate on Inmate Assaults, January 1, 2009 through November 2, 2009	33
Inmate Relations	
Table 9. Number of Reported Concerns to CIIC regarding Inmate Relations with Breakdown by Institution and Subcategories, January 1, 2009 to March 25, 2010.....	34
<i>Expectations Questions: Bullying and Violence Reduction</i>	35
CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:	
ATTENDANCE AT A GENERAL MEAL PERIOD	38
Food Services	
Kitchen	40
<i>Expectations Questions and Responses: Food Services</i>	41
CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:	
ATTENDANCE AT AN EDUCATIONAL OR REHABILITATIVE PROGRAM	43
Sex Offender Risk Reduction Program	
Programs for the Visually Impaired.....	44
Concerns Communicated by the Visually Impaired	45
PROGRAMS OVERVIEW	52
Education Programs	
Table 10. MaCI Education Statistics for October 2009 (Zone A&B Combined)	54
Career Technical Programs	55
Apprenticeship Program	
<i>Expectations Questions and Responses: Learning Skills and Work Activities</i>	57
CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:	
ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENTS	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CIIC CONTACTS AND REPORTED CONCERNS	60
Table 11. CIIC Contacts and Concerns for MaCI, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009.....	61
Table 12. CIIC Number of Contacts for Top 15 Institutions, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009.....	65
Table 13. Number of Reported Concerns regarding Top 15 Institutions, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009	
Table 14. Top Ten Reported Concerns to CIIC System Wide, with Top Three Institutions in each Category of Concern, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009	66
 The Library: Creation or Expansion of Minority Book Sections.....	 67
Madison CI Library Walk-through <i>Expectations Questions and Responses: Library</i>	68
 CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT: INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	 69
Table 15. Top Three Informal Complaint Categories for January 2009 to November 2, 2009.....	70
Table 16. Health Care Grievances, January 2009 to October 31, 2009, MACI January 2009 to October 31, 2009	71
Table 17. Personal Property Grievances, January 2009 to October 31, 2009, MACI	72
Table 18. Staff/Inmate Relations Grievances, January 2009 to October 31, 2009, MACI To October 31, 2009	
 Inspector Activity Reports	 73
 Areas Inspected	
Table 19. Areas Inspected by MACI Inspector, January 2009 through January 2010 by Frequency.....	74
Table 20. Areas Inspected by MACI Inspector, January 2009 through January 2010 by Date	75
 Grievance Procedure Orientations	 77
Table 21. Inmate Grievance Procedure Orientations Presented with Number of Staff and Inmates in Attendance by Date, January 2009 through January 2010	
 Kites	 79
Court of Claims Property Investigations, Approved Settlements	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table 22. MACI Inspector Activity Reports, January 2009-January 2010: Number of Kites, Court of Claims Investigations, Approved Property Settlements, Outside Agency Contacts, Other Contacts by Month with Monthly Average and Range	80
Outside Contacts	81
Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars	
Table 23. Inspector Activity Report, January 2009-January 2010, Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars by Frequency	
Table 24. Inspector Activity Report: Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars, January 2009 –January 2010 by Month	82
Informal Complaints/Grievances Received	83
Table 25. Institution Grievance Statistics: Number of Grievances and Informal Complaints Received at MACI by Month, January 2009 – January 2010	
Granted Grievances	
Table 26. MACI Grievance Statistic: Number of Granted Grievance Dispositions with Status of Problem Correction and Month from January 2009 – January 2010.....	84
Denied Grievances	
Table 27. MACI Grievance Statistics: Grievance Disposition Denied by Month in 2009 with Reason for Denial, January 2009 through January 2010	85
<i>Expectations Questions and Responses: Duty of Care, Complaint/Grievance Procedure</i>	86
<i>Expectations Questions and Response: Staff – Prisoner Relationships</i>	90
ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE INSPECTION	91
Zone B Visitation Room	
Medical Services	92
Staff and Inmate Concerns Regarding Medical Services	
Table 28. October 2009 Institution Monthly Medical Report for MaCI	94
Table 29. MaCI Contractual Staff Utilization for October 2009	95
Mental Health Services	
Suicide Data	96
<i>Expectations Questions and Response: Self Harm and Suicide</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING UNIT	99
HOUSING UNITS	100
Washington A&B	
Adams A: Youthful Offender Housing Unit.....	101
Monroe D: Faith Based/Re-Entry Program Housing Unit.....	102
<i>Expectations Questions and Response: Residential Units</i>	
<i>Expectations Questions and Response: Clothing and Possessions</i>	<i>104</i>
<i>Expectations Questions and Response: Hygiene</i>	<i>105</i>
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:	
CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE	
RECOMMENDATIONS	107
Infrastructure	
Alternatives to Incarceration	110
Institutional Programming	111
Reentry Programming.....	113

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

THE MADISON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

INSPECTION PROFILE

Date of Inspection:	November 2, 2009
Type of Inspection:	Unannounced
CIIC Member and Staff Present:	Representative Robert Hackett Gregory Geisler, Inspector Adam Jackson, Inspector
Facility Staff Present:	Brian Cook, Warden Rhonda Richard, Dep. Warden of Operations William Tanner, Dep. Warden of Special Services

Areas and Activities Included in the Inspection:

Zone B: Visitation
Q-Building (Medical, Mental Health, Special Services, Shift Office)
Monroe D: Faith Based Housing Unit

Zone A:

Food Services	Medical
Segregation	SORRC Classroom
Housing Unit: Adams A/B, and D	Library
Housing Unit: Washington A/B	Education Building
Indoor Recreation	Mental Health
Staff Group Listening Session	Questionnaires

INTRODUCTION TO QUESTIONNAIRES

Two questionnaires were developed by CIIC for use on inspections from 2007 to the present. One of the questionnaires is based on selected sections of *Expectations*, which contain inspection criteria used by the British Inspectorate. These *Expectations* were the subject of one of the presentations at an international conference on effective prison oversight in 2006. They are reported to be consistent with international standards for adult incarceration. The purpose of gathering information on the extent to which Ohio correctional institutions are similar or different from selected sections of *Expectations* is twofold: To identify possible areas in need of improvement, and to identify possible means of addressing reported areas of concern.

The second questionnaire is based on the 16 recommendations of the Ohio Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force. The purpose of the questionnaire is merely to gather information

on the extent to which progress is being made in implementing the recommendations. Brief, handwritten responses to the questions by any staff person knowledgeable of the subject, were requested.

To avoid burdening any one staff person at the facility with the task of responding to the entire questionnaire, sections and subsections identified by topics were separated and stapled, ranging from one to three pages each. The Warden could choose to give each section or subsection to a different staff person who is knowledgeable in the particular area. Very brief responses, such as “yes”, “no” and/or 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.

EXPECTATIONS

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

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

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

The questions and responses are inserted in the relevant subject area included in this report.

INSPECTION SUMMARY

On November 16, 2009, the CIIC Director provided the following inspection summary to the DRC Assistant Director and Warden. Although the goal is to complete the full report within 30 days of the inspection, the volume of inspections conducted in the time period, a total of 17 from August 2009 through January 2010, caused an unavoidable delay in the completion of the full report in this instance.

Verbal communication to the Warden is always provided at the closing immediately following the inspection prior to leaving the institution. The purpose of the closing is to ensure that any serious issue or concern is shared with the Warden who has the authority to determine the facts and to take any corrective action found warranted. The detailed written inspection summaries serve to provide prompt, yet more detailed communication to the Warden and key DRC central office staff for their information and evaluation. As noted above, the following summary was provided to such staff on November 16, 2009:

Sanitation and Conditions

- The appearance of the institution reflected that staff makes order, cleanliness and maintenance a priority.
- Even though the institution has been in operation for 22 years, the condition of its physical facilities was observed to be comparatively excellent. Throughout the inspection, there were no obvious signs of neglect or disrepair other than normal wear and tear typical of an institution that age. The Warden relayed that his staff does an excellent job at practicing preventive maintenance before repairs become an issue.
- The Warden relayed that work crews of “Wellness Porters” have been established in order to reduce the spread of germs. These porters specifically concentrate their sanitation efforts on door handles, hand rails, and other areas commonly touched by inmates and staff.
- One inmate stated that the chemicals provided to clean the cells are insufficient. The inmate alleged that the chemicals were diluted with water and not effective.
- **Throughout the inspection, inmates relayed complaints that there was no state soap available for them to wash.** Staff acknowledged that prior to distribution they break the soap bars in half in order to make the soap last longer. While soap can be purchased in the commissary, issued soap had not been available for months. According to the staff, the source of this problem was reportedly due to the budget. However, the matter was reported to have been recently resolved, and a shipment of state soap had been delivered that morning, and was awaiting distribution throughout the institution.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *All order requests are in good standing. Housekeeping and clothing supply orders are processed based on institutional inventory levels. Inmate clothing, bedding, bar soap, toilet paper and other hygiene items are readily available to the inmate population. We have installed hand sanitizing dispensers in all housing units and common areas for inmate use.*

Institutional Atmosphere: Staff and Inmate Communication

- Tension on the compound was lower than in previous visits to the institution. Throughout the inspection, communication from inmates indicated that there are no major burning issues in need of immediate attention, or issues that the Warden was not aware of already. Throughout the inspection, it was apparent that the Warden and his executive staff in attendance were known by the population, and were comfortable interacting with inmates and listening to their concerns.
- One staff member in the staff group session reported that the local Prosecutor was not aggressive enough at prosecuting inmate on staff assaults. However, the Warden later relayed that the Department has an excellent relationship with the County Prosecutor's office, and did not agree with the opinion expressed by staff.
- **Inmates relayed their irritation that staff operates the facility too strictly for a medium security prison.** According to the Warden, the Department is examining how to address this issue while maintaining a safe environment. The institution has two special missions in addition to their primary mission that makes this a challenging goal to achieve. The Sex Offender Risk Reduction unit for all inmates convicted of sexually related crimes, and the Youthful Offender Program for juveniles ages 14 to 17. Both are contained within the same compound. According to what was relayed, staff must maintain an "out of sight and sound" separation between the adult and juvenile populations. The juveniles eat separately, recreate separately, and are escorted everywhere by Officers when they are moving on the compound. It was apparent based on staff communication that the murder of the juvenile in 1995 by adult inmates still has a significant impact on the institutional operations.
- **Many older inmates begged to be housed separately from younger adult inmate offenders.** Older inmates stated the behavior of the younger adult inmates makes it difficult to do their time. According to them, the younger adult inmates do not respect personal property, are assaultive, disrespectful, and make it impossible for older offenders to do their time peacefully.
- During the staff feedback session conducted at the conclusion of the inspection, the staff's sincere dedication to their job was more than obvious. Based on communication

from staff, the morale of staff was reported to be high despite the budget crisis. They communicated that even with the cuts in staffing levels that have occurred there is still a good amount of cooperation between all levels of management.

- **It was very apparent that staff was concerned that the budget makes it difficult to provide inmates with the basic necessities such as soap, bedding, and clothing.** Staff also expressed that the opportunities for inmates to participate in beneficial programming was becoming more limited as the budget conditions worsened.
- Staff stated that despite being provided no additional resources commensurate with their increased work load, the expectations of central office and the inmates continue to increase. Despite this, staff reported that even though they are being given more to do with much less, they do not miss a beat and pitch in to help their colleagues.
- It was relayed that there are frequent shortages of necessary office supplies, equipment, and forms needed to maintain compliance with policy and ACA standards. Staff reported that going paperless would be an effective way to operate, if every staff person had a computer at their work station. According to what was relayed, the staff that generate the most work, often do not have access to computers to complete forms that are only available online. As a result of the effort to go paperless, often times there is a reported lack of necessary forms, which creates greater inefficiencies. For example, Officers who write conduct reports or have to complete bed rosters and pack ups cannot do so because the forms are either online only and are not available in the amounts needed and require making copies of copies. Forms requiring multiple signatures of staff must be completed by staff going to multiple locations on the compound to acquire the signatures, thus delaying the timely completion of the task.
- There is a lack of forms to document inmate property. These forms provided documentation that the inmate's personal items were collected and accounted for when the inmate was moved to segregation. If the forms are not available for staff to use, it is difficult to verify the inmate's items and raises an accountability issue with staff if an inmate's property is missing. This can lead to more compensation being paid to inmates, and/or more lawsuits regarding inmate property.
- It was reported that unit secretaries are responsible for a tremendous amount of administrative responsibilities to ensure the housing units function properly. According to staff, due to cuts they have only *one secretary for ten housing units*. This has contributed to staff missing deadlines on a variety of important issues, and a backlog of paperwork that needs to be scanned into the online filing system.
- It was also relayed that due to cuts the institution lost a pay clerk, and one staff member processes the pay for 500 staff at the institution. According to staff, this is too much for one person to handle, especially with regard to accounting for all of the overtime pay, and flex time used or accumulated by staff. Staff relayed that due to this workload, human

error is bound to occur leading to shortages in pay, and other clerical mistakes that may have been averted with another staff to share in the work load.

- Communication from staff also highlighted their dislike for the OAKS accounting system, with one staff member referring to it as “Poison OAKS.”

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

Administration at Madison has assessed the freedom of movement as a medium facility and taken the following steps to address stated concerns:

- *Effective June 22, 2009, scheduled yard movement for Zone A (medium side) was changed to open yard movement and the unit doors remain unlocked to allow offenders freedom of movement to and from approved destinations. This does not include Youthful Offenders by nature of the sight and sound laws or SORRC offenders as they remain in reception status upon completion of sex offender education classes and transfer to the parent institution.*
- *Effective March 14, 2010, daylight savings time was in effect and changes to the recreation procedures for Zone A (medium side) and Zone B (minimum side) resulted in the yard remaining open until 8:30pm allowing all offenders opportunity for movement to and from recreation versus scheduled recreation.*

In addition, when each unit is called to lunch and evening meals, the basketball courts are open for that respective unit and musical instruments can be played in that area until yard closes, excluding SORRC and juveniles.

This procedure is subject to change when winter daylight savings time goes into effect.

- *All order requests are in good standing. Housekeeping and clothing supply orders are processed based on institutional inventory levels. Offender clothing, bedding, bar soap, toilet paper and other hygiene items are readily available to the offender population. We have installed hand sanitizing dispensers in all housing units and common areas for offender use.*
- *Due to budget restrictions Madison Correctional Institution is fulfilling essential need items for the offender populations and maintaining the facility as required.*
- *To date, Madison has hired (5) correctional officers, (3) RN nurses, (1) LPN nurse, (1) phlebotomist, (1) correctional food service coordinator, (1) account clerk supervisor, (1) commissary manager, (1) corrections specialist (unit manager), (1) penal workshop*

specialist, (1) penal industrial manager, (1) maintenance repair worker, and (2) secretaries for a total of 19 new staff. Currently we have 53 vacancies and continue to hire as approvals are granted.

Food Services

- The inmate food services on the Zone-A side was observed to be clean and in good condition. Inmate food service workers were observed preparing for the lunch time meal, and others were observed cleaning the work areas not in use. The area behind the serving lines was observed to be clean, and free of any accumulated debris beneath the counters. It was more than apparent that inmates had access to enough bleach to properly sanitize the food service areas. In some locations, the use of bleach was somewhat overpowering.
- The meal prepared for the majority of the inmates consisted of tuna salad, coleslaw, spinach, potato chunks, an orange, two slices of wheat bread, and juice or water. The taste, flavor, and texture of the meal were appetizing with the exception of the potato chunks that were cold and lacked flavor. However, on one table near the end of the serving line salt and pepper shakers were available for inmates who choose to season their food.
- Visually impaired inmates expressed concern about the location of the tables set aside for their use. These inmates relayed that they should be closer to the front near the serving line. However, each visually impaired inmate has a “blind aide” that retrieves the meal tray for them and brings the tray to the table. Furthermore, having the tables closer to the exit doors makes more sense if the dining hall needed to be evacuated quickly.
- **Several inmates relayed concerns that the food service staff too frequently deviates from the meal menu prepared by the central office dietician. They cited that the institution never serves tortillas or English muffins.**
- In regard to the brunch program, according to staff a large volume of complaints were received at the beginning, but either due to improved implementation of the brunch program, or inmates accepting the program, inmate complaints have reportedly subsided.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *Food Service personnel follow ODRC menu cycle requirements as published and substitutions are used only when there are availability issues with ODMH Central Warehouse.*

Services for the Visually Impaired Inmates

- According to the Warden, the central office Bureau of Medical Services has designated the institution as the primary location to house visually impaired inmates. Reportedly, a grant was recently awarded to the Department to contract with an agency to provide training and services to visually impaired inmates. This agency will be responsible for providing life skills and training to the inmates to enhance their independence. It will also provide training for inmate aides who will assist the visually impaired with their activities of daily living. The Warden relayed that there is a lot of resentment from the visually impaired inmates directed at the institution because of the time it has taken to get any type of programming operational to assist the visually impaired.
- As the Warden correctly stated, these inmates expressed frustration with their situation. Inmates relayed their opinion that the services of the contracted agency have come too late. Until recently, many of the visually impaired inmates reportedly had to rely on the generosity of other inmates to lead them to meals or the infirmary. Unfortunately, these inmates reported that they are often preyed upon, assaulted and robbed by other inmates. Some inmates reported that they only leave the housing units for meals. Otherwise, they remain in the housing units all day.
- **One of these inmates reported that the staff does not have a consistent plan to ensure that they are evacuated during fire drills.** Reportedly they have used the grievance procedure to have this issue addressed, and while corrections were reportedly made, they relayed that the staff still forget to ensure they participate in the drills. According to one of the visually impaired inmates, on a recent fire drill the staff *allegedly* forgot to evacuate them.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *Fire and evacuation drills are conducted quarterly through the health & safety coordinator. Staff are trained through annual in-service and quarterly drills. To date, all evacuations have been conducted successfully evacuating all offenders.*

Recreation

- Staff reported that they have a dedicated recreation department that does a good job at creating programs and activities. The indoor recreation area included a barber shop with three chairs, a weight room, gymnasium, and music room. The weight room included several Universal weight machines and a separate area for pull-ups, dips, and sit-ups.
- One inmate relayed that the barbershop only has one pair of clippers that work properly.
- Inmates reported that they have limited opportunities for recreation. Both adult and juvenile inmates relayed that they would like more outside recreation time. According to

some juvenile inmates they are locked down for 23 hours each day in their housing units. Older inmates miss recreation because they work during the day, and report that the staff frequently do not hold night time recreation or they close the yard early.

- Inmates involved in the music program stated that the staff provide more resources for the sports programs, and tend to ignore the music program. According to the inmates involved in this program, equipment is frequently in disrepair. These inmates stated close security institutions permit inmates to have steel guitar strings, and a drum sticks, but they are not permitted to possess them at Madison. The inmates involved in the music program relayed that they would like to produce larger concerts for the population. They stated that they are only permitted to perform in the chapel, which limits the number of inmates who can attend the concerts due to the small amount of space.
- Inmates are also permitted to participate in authorized organizations and groups that are categorized as special interest or service oriented organizations. These organizations include Buckeye Jaycees, the Gavel Club, Madison Stamp Club, N.A.A.C.P., and the Music Association M.M.A.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *Effective March 14, 2010, daylight savings time was in effect and changes to the recreation procedures for Zone A (medium side) and Zone B (minimum side) resulted in the yard remaining open until 8:30pm allowing all offenders opportunity for movement to and from recreation versus scheduled recreation.*

In addition, when each unit is called to lunch and evening meals, the basketball courts are open for that respective unit and musical instruments can be played in that area until yard closes, excluding SORRC and juveniles.

This procedure is subject to change when winter daylight savings time goes into effect.

- *Currently the music program and juvenile program are under review to address stated issues to increase outside recreation for juveniles and allow more versatility in the music program.*

Inmate Idleness

- According to staff, they have to deal more frequently with inmate behaviors because of limited activities and increased idleness. Administrative staff relayed that alleviating inmate idleness is one of the most difficult challenges they face. While the staff attempt to develop new ways to keep inmates occupied, they relayed that their options are limited due to several reasons, such as reductions in the amount of resources for programming,

and the elimination of prison industries. The staff relayed that in some cases, up to three inmates perform the job of one inmate in an effort to keep inmates occupied.

- **To the frustration of staff, the Ohio Penal Industries shops on Zone-A and B are closing.** These shops provide work for approximately 50 positions where inmates build metal furniture, and a paint shop where the metal furniture built on the compound is painted. These jobs are highly sought after by the inmates due to the skills they acquire, and the higher rate of pay they can earn working in these shops. The closing of these shops is considered to be a detriment to the well being of the institution.
- **The masonry, plumbing and other construction trade-related vocational programs have ceased after the instructor who taught those programs retired.** One staff member stated that the inmates need those programs, but since the teacher retired, the programs have “drifted away.”
- One way the Warden has attempted to create things for the inmate population to do is clearing some of the area on the compound and the planting of a vegetable garden. The goal is to provide inmates with work, and provide another opportunity for inmates to participate in community service. The inmates will be responsible for growing the vegetables which will be donated to a local food pantry for the needy.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *With the closing of the ZONE B OPI shop, Warden Cook has proposed we utilize this space to create a HVAC Vocational Program. Currently as a part of the ZONE B shop, we utilize an area for Community Service. We sew chair back covers, make aprons and tote bags for students. All these ventures are a part of the Crayons to Computers collaboration.*
- *We will move this program from Zone B to Zone A, making room for the HVAC Vocational Program, one of the most popular programs in our Department. These moves will hopefully make up for some of the inmate jobs lost when the vocational teacher retired.*

Staff/ Inmate Relations and the Inmate Grievance Procedure

- **According to the staff, property complaints, and issues concerning staff-inmate relations are two of the three most frequent categories of complaints.**
- Many inmates expressed concerns about the alleged negative demeanor of staff communication towards them. Generally these concerns were related to perceived feelings of being disrespected, harassed, or retaliated against for writing staff up (reporting complaints). One inmate relayed that some staff in Zone B will verbally push the inmates until they react in a manner to justify citing the inmate for a conduct report, and/or placing them in segregation. The Warden stated that new in-service training will

include classes on staff professionalism, with an emphasis on appropriate communication.

- Inmates stated that they do not believe the grievance procedure is effective, or they fear retaliation for using the grievance procedure. Inmates relayed concerns that if they were to write informal complaints against a staff member, they would be taken up to the Captain's office and "confronted" by several staff about the issue presented in the grievance. If this occurs frequently, it does not seem to inhibit inmates from writing informal complaints as staff stated that inmates have no problem filing informal complaints on a frequent basis.
- Inmates relayed that using the grievance procedure results in a shakedown of their cell and potential destruction of their property. More than several inmates reported that their cells have been torn apart and their property has been damaged after filing informal complaints against staff in retaliation for voicing their complaints.
- Inmates relayed that staff do not respond to kites or informal complaints very quickly. The most frequently cited area of concern where the delays occur was with regard to the medical department. The staff relayed that this has been a challenging time for the medical department due to lack of a full time Doctor at the institution. According to what was relayed, the most recent contract medical provider was terminated due to inability to fulfill the obligations of the contract.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *In 2009, Warden Cook formed a back to basics committee to address communication and professionalism. A lesson plan was created and taught during November 2009 during annual in-service. (CIIC staff note: The Warden provided the complete lesson plan for review. It is not attached due to incompatible software.)*
- *Currently to address property concerns, a centralized vault location is being developed on Zone B (minimum side) that mirrors the process on Zone A (medium side) to accommodate the storage of property in one location increasing accountability and accessibility for supervisors on all shifts.*

Library

- The library is located in the Education building, and appeared to be well organized. There were many inmates who were in the library reading or researching their case on the computer using the Westlaw program. Reportedly, MaCI has a system called SCOTI that allows inmates to work on their resumes. The area was small, but effectively provided the information the inmates sought.

- The library had all of the Administrative Rules and Policies available to inmates upon request. According to staff, inmates can request copies of the A.R.'s and policies after they present their inmate badge.
- MaCI was one of the few institutions that had a section of their library solely devoted to African-American, Asian-American, Latino-American, and Native American literature and studies.
- Several educational books were available for inmates, including a GED study guide. Spanish language GED study guides were also available.
- The CIIC memorandum from 128th Biennium *was* posted in the window of the law library area. However, the CIIC memorandum *was not* noticed in any of the housing units visited on the day of the inspection.
- Staff relayed that the USA Today is delivered daily. However, inmates inquired about the lack of local newspapers from the Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus areas. According to staff, MACI has discontinued the deliveries for the local newspapers due to budget concerns.

Special Management Housing Unit

- The segregation unit was mostly quiet during the inspection walkthrough. Staff relayed that when the institution was designed, a very small segregation unit disproportionate to the size of the population was built. With the overcrowded prison, this requires that unit staff rely on alternative punishments such as cell isolation, and other restrictions in lieu of placement in segregation. These options are sometimes unpopular with the unit staff that would prefer to remove troublesome inmates from the unit.
- All cells are occupied by two inmates each. The level of sanitation in each cell appeared to be adequate, even though most of the cells were cluttered with the occupant's minimal belongings. According to staff, inmates are provided the opportunity to clean their cells three times a week, which is supposed to be annotated on a log sheet hanging outside each cell. Some inmates stated that they had not been provided cleaning supplies at all since being admitted into segregation and it was unclear on the log sheets as to whether some of them had been provided the opportunity to clean their cells or not.
- **On one side of the segregation unit, nearly every cell had a “mushfake” shower curtain made by the inmates out of their bed sheets to prevent water from spraying from the shower into the cell, and to provide for some privacy from their cellie. Staff stated that they were not supposed to have these “curtains.” However, this rule did not appear to be enforced. It was later reported that the Officers working the unit that day were all relief officers who may not have been aware of these rules.**

- The food served to inmates in segregation was the same quality as the meals served to inmates in general population, and appeared to have been served at the appropriate temperature.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *As a matter of practice, “mushfake” shower curtains are not acceptable but are a persistent problem. Administrative staff as well as the supervising Lieutenant make rounds on a daily basis and address this issue but offenders continue the practice. It is a daily occurrence and requires constant reminders due to frequent turnover of offenders. Officers are trained the same regardless of the post. Officers that choose the post of ‘relief’ simply means there is variety in the daily assigned duties but has no bearing on staff expectation. Post orders are provided for all posts as a guide for expected duties.*

Medical

- There were very few complaints relayed by inmates regarding the medical department during the inspection, with the exception of one persistent complaint regarding the lack of responsiveness to health services requests, kites, and informal complaints addressed to the medical department. According to facility staff, the lack of expedient responses by medical staff was identified by central office as an area in need of improvement. Inmates stated that it takes weeks to get a response to their concerns.
- Several inmates relayed that it takes too long to see a dentist. One inmate stated that he had to wait several weeks for what he considered emergency care. However, other inmates relayed that they were given attention relatively quickly when they brought their concern to staff’s attention.
- As noted above, staff indicated that the previous contract Doctor, also the owner of the company, was terminated for reportedly failing to fulfill contractual obligations.
- The lack of a full time Physician has created a challenging situation for the prison staff to fulfill the medical needs of the population. According to what was relayed, a significant backlog exists of inmates with chronic diseases, but several medical staff are working to reduce the load.
- Concerns were shared by all staff regarding the H1N1 virus, and the potential negative impact it could have on the prison. According to staff, they are more concerned with the staff infecting the inmate population because they come and go from the prison.
- Staff relayed concerns that several news articles had reported inmates were going to be vaccinated for H1N1 before the public. In the opinion of staff, this had reflected poorly

on the Department because they felt it was inaccurate and the Department's Bureau of Communications should do a better job countering news stories like this.

- Staff relayed that there were too many inefficiencies created by the current manner in which the Department conducts their medical operations that they believe has led to the increased cost of medical care. They expressed concerns that there is too much waste with regard to inmates being sent to OSU and the ordering of unnecessary and costly tests by the hospital. According to the staff, there is too much emphasis placed on treating nonessential cases with trips to the Corrections Medical Center and the Ohio State University hospital that would not be given as much attention on the street.
- Staff relayed that inmates take up too much of the staff's time seeking medications that can be purchased over the counter at the commissary. This behavior is reportedly reinforced by Doctors that continue to write prescriptions for the OTC medications. It was their opinion that this would eventually reduce the amount of time the Doctor spends addressing these concerns so they can spend time addressing the serious medical problems that some inmates have. According to staff, when inmates claim they have no money to purchase OTC medications, a review of their commissary purchases often reveals that they spend their money on junk food.
- Frustration was relayed by medical staff that the specialists at the OSU Hospital do not understand, or are unaware of the restrictions to which prison health care is bound. They recommended that the specialists receive training or education that provide for greater continuity between the recommendations made by specialists and the prison health care system's limitations to improve efficiency.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *All Health Service requests, Kites, And Informal Complaints are being logged on a daily basis by medical staff and addressed by the Healthcare Administrator according to policy parameters. Review of the process implementation and completion is performed by the HCA on a weekly basis.*
- *All Health Service Requests stating Dental pain, abscess, or emergent need are logged and addressed by nursing & dental staff within 24 hrs. Elective and routine dental care visits are scheduled according to policy parameters. Monitoring with review is performed monthly at the Quality Improvement committee meeting.*
- *Previous medical provider contract was terminated for failure to fulfill contract obligations. At present, Central Office is finalizing a contract with a Medical provider to support MaCI with fulltime coverage. Temporary provider coverage utilizing Nurse practitioners and Agency Physicians has been established and maintained until contract finalization.*

- *Medical staff have been and currently are reducing the existing backlog of patients to be seen by effectively triaging and scheduling patients according to Medical Provider scheduled days available. This includes weekend utilization.*
- *Education efforts regarding H1N1, TB, Influenza and other potential infectious diseases are ongoing throughout the MaCI facility for both staff and inmates. Flyers, posters, and pamphlet literature has been disseminated. One on one education is provided by medical staff. Hand washing techniques are included. Hygiene teams have been created and utilized consistently to ensure cleanliness of areas and decrease risk of contamination. Hand sanitizer is available at each entry area for both staff and visitor use. No identified cases of H1N1 have been reported to date.*
- *Staff were timely informed by the MaCI Warden of all ODRC policies, practices and implementations regarding H1N1. The inmate vaccination program developed by the Bureau of Medical Services was communicated and fully implemented. Communications are ongoing to date.*
- *Due to the lack of a fulltime contracted Medical provider, nursing staff were transporting patients with medical needs that were not within the scope of a registered nurse, outside of MaCI to ensure appropriate medical care was given to their patients. Additionally, temporary medical providers not accustomed / familiar with ODRC medical practice, policy, and protocols were following treatment courses above the standard. Reinforcement education to work within the scope of ODRC medical care was provided to the temporary providers as an improvement strategy.*
- *Nursing staff have the opportunity to review commissary purchases when addressing inmate medical concerns. This information is to be evaluated and utilized within the prescribed treatment plan. OTC (Over the Counter) medications are ordered by the medical provider when the patient is classified as, "indigent." In all other instances the Medical provider either dispenses at the time of the visit from department stock or writes an order for the patient to obtain OTC medications in the commissary. When indicated for the prescribed treatment course, OTC medications are utilized as a first line dispense. Once an established fulltime Medical provider is contracted, consistency in practice will be demonstrated.*
- *Dialogue between the Central office Medical Director and OSU / CMC physician staff is recommended. This will help to educate the medical providers of OSU to ODRC medical practice through our collaborative efforts to provide appropriate patient care.*

FACILITY PROFILE

According to the information provided on site, the facility was opened in 1987 with a construction cost of \$40 million dollars. It is an all male, security level 1 (minimum) and level 2 (medium) institution divided into two compounds covering over 55 acres of land inside the fence. The estimated cost to operate the facility is estimated to be \$41.5 million, with an estimated annual cost per inmate of \$20, 046, or \$54.92 per day.

The institution's two compounds, or zones A and B, have a *designed capacity of 1,000 inmates*. However, on the day of the inspection, just fewer than *2,400 inmates* were reported to be incarcerated in the facility. Zone A houses approximately 1,200 inmates who are mostly classified to security level 2. The Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center and the 100 bed Youthful Offender unit that houses juvenile male offenders bound over to the adult system are also located in this zone. With the exception of the SORRC inmates who live in a dormitory, all inmates who are housed on this half of the compound live in cells.

Zone B houses just over 1,200 inmates who are classified to security level 1A and 1B. These inmates are mostly involved in programming, and work details. The residential sex offender treatment program formerly named Monticello is also located on this compound. Inmates that live on this zone are housed in dormitories.

CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN

The staff provided information on capital projects that have been completed or that are in progress towards completion.

Projects Completed

1. ADA/Paving Renovation: The project consisted of repaving all parking lots, 1 perimeter road and all areas inside each compound to include walkways. The project was completed in October 2007 at a cost of \$292,960.

2. Locking Retro Fit: The project is to eliminate the need for inmates to carry keys allowing access to their cells. Everything will be controlled electronically at a panel located at the officer's station. This allows the officer better identification of cells which are secure and un-secured. This project began in August 2008 and was completed in March 2009 at a cost of \$611,250.

Projects in Progress

1. Control Center Renovation: This project began in July 2009. The purpose of this project is to update all electronically/ computerized equipment and key control system currently being used, allowing tighter security throughout the institution. This project is scheduled to be completed in March 2010.

2. Dental Project: The purpose of this project is to establish a dental clinic on Zone B compound eliminating the need to escort inmates from Zone B to Zone A compound.

3. Fence Security System Upgrade: This project will consist of replacing over two miles of perimeter fence alarm due to the current system being obsolete for which replacement parts are no longer available, thus allowing the institution to operate as safe and secure as possible. The estimated cost of this project is \$947,500.

Requested Capital Projects

1. Window Replacement: This project is in the beginning phase, with a project start date of April 2010. The purpose of this project is to replace the windows in all the housing units. The windows are obsolete and parts are no longer available. Most windows are propped open creating a high risk of injury to both staff and inmates. This project will also help the institution comply with the Governor’s Energy Savings executive order.

2. Electrical and Emergency Power Upgrade: Currently power is maxed out at the institution. The emergency generator is not set up to provide power to certain areas in the event of an emergency/life threatening event. The estimated cost of this project is \$912,940.

STAFF DATA

Personnel data available on the Department’s website reports that as of November 2009, there are *513 staff* employed at the Madison Correctional Institution. According to that data, there are *314 correctional officers*, and 199 non-security positions.

The gender composition is listed as 375 males and 138 females. The racial composition is reported as 433 White staff, 73 Black staff, and seven “Other” staff.

Broken down by gender and race, the staff consists of 327 White males, 43 Black males, and five “Other” male staff. The composition of female staff is described as 106 White, 30 Black, and two staff listed as “Other.”

Table 1. Total Staff by Gender and Race

Staff Gender	White	Black	Other	Total	Percent
Male	327	43	5	375	73%
Female	106	30	2	138	27%
Total	433	73	7	513	100%
Percent	84%	14%	2%	100%	

The total number of Officers employed by the institution was reported at 314, with 17 additional vacancies. There are 264 males Officers and 50 females Officers. The racial composition of the officers is broken down into 264 White Officers, 44 Black Officers, and five Officers described as “Other.”

The composition by gender and race for male Officers is 233 White, 28 Black, and three described as “Other.” The racial composition for female Officers is 32 White, 16 Black, and two described as Other.

Table 2. MaCI Correctional Officers by Gender and Race

Officer Gender	White	Black	Other	Total	Percent
Female	22 (49%)	22 (49%)	1 (2%)	45	55%
Male	22 (59%)	12 (32%)	3 (8%)	37	45%
Total	44	34	4	82	100%
Percent	54%	41%	5%	100%	

Facility staff relayed that the *budget cuts are affecting the morale of staff. They reportedly took a three percent cut and lost 21 positions in the previous year. However, this year they have reportedly only lost two positions.* The staff positions that were lost reportedly came from a variety of areas within the institution. People whose positions were cut were able to bump into another position.

In the past, the staff’s perspective had been that working in prison insulated them from the downswings in the economy. However, during discussions with the staff, they were aware that this economic downturn was testing the limits of their perspective. Despite the state of the economy, staff communicated that they are still dedicated to doing the best they can in spite of an uncertain future. Overall, feedback from staff imparted the impression that they believe that they can rely upon one another to get through the difficult challenges by working together, and redistributing the work load where possible.

Staff stated that despite being provided no additional resources commensurate with their increased workload, the expectations of central office and the inmates continue to increase. *It was relayed that there are frequent shortages of necessary office supplies, equipment, and forms needed to maintain compliance with policy and ACA standards.* Staff reported that going paperless would be an effective way to operate, *if every staff person had a computer at their work station.* According to what was relayed, *the staff that generates the most work often does not have access to computers to complete forms that are only available online. As a result of the effort to go paperless, often times there are a reported lack of necessary forms, which creates greater inefficiencies.* Reportedly, Officers who write conduct reports or have to complete bed rosters and pack ups at times cannot do so because the forms are either online only and are not available in the amounts needed and require making copies of copies. Forms requiring multiple signatures of staff must be completed by staff going to multiple locations on the compound to acquire the signatures, thus delaying the timely completion of the task.

There is also a reported lack of forms to document inmate property. These forms provided documentation that the inmate's personal items were collected and accounted for when the inmate was moved to segregation or transferred. If the forms are not available for staff to use, it is difficult to verify the inmate's items and raises an accountability issue with staff if an inmate's property is missing. This can lead to more compensation being paid to inmates, and/or more lawsuits regarding inmate property.

Support staff like unit secretaries and payroll clerks is essential if an institution is to function properly. Staff communicated that there are fewer of these staff to perform the administrative tasks associated with these positions. For example, the reduction in the number of the staff working in the payroll office has raised concerns among many staff who expressed that the pressure of calculating the range of different compensations such as overtime, flextime, etc. for over 500 staff will inevitably result in mistakes. *Several staff commented that paychecks are frequently incorrect, or have not been processed due to the reported systemic failures of the OAKS payroll system.* This has been a common problem, issue or concern relayed by facility staff at the other institutions as well.

Staff also relayed concerns that there is only one secretary for ten housing units, and the work load for the remaining staff member is unreasonable. This essential position is responsible for ensuring that important administrative tasks are accomplished in a timely manner. It was relayed that deadlines are being missed and important paperwork is not being scanned into the system, which has resulted in a backlog because there are not enough staff to perform the tasks any longer. Unit staff at other facilities have allegedly been delegating an inordinate amount of their work to unit secretaries.

While staff shared their concerns about the impact created by the loss of essential staff, they shared an equal concern for the budget's impact on the accessibility of supplies needed to perform their job, and essential supplies needed for the inmate population such as *mattresses, pillows, and clothing that are reported to be in short supply.* *It was also relayed that there had been a problem acquiring sufficient quantities of toilet paper, and state-issued bars of soap.* According to staff they have to break the small bars in half prior to distributing them in order to make them last longer. However, some staff commented that many inmates can actually afford to purchase soap from the commissary, but they choose not to, either because they feel that they are *entitled* to being provided such supplies, or that they would rather spend their money on other things.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

- *To date, Madison has hired (5) correctional officers, (3) RN nurses, (1) LPN nurse, (1) phlebotomist, (1) correctional food service coordinator, (1) account clerk supervisor, (1) commissary manager, (1) corrections specialist (unit manager), (1) penal workshop specialist, (1) penal industrial manager, (1) maintenance repair worker, and (2) secretaries for a total of 19 new staff. Currently we have 53 vacancies and continue to hire as approvals are granted.*

- *Due to budget restrictions Madison Correctional Institution is fulfilling essential need items for the offender populations and maintaining the facility as required.*
- *All order requests are in good standing. Housekeeping and clothing supply orders are processed based on institutional inventory levels. Inmate clothing, bedding, bar soap, toilet paper and other hygiene items are readily available to the inmate population. We have installed hand sanitizing dispensers in all housing units and common areas for inmate use.*

USE OF FORCE DATA

The use of force is authorized per administrative rule 5120-9-01 which lists six general circumstances when a staff member may use less than deadly force against an inmate or third person as follows:

1. Self-defense from physical attack or threat of physical harm
2. Defense of another from physical attack or threat of physical attack
3. When necessary to control or subdue an inmate who refuses to obey prison rules, regulations or orders
4. When necessary to stop an inmate from destroying property or engaging in a riot or other disturbance
5. Prevention of an escape or apprehension of an escapee
6. Controlling or subduing an inmate in order to stop or prevent self-inflicted harm.

Administrative Rule 5120-9-02 requires the Deputy Warden of Operation to review the use of force packet prepared on each use of force incident, and to determine if the type and amount of force was appropriate and reasonable for the circumstances, and if administrative rules, policies and post orders were followed. The Warden reviews the submission and may refer any use of force incident to the two person use of force committee or to the Chief Inspector. The Warden must refer an incident to a use of force committee or the Chief Inspector in the following instances:

- Factual circumstances are not described sufficiently.
- The incident involved serious physical harm.
- The incident was a significant disruption to normal operations
- Weapons, PR-24 strikes or lethal munitions were used.

Every month the Department records data on the number of use of force incidents. For the period between January 1, 2009 and October 31, 2009, there were 158 incidents in which force was used. *There were 109 incidents where force was used on black inmates, 48 incidents where force was used on white inmates, and one incident in which force was used on inmates classified as "other."*

According to the data, incidents assigned to a use of force investigating committee consisted of 46 incidents involving black inmates, and 17 incidents involving white inmates.

Those logged as “no further action required,” consisted of 48 incidents involving black inmates, 24 incidents involving white inmates, and one incident involving an inmate classified as “other.”

**Table 3. Use of Force Incidents by Race, January 1, 2009 to October 31, 2009
(Minus June Data Not Provided)**

Use of Force Reports that were:	Black	White	Other	Total	Percent
Logged as “No Further Action Required”	47	24	1	72	53.33%
Assigned to Use of Force Committee	46	17	0	63	46.67%
TOTAL USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS	93	41	1	135	100%
Percent	68.89%	30.37%			100%
Referred to the Employee Disciplinary Process	0	0	0	0	0
Referred to the Chief Inspector	0	0	0	0	0
Number of those reports (from #2) where the investigation was not completed in 30 days and were extended:	5	4	0	9	
Number of extended investigations from previous month(s) that were:					
Completed	4	2	0	6	
Not Completed	0	0	0	0	

Inmate Resistance Incidents

On a monthly basis, institutions document information on the level of injury staff sustains during incidents of inmate resistance. The table below contains information that was compiled from ten months of reports. According to the data reported, there were:

- 35 incidents in which staff received minor injury due to the active resistance from inmates;
- 10 incidents in which staff sustained moderate injuries; and
- Three incidents in which staff sustained serious injuries during incidents with inmates.

The levels of staff injury are described as follows:

None:	(Self Explanatory)
Minor:	Less in seriousness/requiring little attention or concern.
Moderate:	Requiring some medical care by institution staff or other physician after which the employee returns to work.
Serious:	Requiring extensive medical care, hospitalization, missed work or a fatality.

Table 4. Level of Injury to Madison Correctional Institution Staff: January 1, 2009 to October 31, 2009 (Minus June, N/A)

Type of Incident	Level of Injury to Staff Person				
	None	Minor	Moderate	Serious	Total
Active Resistance	0	35	10	3	48
Passive Resistance	0	0	0	0	0
Active Resistance w/non-aggressive physical contact	0	0	0	0	0
Active Resistance w/ random physical contact	0	0	0	0	0
Assault w/o Weapon	0	0	0	0	0
Assault w/ Weapon	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	35	10	3	48
PERCENT	0	72.91%	20.83%	6.25%	100%

INMATE ON STAFF ASSAULTS

Each time an inmate assaults a staff member, the incident is documented and reported. Assaults fall into several categories; serious injury physical assault, sexual assault, harassment, or inappropriate physical contact.

According to the data provided, there were 28 *documented assaults on staff* between January 1, 2009 and November 2, 2009. During that time, there were 15 *documented incidents of harassment*, 12 *physical assaults*, one *incident of inappropriate physical contact*, and no *reported sexual assaults*. According to the Department's 2008 annual report, *MaCI reported 48 incidents of inmate on staff assault, or seven percent of the total assaults on staff system-wide*. The same report stated that *27% of assaults on staff system wide were by inmates affiliated with a security threat group*.

Table 5. Assaults on Staff, January 1, 2009 through November 2, 2009

Assault by Type	Number of Assaults
Harassment	15
Physical	12
Inappropriate Physical Contact	1
Sexual	0
Total	28

EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:
GOOD ORDER – SECURITY AND RULES

Good Order

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? **In-Service training and supervision serve as tools in managing staff-prison relationships. Ss well as policy, procedure, post orders etc.**
2. Are rules and routines well publicized, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behavior? **Yes, inmate handbook, orientation video, staff orientation, on the job training, policies accessible in the library, mentoring program for staff.**
3. Are categorization and allocation procedures based on assessment of a prisoner’s risks and needs? **Yes, through security reclassification policy 53-CLS-01 and re-entry, 02-REN-01.**
4. Are they clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed? **Yes, annual review of security classification based on subjective security instrument and programming/re-entry monitored quarterly to annually based on need.**

Security

5. Are there any obvious weaknesses or anomalies in the physical and procedural security of the facility? **None at this time**
6. Are the elements of “dynamic security” in place?
 - a. Are staff-prisoner relationships positive? **Yes, inmates have accessibility to staff at all levels via office hours, kites, grievance process-informal/formal, unit staff, etc.**

- b. Do prisoners receive personal attention from staff? **Yes, unit staff has office hours daily and are available to meet with the inmates one on one as well as one late night per week.**
 - c. Is there constructive activity to occupy prisoners? **Yes, recreation, arts and crafts, programming, religious services, and community service.**
 - 1. Do staff cluster during association? **All staff work well and get along together regardless of rank or title.**
 - 2. Are there enough staff in dorm/block areas to facilitate good officer work? **These are Sgt's, secretaries, case managers, unit managers, and correction officers in one area.**
7. Does effective security intelligence safeguard prisoners' well-being? **We have an STG officer, investigator, inspector, UMA who are all proactive in evaluating looking after well being of our offenders.**
- a. Do staff comply with security requirements in terms of filing reports? **Yes, they file incident reports and they are submitted in a timely manner.**
 - b. Are there recent incidents where security reports have led to action? **Yes, we take and review all written reports if determined that an investigation is required then the invest is assigned.**
8. Is prisoners' access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessarily restrictive approach to security? **We are in the process of making changes (example: allowing inmates to walk and move freely on the Zone A yard. The front doors are opened to allow inmates to walk in and out of the units.**
9. Is strip and squat-searching of prisoners carried out only for sound security reasons? **Yes, squat-searches are done anytime an inmate is transported into or out of the institution.**
10. Are prisoners strip or squat searched only in the presence of more than one member of staff, of their own gender? **During strip or squat searches regarding transportation, inmates are in the presence of an officer and supervisor. Inmates are strip searched in the presence of an officer of the same gender.**
- a. If squat searches are used, does their incidence and authorization need to be logged and regularly checked? **Officers are required to do pat down searches as well as strip searches. All searched are to be logged.**
 - b. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances? **Squat searches are usually during all strip searches involving transportation.**

11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available? **Yes, we have documentation in the Inmate Handbook. Visiting rules are handed out to newly approved visitors and addressed at inmate orientation.**
- a. Are the visitors subject to bans or restrictions reviewed every month? **Whenever the visitor requests reconsideration.**

Rules

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas? **Yes as well as in the unit, inmate handbook, and libraries.**
 - a. Are rules and routines posted/distributed on units/blocks/dorms? **Yes on bulletin boards.**
 - b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs? **Through unit staff, yes.**
2. Are rules and routines applied openly, fairly and consistently, with no discrimination? **Yes, employees are trained to be fair, firm and consistent.**
3. Does staff use Only the level of authority necessary to ensure a prisoner's compliance with the rules? **Staff is trained to follow chain of command starting with unit staff and if it is a security issue then a Lieutenant is contacted.**
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned? **Officers as well as all supervisors will and do explain to inmates why they are being charged with a rule violation.**
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoners, are appeal arrangements explained and made available? **Yes, anytime a conduct report is written that conduct report goes through steps and procedures are taken to notify the inmate and allow him to have the 24 hour notice to prepare his case before the Sergeant or RIB panel. He also is given the right to waive or not waive his 24 hour notice, as well as the right to a number of witnesses and the charging official. The inmate's rights have to be preserved. They are provided appeal form upon request for RIB disposition.**

INMATE DATA

According to the information provided on the date of the inspection, the population count was reported to be approximately 2,348 inmates. The data provided states Zone A (Levels 1-4) had a population of 79 Youthful Offenders, and a total of 1,111 adult inmates assigned to general population. The population count for Zone B (Level 1) showed a total of 1,158 offenders.

Table 6. Number of Inmates by Security Level at MaCI

Security Classification Level	Number of Inmates	Percent
Zone B (Level 1-minimum)	1,158	49.32%
Zone A (Level 2 medium but may include inmates level 1-4)	1,111	47.32
Youthful Offenders (age 14-17)	79	3.36
Total	2,348	100%

According to the information provided on the institution's website as of November 13, 2009, the facility had 1,148 level one inmates (minimum security) comprising 50.75 percent, 1,001 level two inmates (medium security) comprising 44.25 percent, and 113 level three (close security) inmates comprising 49.96 percent, with a total of 2,262 inmates.

It was also reported in the November 13, 2009 data, that the racial composition of the inmates consisted of 1,241 White inmates, 1,057 Black inmates, and 32 inmates classified as Other.

Table 7. Number and Percentage of Inmates by Race at MaCI

Race	Number of Inmates	Percentage
White	1,241	53%
Black	1,057	45
Other	32	2
Total	2,330	100%

Security Threat Groups

Security threat groups (gangs) are one of the primary challenges to the staff's efforts to maintain safety and security within an institution, yet their existence is inseparable from almost any prison environment. Inmates join STGs for reasons such as protection, power, a sense of identity, or a blend of these reasons. Some gangs are traditional prison gangs that exist only within the confines of correctional systems; others are street gangs whose presence inside correctional facilities bridges their street activities. The dynamics of these groups can be fluid, as some maintain their street affiliations, while others abandon their street affiliations and band together with inmates from opposing gangs along geographic identification.

In prison, some individuals band together with others who share a common identity for protection. It is the appearance of order and identity that causes some inmates to gravitate towards gangs. This can induce the perception of stability and order in an environment that can be chaotic, especially to individuals who have never been in such an environment. However, communication from many gang members has revealed that the appearance is merely a façade.

In an effort to exert control, many gangs use extortion, threats, and violence. *The use of violence against other inmates by gang members accounted for 26 percent of all inmate on inmate*

assaults according to the Department's 2008 Annual Report. However, almost as much violence occurred between gangs or between gang members. The same report stated that 20 percent of the victims of all inmate on inmate assaults were affiliated with gangs. Per the same report, MaCI ranked among the prisons with the highest number of inmate on inmate assaults that showed 48 assaults or seven percent of the total number of assaults system-wide.

Much of the focus of prison gangs throughout the last year has focused on the extremely violent and disruptive presence of youth gangs, some who have "graduated" from the Department of Youth Services. In a very short period of time, these youth have reportedly recruited a substantial number of members, and garnered a level of authority and reputation for violence that rivals older, more established prison gangs. However, at MaCI, these younger gangs did not appear to have the presence that they do in a number of other institutions. *The staff did acknowledge that the younger offenders are more challenging, but they communicated that the Aryan Brotherhood continues to be their greatest problem.*

On the day of the inspection, 178 inmates were profiled as members of gangs at the institution. The Aryan Brotherhood and other "whites-only" oriented gangs accounted for about 60 of the total profiled gang members. According to the information provided, there were 17 profiled Crips, approximately 21 members of the Bloods and/or affiliated gangs associated with the Bloods, and approximately 12 profiled members of the Folks/Gangster Disciples. **In light of staff reductions, this may be affecting the ability of staff to identify all gang members and to monitor their activities. As a result, there may actually be a higher number of gang members than the statistics indicate.**

Table 8. Inmate on Inmate Assaults, January 1, 2009 through November 2, 2009

	Physical	Sexual	Both	Harassment	Total
Number of Assaults	47	4	0	2	53
Total	47	4	0	2	53

Inmate Relations

A review was made of the CIIC contacts and reported concerns logged in the category "Inmate Relations," which includes a breakdown of "Security Threat Groups," "Assaults", "Inappropriate Sexual Behavior," and "Other." From January 1, 2009 to March 25, 2010, the CIIC received 434 contacts system-wide reporting 547 concerns in the category "Inmate Relations." There was only one reported concern in the category regarding Madison Correctional Institution, which specifically pertained to "Assaults."

Table 9. Number of Reported Concerns to CIIC regarding “Inmate Relations” with Breakdown by Institution and Subcategories, January 1, 2009 to March 25, 2010

Prison	Assaults	Security Threat Group	Other Inmate Relations Problems	Inappropriate Sexual Behavior	Total
SOCF	67 (26%)	48 (24%)	21	6	142 (26%)
MANSFIELD	51 (20%)	62 (30%)	7	2	122 (22%)
WARREN	19 (7%)	9	3	7	38
PICKAWAY	14 (5%)	11	4	1	30
NORTH CENTRAL	17 (7%)	9	1	3	30
TOLEDO	12 (5%)	11	3	3	29
SOUTHEASTERN	25 (10%)				25
LEBANON	6	8	1	2	17
GRAFTON	1	11	1		13
TRUMBULL	7	5			12
ROSS	4	7	1		12
LONDON	3	7		1	11
NOBLECI	3	1	1	3	8
OHIO STATE PEN	5		2		7
Other*	2	1		3	6
LAKE ERIE	1	4	1		6
ALLEN	4		1		5
MARION	2	1	1	1	5
RICHLAND	2	2	1		5
BELMONT	3	2			5
LORAIN	2	2			4
CHILLICOTHE	2	1		1	4
OAKWOOD	1	1	1		3
N. COAST	1	1			2
OHIO R FOR WOMEN			1	1	2
MADISON	1				1
N. EAST PRC	1				1
N. EAST OHIO	1				1
HOCKING	1				1
TOTAL	258	204	51	34	547
PERCENT	47.2%	37.3%	9.3%	6.2%	100%

*NEOCC is a totally private prison, but subject to CIIC inspection and evaluation. “Other” includes jails and non-Ohio facilities.

***EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:
BULLYING AND VIOLENCE REDUCTION***

1. Does everyone feel safe from bullying and victimization (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault)? **Yes**
2. Are active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation known to staff, prisoners and visitors? **Yes-through orientation and in-service training.**
3. Has the prison developed an effective strategy to reduce violence and intimidation, which has earned the commitment of the whole prison and has drawn on multi-disciplinary consultation including feedback from prisoners? **Yes-through orientation video-inmates advised on how to report, unit management, security, mental health.**
 - a. Is the violence reduction strategy widely publicized? **Yes-also PREA posters in units, orientation video, inmate handbook and unit orientation.**
 - 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? **Incident reports are written when reported. All assaults are entered into DOTS portal and OSP is notified.**
 - c. Do staff understand their duty to maintain a safe environment and what they do to promote this? **Yes-reminded in yearly training.**
 - d. Are staff alert to threats to a safe environment, and do they confront all forms of victimization? **Yes**
 - e. Are prisoners consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance? **Needs assessment done annually by unit management staff; listens to inmates concerns when brought to staffs attention.**
 - a. How effective is the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction? **GOOD.**
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? **See above-needs assessment annually.**

- a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months? **Inmates have access to unit staff daily. They can also use the kite system to communicate with others.**
 - 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? **Since May 1, 2009, there have been 36 inmate on inmate assault cases.**
 - b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying? **Recreation and Returning to units with commissary items.**
 - c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners? **Security Classifications, assignment of single cell, safe housing, inmate separations, classification to Protective Control.**
 - d. Do staff lead by example in the way they treat their colleagues/prisoners, and understand that their duty is to foster a safe environment, by confronting unacceptable behavior quickly and fairly? **Yes**
 - e. What are the arrangements for movement, exercise, mealtimes and discharge, especially for those who are considered vulnerable? **If necessary, safe housing used while investigation is taking place.**
 - f. Is particular attention given to prisoners who have asked for protection from other prisoners or those who may be victimized because of the nature of their offense or other individual circumstances? **Yes-Protective Control investigations take place.**
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? **There is no specified policy, however, family may call staff and matters are heard and investigated.**
- a. Are prisoners' families encouraged to come forward if they feel they are being bullied to bring drugs into prison? **Yes they can contact investigator's office.**
 - 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? **Majority**
 - d. Are there posters in visiting rooms? **PREA posters.**
8. Is an effective strategy in place to deal with bullying which is based on an analysis of the pattern of bullying in the prison and is applied consistently throughout the prison? **Yes**
- a. Has a strategy been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison? **Through annual needs assessment.**
 - b. Is a central log of bullying kept, and are incidents of bullying reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee? **RIB (Rules Infraction Board); sexual assault committee, unit management, investigation of protective control requests.**
 - c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization? **Yes**
 - d. Are all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. used for evidence of bullying/intimidation? **Disciplinary records, confidential statements, commissary, incident reports reviewed.**
 - e. How do staff contribute to the strategy? **Conducting rounds, report writing, interview inmates, reports of unusual incidents, inspections, shakedowns.**
 - f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments? **Inmate orientation, inmate handbook, STG, sexual assault committees, and unit management.**
9. Are allegations of bullying behavior treated consistently and fairly? **Yes**
- a. Are they investigated promptly? **Yes**
 - b. Are outcomes of investigations recorded and is the prisoner who reported the bullying supported? **Yes-through the Rules Infraction Board (RIB), unit classification committee and investigation.**
10. Are prisoners made aware of behavior that is unacceptable through a well-publicized policy and are made aware of the consequences of bullying? **Yes-DRC Policy56-DSC-01.**
11. Is inappropriate behavior consistently challenged? **Yes-disciplinary action.**
- a. Are there bullying posters throughout the prison? **Not bullying but PREA posters.**

- b. What information is distributed to new arrivals? **Inmate handbook, weekly orientation videos and unit staff orientation.**
 - c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners? **No-explain how to report sexual assault.**
 - d. Are staff aware of both direct and indirect forms of bullying? **Yes**
12. Do anti-bullying measures support the victim and take the victim's views about their location into account? **If staff determine unit move or institution transfer required, then action is taken.**
- a. Do staff understand the link between bullying and aggressive and disruptive behavior generally? **Yes-addressed through IPC and discipline.**
13. Are appropriate interventions in place to deal with bullies and support victims? **Yes-inmate separations, disciplinary security reviews.**
- a. What interventions are available to challenge bullies and to support victims of bullying? **Victim awareness program, Anger Management, Thinking for a Change and Rules Infraction Board.**
 - b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior? **There is a reentry accountability plan which recommends needed programs those completed and detailed notes on behavior. Taken into account when determining security level and job reclassification.**

CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:

ATTENDANCE AT A GENERAL MEAL PERIOD

According to the Ohio Revised Code, each CIIC inspection must include attendance at a general meal period.

FOOD SERVICES

During the serving of the meal to the general population, the order and movement of the feeding was observed to have been done efficiently and in an orderly manner. Staff relayed that inmates have approximately 20 minutes to eat each meal. It was reported that it can take anywhere from under two hours or more to feed the entire population depending on the popularity of the meal being served. The inmate dining hall has a reported capacity to seat approximately 128 inmates, and was clean and well lit, mostly with natural light. As inmates enter the dining hall they swipe and scan their identification card and proceed through the line. Inmates sit where they like at

tables that seat up to four. The entire feeding process is supervised by staff, and continues until all housing units have cycled through the dining hall. There is an increased presence of staff and officers during this time, who are drawn from other areas in the prison to help supervise the inmates as they eat.

The youthful offenders housed at the institution eat first while all adult inmates are still confined to their housing units. Once they have completed their meal and are escorted back to their housing unit, the staff begins to call the inmates in the blind program who are escorted to eat, and then the adult housing units are called one at a time to eat. The staff determines the order in which adult housing units eat by way of monthly safety and sanitation inspections. Units that score the highest on the inspections eat first, and units with the lowest score on the inspections eat last.

The meal served consisted of a main serving of tuna salad, with coleslaw, spinach, potato “chunks,” an orange, and orange juice. The tuna was substituted with vegetarian nuggets for inmates that were served vegetarian meals. Salt and pepper seasoning was available for inmates on a table near the end of the serving line. The institution uses drink dispensers and juice boxes to serve beverages instead of the plastic baggies for milk and Kool-Aid used at many other institutions. Inmates under the age of 21 are required to drink milk in accordance with the National School Lunch Program, and a sign above one of the serving lines directed inmates under the age of 21 to that line. The same meal was served to the inmates in the special management housing unit.

The overall taste, texture and temperature of the food served were good. However, the potato “chunks” (which an officer strongly encouraged us to sample) were cold and unappetizing. Meals are determined by ODRC central office dietary staff that establishes a menu cycle for the institutions to follow. Special meals for inmates who require an alternate meal such as vegetarian or a pork substitute are provided one after authorization is granted by either medical or religious services.

Often time inmates relay complaints that their institution does not follow the menu established by central office. During the inspection only two inmates relayed that the menu has called for items like tortillas and English muffins, but they had never been served. However, the procurement of the quantities of food needed to feed the entire prison population is a frequent and challenging task. It has been relayed in the past that the unavailability of the necessary quantities of chicken for example, forces the institution to substitute the item with another meat. Staff have relayed that the Department is competing with grocery chains to purchase items that can be in short supply. Another reason prompting deviations in the menu includes equipment malfunctions. However, it was reported all essential food service equipment was in working order. Despite these challenges, the DRC is still able to provide meals three times each weekday, and twice a day on weekends to all prisoners in the state of Ohio who want them.

Just outside of the dining hall, mailboxes for kites and outgoing mail were located near the building’s doors, as were boxes for inmates to submit health services requests.

Kitchen

The Warden spoke highly of his food service staff for staying focused on providing a quality level of service despite any adversities that they may encounter. He relayed that three more food service staff were currently completing their time at the Corrections Training Academy and would begin working at the institution soon. One inmate relayed that a particular food service manager did an excellent job running their work area.

The area behind and underneath the serving line was observed to be clean with no accumulated filth underneath the counters. Inmates serving meals all wore hair nets, gloves, and were necessary beard covers. To work in food services, these inmates must always maintain good personal hygiene practices.

In the kitchen, most of the food preparation had ceased for lunch, and the preparation for the evening meal had not begun. Only one inmate was observed to be preparing the dessert for the evening meal. He was wearing gloves, a hair net, and was using the appropriate utensil. Other inmates were cleaning the food preparation area.

The kitchen had two coolers, each designated to hold a specific item. One cooler contained produce and milk products, and the other cooler stored food that had been prepared no later than the earlier day. Staff relayed that the institution receives deliveries for milk every Thursday, and receives produce on Mondays. There was also a dry storage room where items were observed stacked as high as 18 inches from the ceiling.

Other inmates were observed cleaning, or washing the pots and pans used to produce the meal. The floor surrounding the dishwashing machine was partially covered in water, and there were no non-slip mats for the inmates operating the machine to stand. However, the tiles were in good condition and seemed to provide some traction. One of the inmates working with the machine relayed that it rarely breaks down unless other inmates sabotage it.

The use of bleach was obvious as in some areas where inmates had been mopping, the fumes from the bleach were somewhat overpowering. The surfaces of all the food preparation areas were observed to be very clean, as were the floors, and the surfaces in the inmate restroom located in the kitchen. The location where the bleach and other cleaning products were stored was secured. Based on these observations, it was obvious that thorough sanitation practices were a habit with the staff and inmate workers in this area. *However, the inmate restroom located in the kitchen was observed to have no soap or hand sanitizer.*

Another area that provided evidence of consistently good sanitation practices was the area near the trash dock. In some institutions there are at least some foul odors and accumulated filth on the floors and walls in this area. This institution was the exception as no such conditions were observed. Inmates relayed that they have never observed a problem with rodents or insects in the kitchen since they have worked there. One staff member relayed that there were some concerns

with rodents in the winter time that escape from the fields and try and find shelter inside the institution, but that it is generally not an issue in the warmer seasons of the year.

***EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:
FOOD SERVICES***

1. Are prisoners offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements? **Yes, specified diets are issued per ORDC diet protocol through institutional Medical Director.**
2. Is food prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes, prepared food is served through religious protocol and also stored, prepared and served utilizing state health department guidelines. Logs are completed.**
3. Do all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to the relevant food safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes**
4. Are religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving, fully observed and communicated to prisoners? **Yes, assigned food service staff work with the institution's religious service staff to ensure all requirements are met and information is accessible to inmate population.**
 - a. Are Halal certificates displayed where prisoners can see them? **No, not a requirement. Lamb is only served once annually for the last Islamic feast per ODRC guidelines**
 - 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? **N/a**
 - Specific religions? **Yes**
 - Prisoners with disabilities? **Yes-as ordered by a Physician.**
 - d. Do prisoners who are on special diets have confidence in the preparation and content of the meals? **Yes, to this date, no kites and/or complaints have been received by any of the inmate population.**
5. Are all areas where food is stored, prepared and served properly equipped and well managed? **Yes**

6. Are prisoners and staff who work with food, health screened and trained, wear proper clothing, and prisoners are able to gain relevant qualifications? **Yes**
 - a. Do medical clearance forms exist on food service workers, and are training courses offered? **Proper hand washing techniques and instruction on food safety is addressed and documented on all assigned inmate workers. Medical clearance is mandatory for all assigned to food services.**
7. Are prisoners' meals healthy, varied and balanced and always include one substantial meal each day? **Yes**
 - a. Are prisoners encouraged to eat healthily and are they able to eat five portions of fruit or vegetables a day? **Yes, ODRC hearth-healthy menu is followed daily to ensure proper nutrition is offered to all inmate population.**
 - b. Do prisoners on transfer miss out on their main meal? **Prior to AM transfers, the inmate is provided a nutritionally sound meal. Upon return to Madison, a nutritionally sound lunch or dinner meal is provided.**
8. Do prisoners have a choice of meals including an option for vegetarian, religious, cultural and medical diets? **Inmates are offered a variety of food items the ODRC heart healthy menu to meet their personal needs.**
 - 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? **Yes**
9. Are prisoners consulted about the menu, and can they make comments about the food? **Yes, a survey is offered for inmate feedback.**
 - a. If logs of comments are kept, how frequently are they consulted? **This process is completed annually.**
 - b. Is there a food comments book? **No, inmate population is offered to respond through the kite system.**
10. Is the breakfast meal prepared on the morning it is eaten? **Yes, breakfast items are also cooked the morning of service to the inmate population.**
11. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm? **Yes**

12. Do prisoners have access to drinking water (including at night time), and the means of making a hot drink after evening lock-up? **Yes, all housing units are equipped with drinking fountains and microwave ovens.**
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, a food service employee is assigned to each serving line to monitor assigned inmate workers.**
15. Where prisoners are required to eat their meals in their cells, are they able to sit at a table? **Yes**
16. Do pregnant prisoners and nursing mothers receive appropriate extra food? **N/a**
- -----

CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:

ATTENDANCE AT AN EDUCATIONAL OR REHABILITATIVE PROGRAM

Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center

The CIIC observed inmates participating in the Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center (SORRC) facilitated by a staff member. SORRC is a required 20 hour educational program that all inmates convicted of a sexually related offense attend after reception and prior to being transferred to their parent institution. After completion of SORRC, eligible inmates may participate in either the comprehensive, or mandatory sex offender treatment programming, which are more in-depth sex offender treatment programs also conducted at the institution. A description of the SORRC program is located on the institution's website:

Sex Offender Risk Reduction Center (SORRC) provides assessment and basic sex offender education services to all inmates sentenced as or determined to be a sex offender. The SORRC program provides twenty hours of basic sex offender education with the goal of ensuring that all sex offenders committed to DRC are confronted with the effects of their offenses on their victims and encouraged to take responsibility for their actions. After completing the program, the inmates are transferred to their parent institution to complete their court ordered sentence.

At the time of the inspection, there were approximately 15 inmates in the SORRC program class. The lesson being discussed revolved around the decision making process, and breaking the negative behavior cycle. During the class, inmates were read several scenarios by the instructor describing characters given the opportunity to make either a good or bad decision. In each of the scenarios the characters made bad choices that resulted in further negative consequences. Afterwards, the inmates were asked to reflect upon the point in which the characters made the poor choices that led to further negative consequences.

In the lesson that followed, the inmates read passages from the program material regarding the behavior cycle, and discussed how individuals can develop interventions themselves, and eventually break the cycle of their negative behavior. Through learning to identify the stressors, the individual can learn when to engage in other activities that interrupt the build up and planning associated with the negative behavior.

Program for the Visually Impaired

According to facility staff, the central office Bureau of Medical Services has designated MaCI as the primary location to house visually impaired inmates. While no official criteria were provided as to what made the institution the most eligible, all inmates who are blind will reportedly be housed at the institution. Currently they reported that there are 11 visually impaired inmates.

After the Department Received a grant for \$30,000, the Department chose the Vision and Vocational Services Company to provide services to visually impaired/blind inmates. According to the literature provided, VVSC will serve ten inmates with diagnosed visual disabilities and provide evaluations, training for staff and inmates to assist the visually impaired/blind inmates, as well as resources to enhance the visually impaired/blind inmate's independence. *The main concern of some staff is that MaCI will receive more blind inmates than the institution can care for because the funds from the grant are only for one time funding.*

According to literature provided, key elements of the services to be provided per the contract by VVSC consist of:

1. Evaluation Services:

- a) Optometric low vision examination and functional assessments to determine if the inmates might benefit from changes in refractions, use of low vision aides, or vision training to utilize any remaining vision.
- b) Evaluation to determine the skill level in areas of personal adjustment, life skills, mobility and computer/CCTV technology.
- c) Evaluation to determine their potential for learning Braille (if required)

2. Personal Adjustment Training Services: Goals determined in the evaluation process may include training.

- a) Personal care and grooming, hygiene, eating techniques, clothing care, dress, laundry, communication skills such as labeling, handwriting, use of recording devices, keyboard use, accessing computer, interpersonal skill, anger management, transportation, child care and use of community resources.

- b) Orientation and mobility to include self protective techniques, use of sighted guide, locating dropped objects, trailing, negotiating stairs, doorways, and cane skills.
- c) Independent living skills to include nutrition and food preparation, kitchen safety, cooking, shopping, money identification, phone dialing, recordkeeping, cleaning and socialization skills for community integration.
- d) Assist with acquisition of new skills related to preparing for competitive employment, where appropriate.

Concerns Communicated by the Visually Impaired

During the pre-inspection meeting, facility staff relayed that blind and visually impaired inmates would likely communicate concerns to the CIIC inspection team regarding the lack of services and programs available to them at the institution. As the staff correctly predicted, many of the blind or visually impaired inmates communicated their dissatisfaction. The CIIC office has also been receiving communication from visually impaired inmates at Madison for several years regarding their concerns. Their correspondence reveals that much of the dissatisfaction comes from the reported fact that the program infrastructure to assist the blind with their mobility and life skills is essentially non-existent. Communication to the CIIC supports concerns that the environment at MaCI prior to the VVSC contract was not prepared to provide assistance to the blind or visually impaired. However, while some of the responsibility does rest with staff, it is important to take into account the resources provided to assist them with the challenges associate with establishing this program.

It is unclear as to why MaCI was chosen to spearhead this program, as staff's time is already divided among several other special missions *in addition* to running a regular minimum/medium institution. It cannot be denied that the responsibilities of the youthful offender program and the sex offender risk reduction center (SORRC) already add enough complications in the administration of the institution's operations. *Based on communication from staff, little was revealed to them as to exactly why MaCI was chosen to administer this program.*

Appropriation of the funding to pay for the evaluative services and bureaucracy has prevented the program from successfully getting off the ground. Staff acknowledged that several delays have contributed to the reported atmosphere of distrust between the staff and the visually impaired, as expectations of services being provided have not been met on several occasions due to missed deadlines. Inmate communication reflects frustration that they were sent to the institution under the impression that they would be provided mobility training and skill development to enhance their independence. According to what was relayed, many inmates discovered upon arrival there was no program.

Communication from one inmate relayed that the Department began sending visually impaired inmates to MaCI after the closure of Orient Correctional Institution in 2002. *Reportedly there*

were 16 blind inmates sent to MaCI to participate in a proposed “Braille program” for the visually impaired. Reportedly, that program was never implemented.. Other inmates were temporarily housed at the Frazier Health Center located on the grounds of the former Orient Correctional Institution. According to correspondence, it also provided inadequate training for the blind, but it was staffed with a greater concentration of medical personnel who were reportedly more attuned to the needs of the blind and visually impaired as a consequence of their medical training. It may be a better utilization of resources to place these offenders in such a facility that has an infrastructure already suited to support the needs of offenders with disabilities.

The housing unit where many of the blind inmates are housed did not appear to have many accommodations for the visually impaired. The description of minimal resources cited by one blind inmate’s communication prior to the inspection reflected exactly what was observed on site. It is difficult to understand how after years of not having any semblance of a “program” for the visually impaired, that the resources available in the unit housing the blind would be so inadequate even prior to the VVSC evaluation. The room designated for blind inmates reflected that little priority has been given to acquire adequate resources needed to learn Braille or other instructional aides to enhance the blind inmate’s ability to cope with his disability. *The Braille room appeared unorganized, books were old and worn, and there appeared to be few other instructional resources to assist them.* According to staff, a computer will eventually be installed in the room for visually impaired inmates to learn to use. As one inmate had described the room in previous correspondence to the CIIC:

This institution also provides the Visually Impaired with a small room called the Braille-Room where six people can fit in it at one time. They have a bookshelf with worn-out, out-dated Braille books, Perkins Brailier, and a couple of old games for the Visually Impaired that have pieces missing or worn out. They have a CCTV in this room and a regular TV. This room is supposed to be for the Visually Impaired only, but the Officers that work here let anyone go into this room. That’s why game pieces are missing and Braille Books are tore up because they steal the Braille paper.

In follow up communication from the Department, the staff relayed that they instructed the blind inmates to inform staff whenever general population inmates use their room. Furthermore, staff reportedly posted signs instructing the general population inmates that the Braille room is for the blind inmates only.

According to the inmate communication, staff members responsible for ensuring that the blind’s needs are addressed, are perceived as reluctant to assume the additional duties. One blind inmate who frequently communicates with the CIIC relays that attempting to contact the staff responsible for assisting the blind is oftentimes difficult. According to their correspondence, the ADA Coordinator appointed a Case Manager as facilitator and the Program Manager, but that staff member is reportedly not even located in the same unit as the blind inmates. According to the communication:

...But we have problems getting him [the case manager] to have any meetings with us, and he is in another unit and sometimes it is really hard to catch him in his office. We cannot get any answers to any questions....We cannot obtain any supplies to assist us in learning Mobility Training, or every-day life skills training. We cannot obtain any type of recreational supplies. We have problems obtaining any blind-aids. When we find someone that we can trust, the Unit Manager gives us a hard time getting them reclassified. Most of the time he will reclass inmates no one knows or asked for.

The inmate further reiterated these concerns in later correspondence, relaying that staff person responsible for assisting inmates with disabilities is difficult to communicate with. According to an excerpt from his correspondence below, he shares his frustration.

The ADA Coordinator does not communicate with the Visually Impaired here. We send "KITES" to her and she sends it right back telling us to contact our Facilitator..., who returns it to us saying see the Unit Manager...,who tells us he has nothing to do with the Blind or the ADA. If we have a problem then we should see the Institutional Inspector. As you can see by now, we never get an answer all we get is the run around."

The CIIC submitted a written inquiry to the institution regarding these allegations. In their response, **staff refuted the allegations, and added that the staff communicates frequently with the blind inmates at monthly meetings especially in regard to the implementation of the VVSC recommendations to assist visually impaired inmates. The response from staff also denied that the program facilitator refused to answer kites or other communication from blind inmates. The staff who authored the response to CIIC's inquiry stated that many of the inmate's allegations could not be substantiated or could be refuted through documentation possessed by institutional staff. They also denied that inmates are ever given the run around, and instead are directed to contact the appropriate department or staff member responsible for the issue of concern.**

Several inmates also commented that the Correctional Officers are *disrespectful towards blind inmates*, and insinuate that inmates are "*running a good scam.*" One Officer allegedly told a blind inmate that, "You see better than me." **During the inspection, one Officer even made a similar remark to a CIIC Inspector that supported the inmate's allegation.** According to the Officer's comment, "*the blind inmates are only blind when you are watching them.* Lack of empathy will intensify the level of hostility between the two groups if this is a persistent attitude among staff when blind inmates who are highly dependent on staff are already frustrated with their situation.

Based on communication to the CIIC from blind inmates regarding the use of other inmates to assist the blind, there seems to have been a *problem selecting appropriate candidates* for this task in the past. Inmates have complained that the aides *mishandle food trays, and have stolen*

property from the inmates they are supposed to care for. Some blind inmates have communicated that they have been preyed upon and sometimes assaulted by inmates assigned to be their aides. According to correspondence, the staff has sometimes assigned other inmates as blind aides that did not request to be aides, or have assigned inmates that are unknown to the blind and therefore are resentful and/or not trusted. One inmate relayed in his communication that the institution:

Staff provides us inmates to lead us around so we can make it to meals and to any passes we may have, they also take us to the Recreation Department and walk us around the track if they feel like it, if this inmate does not feel like taking us anywhere we are stuck. Some of us have no choice but to place a hand on the shoulder or elbow of the inmate escort in order to go anywhere, but some of the inmates [the Program Facilitator] assigns as escorts, refuse to lend us a hand or help us in any way due to the fact they don't like to be touched. We report any blind-aide that refuses to do the assigned job [to the Program Facilitator or the ADA Coordinator or the Unit Manager] but nothing happens....Therefore we have nine visually impaired inmates, ten blind-aids but only five of them work, and the Program Facilitator and the rest of the staff want to give me grief for bringing this to their attention. I've filed complaint after complaint and grievance after grievance and appeal after appeal, and still nothing has been done.

The coordination and quality of some of the inmates chosen by staff to assist the blind has been cited as concerns for several years. According to communication to CIIC in 2006, the inmate relayed that he was left without an aide, and when he attempted to find his way to the dining facility he injured himself. At the time, the institution replied to a verbal inquiry from CIIC that blind inmates were not designated a dedicated blind aide, but that a pool of blind aides assisted the inmates as necessary.

In another instance, the inmate's assigned blind aide went on a round trip to CMC leaving the blind inmate without any assistance. According to the letter, he was not provided a temporary replacement even after allegedly requesting one from the Officer in the unit, and did not get his medications, an evening meal, or an opportunity to bathe himself. He relayed that he often missed classes, and often did not get out for exercise.

In further correspondence, an inmate provided a staff member's response to an inmate's kite regarding this situation, which stated that the inmate was "welcome to ask anyone to assist you. This is a reoccurring problem with you which leads me to believe that the problem is you and not the blind aides." The responses from certain staff members in several copies of documentation tended to reflect the inmates' allegations that the blind inmates are "scorned" by some staff due to the extra assistance they require. Some staff communication shared with the CIIC by inmates reflects an attitude that it is acceptable to dismiss the blind inmate's demands by blaming them for their situation.

An inmate on site relayed that he is confrontational with staff because the staff are aware of what needs to be done, but they will not do what is necessary to address the problems. One blind inmate relayed that he needs a replacement cane. According to him, his cane is too short and

broken, and needs a cane that is 32 inches. Reportedly, even though he used the grievance procedure, he reportedly waited over two weeks with no action being taken by staff. Another blind inmate reported that the handicapped toilet in the recreation area was inoperable.

There also seems to have been problems with the appropriate selection of other inmates to cell with blind inmates. One inmate relayed that he was being threatened by his cellie who was also suspected of stealing his property. Reportedly in spite of requests for assistance and reporting that the two were at the point of a serious confrontation, the staff member's response in the kite stated that they would move the blind inmate, not the cellie, even though the blind inmate was in the same cell for nearly three years. The staff member's frustration with the inmate was on full display in his response to the kite as his choice of words were curt and reflected little empathy for the inmate's problem. The fact that the inmate had been in the same cell for so long was of little significance to the staff member, and essentially told the inmate he was trapped in the cell with a potentially hostile cellie.

However, one inmate did relay that *now that the mobility program is starting, things are going better*. Prior to the program, the inmate relayed that he had to rely on other inmates to get around outside the housing unit. The inmate relayed that he was recently assigned a "blind aide" whose job is to help him get to meals and appointments, or with other activities of daily living. This inmate's blind aide relayed that the position is *voluntary and are supposed to be receiving special training that teaches them to provide assistance*. The inmate relayed that he was assigned to the position prior to the VVSC contract, and until the contract was signed, he *learned about being an aide by listening to the inmate he was responsible to provide care for, and learning from other blind aides*. He relayed that the job provides him with *a lot of satisfaction because it gives him the opportunity to put someone else before him*. However, the aide relayed that he was *recently reclassified to a lower security level and would be transferring out soon*. This remark also echoes a similar theme often written about by the blind. *Many relay that there is a lack of continuity among the blind aides, and many aides frequently come and go from the program*.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

The following is an overview of the visually impaired program to date:

- *The ODRC provided an Alien Grant in partnership with the Vision & Vocational Services (V&VS) committed to serving inmates at MaCI with diagnosed visual disabilities. Services include: optometric examinations; functional assessments to evaluate how low vision aids such as magnifiers and lighting can improve a person's use of vision; traditional rehabilitation teaching services such as: personal adjustment training in daily living skills; orientation mobility training to teach safe traveling and navigation of the environment; computer adaptive training; and closed circuit television evaluation.*

- *Since the onset of the initial grant, MaCI has received more offenders in need of this service. We are currently inquiring the availability of future grants to continue stated services.*

- **Transfers**

When vision impaired inmates arrive at MaCI they are housed in Adams D unit on Zone A or to Monroe A on Zone B. These units are set up with accommodations for the visually impaired. If an inmate arrives and has not been defined as vision impaired but he seems to have problems adjusting, due to vision problems, a staff member (a C.O. or a unit staff member) will report the issue to the medical staff or a supervisor. The inmate is then sent to the medical department for a preliminary evaluation to determine if the inmate meets the initial criteria as a vision impaired inmate. If the inmate meets the criteria he will be moved to Adams D or Monroe A, while he awaits an evaluation by the institutional Optician to confirm the need for permanent placement in the vision impaired unit.

- **Blind Aides**

The vision impaired inmates are housed in specialized units which also house general population inmates. They are housed with inmates of all ages and backgrounds. The dorms in which the vision impaired inmates are housed are not dorms that house only young inmates with a history of discipline problems. The dorms are not disciplinary dorms.

The vision impaired inmates have access to blind aides at all times. If their aide is on a visit and the back up aide is also unavailable all of the vision impaired inmates have been instructed to let the officer know they need help. The officer will assign someone to take the vision impaired inmate where he needs to go.

Blind Aides are housed in the same unit as the vision impaired inmates. Many of the aides share a cell with the vision impaired inmate that they are assigned to as a guide. Some of the aides and the vision impaired inmates do not wish to share a cell. Blind aides are always on call unless they have visits, medical appointments etc. As stated above when they are not available the assigned back up aides take over as guides or the dorm officer will assign an inmate to assist the vision impaired inmate.

The final selection of the blind aides is made by unit staff however; most of the vision impaired inmates let staff know who they want as an aide. Most of the blind aides are hired through word of mouth from the vision impaired inmates after staff reviews the aide's institution record. There continues to be turnover of aides due to conflict with

the vision impaired inmate, refusal to do the assignment, or conduct reports. If an aide refuses to work with the vision impaired inmate he is removed from the position and can face a conduct report for refusal to carry out a job assignment. Staff members do not expect the vision impaired inmate to act as the aide's supervisor however; the vision impaired inmate is told that if he is having a problem with his aide he must let staff know there is an issue. If staff is not aware of an issue they can not address the problem.

The blind aides have been trained by the mobility specialist of the Vision and Vocational Services. This is a component that was written into the grant. It is a component that will remain in the grant.

- **Confidential Communications**

The computer in the Braille room for the vision impaired offenders has been installed and is operational on Zone A (medium side). The Network Administrator is in the process of getting a computer for our newly developed Braille Room on Zone B (minimum side).

- **Braille Labeling**

The microwaves have Braille buttons on them that cannot be removed. The walls by the doorway of the cells of the vision impaired inmates do have Braille identifying the cell as vision impaired. The washers and dryers will have holes drilled beside the wash & dry cycles. Label makers are available in the commissary if any inmate wishes to purchase one.

- **Locks**

A lock has been located to assist visually impaired offenders and will be sold in the commissary in the coming month.

- *In 2009, Warden Cook formed a back to basics committee to address communication and professionalism. A lesson plan was created and taught during November 2009 during annual in-service. (CIIC staff note: The lesson plan was provided for review, but is unable to be included in this report due to incompatible software.)*

PROGRAMS OVERVIEW

The Department provides rehabilitative programming opportunities to inmates as one element of their underlying philosophy and belief that inmates who are productive during their incarceration are less likely to return to prison. The Department attempts to determine what programs are needed through assessment of the offender's needs and placing them into the appropriate educational, vocational, and recovery services programs that will meet those identified needs during incarceration.

Although a significant portion of the prison population in Ohio is serving a year or less, according to the DRC Director's testimony on November 10, 2009, the Department has begun to provide more programming to address the needs of this short term population. These include certification programs for career enhancement, advanced job training, apprenticeships, Adult Basic Education, Pre-GED, and transition education programs. *The Director proudly relayed that his staff have helped inmates earn 12,767 certificates for completing programs of this form to date in 2009.* Table 1 below highlights the number of inmates who have successfully completed these programs at MaCI through October 2009.

However, there are a host of serious factors that make providing the programming a challenge for the Department to accomplish. The decreased number of program staff due to layoffs, a historically larger prison population, as well as the changing composition of the inmate population are factors forcing the Department to retool their approach to programming due to a decreased amount of resources. Despite these challenges, the resiliency of staff working in the Department to provide a high quality of programming is astounding and should be commended.

The hemorrhaging of program staff positions due to layoffs has been partially compensated with the use of volunteers from the community. According to the Warden, he is pleased with the services provided by volunteers, and reported great success with the programming and services they provide. Currently there are at least *35 citizens that provide faith based religious programming* to the inmates that are housed in the faith based housing unit located in Zone B. However, if more programming staff are cut and not replaced through volunteers, it is difficult to see how the Department will be able to provide the programming which will allow a significant number of inmates to participate in programs associated with earned credit.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The inmate handbook provides inmates with information regarding the range of educational opportunities that inmates can take advantage of while incarcerated. The following information describes these opportunities.

Kaleidoscope Literacy: Minimum security inmates who read at or below a 6.0 grade equivalent must participate in literacy instruction. They may choose to enter Pre-GED classes upon demonstration of a 6.1 or better reading grade equivalent. The primary instructional areas are reading comprehension and arithmetic.

Pre-General Educational Development (PRE-GED): Minimum security inmates who score a 6.1-9.0 grade equivalent on the reading portion of the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) standardized achievement test and who cannot demonstrate that they have earned a high school diploma or GED must participate in Pre-GED instruction for at least two quarters to prepare for the high school equivalency examination. They learn reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science.

General Education Development: Medium and close-security inmates who score at least a 9.1 grade equivalent in reading may participate in GED instruction to prepare for the high school equivalency examination. The primary instructional areas are reading comprehension, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science.

Ohio Central High School: Medium and close-security inmates ages 16-21 must participate in high school instruction for at least two quarters if they lack a high school diploma or GED. These classes prepare students to complete the state minimum requirements for a high school diploma. The primary instructional areas are reading comprehension, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science.

High School Options: Inmates who are within three credits of receiving a high school diploma pre the state minimum standards may participate in the high school options course. The primary instructional areas are reading comprehension, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science.

Postsecondary Education: Columbus State Community College offers to both minimum and medium security inmates classes in business management, psychology, ethics, mathematics, and accounting.

Special Education: Inmates who arrive at MACI with an active Individualized Instruction Plan (IEP) or who are referred by education staff and who ultimately demonstrate appropriate test scores receive services from two special education teachers.

The institution also employs inmate Tutors and Library Aides who assist other inmates in meeting their academic goals and research needs.

Tutors: Tutors are employed mostly in the Hope Literacy and Kaleidoscope areas. Several others assist students in Pre-GED, GED, high school, and college.

Library Aides: Library aides are employed in both the minimum and close security schools. They process materials for circulation, help inmates locate materials, and assist inmates with their legal papers.

Table 10. MaCI Education Statistics for October 2009 (Zone A&B Combined)

Program	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	# of Certificates		% Attained Goals			
					Month	YTD	QTR	YTD		
Literacy	57	12	125	184	0	36	0	100%		
ABLE	6	4	14	95	0	0	0	100%		
Pre-GED	72	26	125	239	0	10	0	100%		
GED	28	11	59	72	1	8	0	100%		
HS/HS	77	77	117	0	5	5	0	100%		
Academic	240	130	440	590	6	59	0	100%		
Career-Tech (by program)	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	# of Certificates		% Attained Goals			
					Month	YTD	QTR	YTD		
AOT	14	7	17	8	4	4	0	100%		
Horticulture	23	3	28	218	0	0	0	100%		
Career Tech Total	37	10	45	226	4	4	0	100%		
Special	26	26	27	0	0	0				
Title One										
EIPP										
TEP	12	1	12	48	0	12				
YTP										
ESL										
Career Enhancement	38	31	39	48	0	12				
					50%	100%	50%	100%		
Apprenticeship	30	0	31	0	1	1	2	1		
	For Month	< 22	YTD	Waiting List	Program Cert.		1-Year Cert.		2-Year Cert.	
					Term	YTD	Term	YTD	Term	YTD
Advanced Job Training	38	4	42	0	16	16	0	0	0	0

	For Month	< 22	YTD
Total GEDs	0		51
Total GEDs	0		24
Literacy Tutors	18		19
Other Tutors	8		8
Tutors Trained	0	17	
Tutor Hours	445		2,353
Children served in	0		0
Narrator Hours	44		44
Work Keys	10		10

CAREER TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

Horticulture: Skills taught include landscaping, and plant management. A certificate from the Ohio Department of Education and vocational portfolio area awarded when the student demonstrates to the teacher competence of major tasks. Average completion is ten months.

Automated Office Technologies: Skills taught include office procedures, computer program applications, keyboarding, communications, records management, finances, and support tasks, A certificate from the Ohio Department of Education and a vocational portfolio are awarded when the student demonstrates to the teacher competence of major tasks. Average completion is ten months.

Building Maintenance: Skills taught include carpentry, electric wiring, plumbing, masonry, and interiors. A certificate from the Ohio Department of Education and a vocational portfolio area awarded when the student demonstrates to the teacher competence in five major categories of skills. Average completion is ten months.

APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

Apprenticeship programs are available to inmates, and are recognized by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Animal Trainer: Inmates can earn a certificate in the training and handling of canines. The skills learned include health maintenance, kennel management, and commands training. Average completion for a full certificate is two years or 4,000 hours of work.

Boiler Operator: inmates can earn a certificate in the operation of steam boilers. The skills learned include combustion, instrumentation, emergencies, turbines, lubrications, and piping. Average completion for a full certificate is four years or 8,000 work hours.

Computer Peripheral Equipment Operator: Inmates can earn a certificate in the operation of computer peripherals. The skills learned include work processing, spreadsheets, using databases, installing and configuring equipment, and commercial grade printing and publishing. Average completion for a full certificate is four years or 8,000 work hours.

Electrical Maintenance: Inmates can earn a certificate in the installation and repair of electrical systems. The skills learned included transformers, wiring, conduit, power distribution, and controls. Average completion for a full certificate is four years or 8,000 work hours.

Electrical Appliance Repair: Inmates can earn a certificate in the repair of electrical appliances. The skills learned include controls, instrumentation, a great variety of appliances, and the business of repairs. Average completion for a full certificate is three years or 6,000 work hours.

Electronic Technician: Inmates can earn a certificate in designing, installing, and repairing electronic components. The skills learned included communication equipment, supplies and sales, maintenance agreements, parts inventories, testing, and computer hardware and software. Average completion for a full certificate is four years or 8,000 work hours.

Environmental Controller: Inmates can earn a certificate in installing and repairing environmental control systems. The skills learned included ductwork, piping, wiring, sheet metal: heating and cooling systems and their equipment. Average completion for a full certificate is three years or 6,000 work hours.

Janitor: Inmates can earn a certificate in cleaning and housekeeping. The skills learned include safety and sanitation, floor care, time management, and chemical applications. Average completion for a full certificate is one year or 2,000 work hours.

Maintenance Repairer: Inmates can earn a certificate in building maintenance. The skills learned include carpentry, surface and grounds maintenance and cleaning, electrical and air quality systems, and plumbing. Average completion for a full time certificate is two years or 4,000 work hours.

Painter: Inmates can earn a certificate in surface preparation and painting. The skills learned include safety, material and tool handling, mixing colors, striping and texturing, and clean up. Average completion for a full certificate is three years or 6,000 work hours.

Plumber: Inmates can earn a certificate in plumbing. The skills learned include pipe fitting, installation, and repair. Average completion for a full certificate is four years or 8,000 work hours.

Welder: Inmates can earn a certificate in welding. The skills learned include ARC, MIG, TIG, and oxy-acetylene welds, theory, flame, cutting, and brazing. Average completion for a full certificate is three years or 6,000 work hours.

***EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:
LEARNING SKILLS AND WORK ACTIVITIES***

2. Are prisoners encouraged and enabled to learn, and do they have access to good library facilities? **Education-yes**
3. Is sufficient purposeful activity available for the total prisoner population? **No Education, No Recovery Services-some inmates report that there are not enough programs and/or education programs however, many inmates have more than three years left to serve and may not be able to be admitted.**
4. 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? **Education-yes.**
5. 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? **Education-yes. Recovery Services-I don't know if an assessment is completed for learning and work. All inmates are assessed for substance abuse issues.**
 - a. Does provision meet the needs of older, younger adult, and disabled? **Education-yes. Recovery services-I don't know if an assessment is completed for learning and work. All inmates are assessed for substance abuse issues.**
6. Are there sufficient activity places to occupy the population purposefully during the core working day? **Education-no. Recovery Services-I believe the program space is somewhat limited.**
 - a. How many prisoners are locked up during the day?
 - b. How many are formally registered as unassigned?
 - c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population?
 - d. How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job? **Recovery Services offers limited Jobs and programs cycle on a 90 day basis.**

7. Are activities that fall outside the learning and skills provision purposeful and designed to enhance prisoners' self-esteem and their chances of successful reentry? **Education-yes.**
8. Are facilities and resources for learning and skills and work appropriate, sufficient and suitable for purpose? **Education-yes. Recovery Services uses TV rooms, chapel classrooms, and visiting rooms.**
9. Are all prisoners able to access activity areas? **Education-yes. Recovery Services-I believe yes.**
 - a. Is there access for older and disabled prisoners? **Yes**
 - b. Are there any inaccessible areas because of poor mobility and insufficient help to get to them? **Recovery services-not to my knowledge. Education-no.**
10. 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? **Recovery services excludes those who don't have substance abuse issues and those who have Mental Health/Medical/Emotional impairments until remedied or stabilized.**
 - a. Is a full schedule of activities available to all prisoners? **Unknown. Education-yes.**
11. Is allocation to activity places equitable, transparent, and based on identified reentry planning needs? **Recovery services-yes, Education-yes.**
12. Can prisoners apply for job transfers and are they given written reasons for any decisions? **Education-yes.**
 - a. Does case management link with the reentry planning process? **Education-yes**
 - b. Do prisoners with identified learning needs work in low-skilled, production line work, rather than relevant classes? **Education-no**
 - c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures? **Education-assigned by unit classification committees according to need per institution inmate table of organization.**
 - d. Is there any favoritism or line jumping? **Recovery services bases enrollment on strict criteria in order to avoid favoritism or skipping appropriate participants.**
13. Do local pay schedules provide disincentives for prisoners to engage in education or training activities? **Education-yes.**

- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities? **Education in some instances.**
14. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay? **Education-yes**
15. Do prisoners who are unemployed through no fault of their own or who are exempt from working unlocked during the day, provided with access to the library and other activities? **Education-yes.**
16. Does the prison have an effective strategy to ensure that learners are able to regularly and punctually attend those activities that meet their needs and aspirations? **Recovery services uses job reclassification to ensure participants do not have scheduling conflicts. Inmates can participate in other programs that do not conflict with our schedule.**
- a. What systems are in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities? **Recovery services-job reclassification, pass sheets, schedules are provided , and at times discipline is enacted for those who do not abide by program rules. Education-classed into jobs as students postings in the units re: special events and classes.**
17. 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? **I believe so. Education yes.**
18. 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? **Assessments are the criteria for admission to recover services programs. Education-yes.**
19. Do work placements provide purposeful and structured training for prisoners? **Recovery services program is structured and purposeful and meets the substance abuse domain on the dynamic assessment. Education-yes.**
- a. Wherever possible, can vocational qualifications be obtained alongside their work? **Recovery service-unknown. Education-Yes.**
- b. In the absence of such qualifications, are developed skills recognized and recorded? **In recovery services, treatment files are completed, certificates of completion are issued and RAP screens are completed. Education-yes.**

20. Are prisoners helped to continue on their courses when transferred or to progress to further education, training or employment on release? **Recovery services contracts Regional CDS staff to assist participants with community resources once the participant completes programming. Education-yes.**
21. Does the prison accurately record the purposeful activity hours that prisoners engage in, excluding non-purposeful activities in their calculations? **Recovery services documents all hours of participation. Education-yes.**
-
-

CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS:

ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENTS

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

The CIIC relies on communication from staff and inmates in the Ohio prisons to assist in identifying problems, issues, concerns and/or areas in need of improvement. The following section includes communication received through contacts and reported concerns primarily by letter in 2009.

CIIC CONTACTS AND REPORTED CONCERNS

The CIIC documents all contacts made with the CIIC office from inmates, their families and/or friends, and facility staff. These contacts are recorded in a database for each biennium. From the beginning of the current biennium, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009, the CIIC has received 76 *contacts* relaying 314 *concerns* regarding the Madison Correctional Institution, ranking *11th among all Ohio prisons*. As of March 18, 2010, the number of contacts since January 1, 2009 regarding Madison Correctional Institution is 107, and the number of reported problems, issues or concerns totals 412.

The following table displays the number of contacts and concerns regarding MaCI from January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009 in order from the largest category of reported concern (Staff Accountability) to the least reported category of concerns (telephones, visiting, records, etc.).

Table 11. CIIC Contacts and Concerns for MaCI, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009

Staff Accountability	
Failure to Follow Policies	25
Failure to Perform Job	20
Access to Staff	9
Failure to Respond to Communication	8
TOTAL	66
Supervision	
Unprofessional Conduct	16
Retaliation for Voicing Complaints	11
Harassment	8
Intimidation Threats	8
Retaliation for Filing Grievance	7
Abusive Language	5
Conduct Report for No Reason	5
Other	3
Privacy Violation	2
TOTAL	65
Health Care	
Improper/Inadequate Health Care	10
Access/Delay Receiving Medical Care	8
Medical Transfer	4
Delay/Denial of Medication	3
Medical Aid/Device	3
Medical Records	2
Disagree with Diagnosis	2
Other	2
TOTAL	34
Inmate Grievance Procedure	
Inspector	19
Informal Complaint	8
Chief Inspector	5
Other	1
TOTAL	21
Non-Grievable Procedure	
APA	6
Court	5
RIB/Hearing Officer	3
Separate Appeal Process	2
Legislative Action	1
Transitional Control	1
TOTAL	18

Institutional Assignment	
Transfer or Denial	12
TOTAL	12
Dental Services	
Access/Delay in Receiving Dental Care	3
Improper/Inadequate Dental Care	1
Delay/Denial of Dentures	1
Dental Co-Pay	1
TOTAL	7
Special Management Housing	
Placement	6
Release	1
TOTAL	7
Safety and Sanitation	
Air/Water Quality	2
Overcrowding	1
Handicapped Facilities	1
Unsafe Living Areas	1
Dirty Living Quarters/Work Areas	1
TOTAL	6
Personal Property	
Stolen or Damage by and Inmate	4
Lost-Damaged-Confiscated	1
Denied Possession to Receive/Possess	1
TOTAL	6
Recreation	
Recreation Facilities/Equipment	3
Improper/Inadequate Access	1
Recreation Hours	1
Other	1
TOTAL	6
Discrimination	
Other	3
Housing Assignment	1
Programs	1
TOTAL	5
Force	
Use of Force with No Report	3
Reported Use of Force	2
TOTAL	5

Facility Maintenance	
Toilets	1
Showers/Sinks	1
Ventilation	1
Windows	1
Others	1
TOTAL	5
Food Service	
Unsanitary Cooking Conditions	2
Foreign Object in Food	1
Other	1
Foreign Object in Food	1
TOTAL	5
Commissary	
Inadequate Selections	2
Denied Commissary Privileges	1
Pricing	1
TOTAL	4
Security Classification	
Procedural Issues	3
Other	1
TOTAL	4
Protective Control	
Personal Safety	3
Separation	1
TOTAL	4
Other	
Other	4
TOTAL	4
Mail	
Delay /Failure in Sending	1
Handling of Legal Mail	1
Postage Charges	1
TOTAL	3
Educational/Vocational Training	
Other	2
Educational Program	1
TOTAL	3

Housing Assignment	
Unit Assignment	2
TOTAL	2
Inmate Account	
State Pay	1
Court Ordered Collections	1
TOTAL	2
Recovery Services	
Recovery Services Programs	1
Mandatory Program Placement	1
TOTAL	2
Laundry/Quartermaster	
Denied Item	1
TOTAL	1
Library	
Library Materials	1
TOTAL	1
Visiting	
Visitor Not Approved/Removed From List	1
TOTAL	1
Telephone	
Inadequate Access	1
TOTAL	1
Records	
Release of Information	1
TOTAL	1

The following table displays information regarding the number of contacts and concerns from the prisons in Ohio with the largest volume of contacts and concerns. As of November 3, 2009, the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility continues to account for the *highest* number of reported concerns communicated to the CIIC.

The Madison Correctional Institution ranked 11th in number of contacts received by the CIIC, sharing the 11th rank with Warren Correctional Institution, each with 76 contacts. Madison Correctional Institution ranks tenth in number of reported problems, issues or concerns received by the CIIC with 314 reported concerns from January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009.

Table 12 . CIIC Number of Contacts Received from the Top 15 Institutions, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009

RANK	Institution	Number of Contacts	Percent
1	SOCF	429	24.01%
2	Mansfield CI	227	12.70
3	Chillicothe CI	135	7.55
4	Pickaway CI	119	6.66
5	Toledo CI	111	6.21
6	London CI	99	5.54
7	Lebanon CI	89	4.98
8	Marion CI	88	4.92
9	Grafon CI	83	4.64
10	Lake Erie CI	80	4.48
11	Warren CI	76	4.25
11	Madison CI	76	4.25
12	Trumbull CI	60	3.36
13	Ohio State Penitentiary	59	3.3
14	Allen CI	56	3.13
(Top 15 prisons)	Total	1,787	100%

Table 13. Number of Reported Concerns Regarding Top 15 Institutions, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009

Rank	Institution	Total Concerns	Percent
1	SOCF	2,287	29.09%
2	Mansfield CI	936	11.91
3	Toledo CI	559	7.11
4	Chillicothe CI	533	6.78
5	Pickaway CI	464	5.90
6	London CI	402	5.11
7	Warren CI	366	4.66
8	Lebanon CI	351	4.47
9	Marion CI	333	4.24
10	Madison CI	314	3.99
11	Grafon CI	310	3.94
12	Lake Erie CI	271	3.45
13	Trumbull CI	275	3.50
14	Ohio State Penitentiary	247	3.14
15	Allen CI	213	2.71
(Top 15 prisons)	Total	7,861	100%

The following table displays information on the ten largest categories of concern reported to CIIC from all institutions in the state, and the top three institutions with the largest numbers of complaints in the categories. The Madison Correctional Institution is **not** among the top three institutions in reported concerns in any of the top ten categories of concerns system-wide.

Table 14. Top Ten Reported Concerns to CIIC System Wide, with Top Three Institutions in Each Category of Concern, January 1, 2009 to November 3, 2009

Highest Area of Concern Reported System Wide	Total Reported Concerns System Wide	Top Three Institutions Per Category of Reported Concern		
		Institution Ranking #1 in Subject Category	Institution Ranking #2 in Subject Category	Institution Ranking #3 in Subject Category
Staff Accountability	1,611	S. Ohio CF-389	Mansfield CI-164	Chillicothe CI-96
Supervision	1,414	S. Ohio CF-455	Mansfield CI-83	Chillicothe CI-78
Health Care	925	S. Ohio CF-224	Chillicothe CI-111	Marion CI-59
Inmate Grievance Procedure	718	S. Ohio CF-155	Mansfield CI-65	London CI-54
Non-Grievable	623	S. Ohio CF-100	Mansfield CI-87	Chillicothe CI-36
Inmate Relations	417	S. Ohio CF-112	Mansfield CI-102	Toledo CI-28
Institution Assignment	407	S. Ohio CF-95	Mansfield CI-59	Toledo CI-28
Housing Assignment	370	S. Ohio CF-60	Toledo CI-13	Allen CI/PCI-11
Protective Control	312	S. Ohio CF-104	Mansfield CI-168	Toledo CI-20
Personal Property	299	S. Ohio CF-54	Mansfield CI-27	Toledo CI-20
Subtotal of Top Ten Subject Categories of Reported Concerns	7,096	SOCF- 10 OF 10	MANCI - 8 of 10 Chillicothe CI-1 Toledo CI -1	Toledo CI-4 Chillicothe CI-3 Allen CI-1 London CI-1 Marion CI-1 PCI-1

THE LIBRARY: CREATION OR EXPANSION OF MINORITY BOOK SECTIONS

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

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

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

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

There are dedicated librarian staff in the prisons. Unfortunately, a number of librarian positions have been left vacant due the budget problems. At some institutions, other staff volunteers 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 at maximum and high maximum security institutions are effectively in isolation indefinitely, sometimes for years. If they were provided with good biographies and even good self-help books, at least the materials would be filling their mind with something positive that may make a difference in their life. Reading can keep them mentally healthy, as well as make them think, which ultimately affects their actions.

Madison CI Library Walk-Through

According to information provided, the institution provides a wide variety of literature, media, and resources to inmates in the institution's library. Inmates have access to the library daily, including evenings and weekends. It is located in the Education building in a small but well

organized and maintained area. On the date of the inspection, there was a relatively large number of inmates in the library reading, or researching legal material on the computer using the Westlaw program.

According to staff, upon request, inmates can acquire the most up to date versions of the Department's Administrative Rules and Policies. In addition, inmates provide their identification badge to the staff in exchange for the Administrative Rule or Policy they are seeking to review. The institution's law library also reportedly contains the most up to date federal, state, and local codes needed by inmates. Furthermore, trained aides can provide assistance to inmates seeking help with forms and procedures.

The information provided states that there are also magazines, newspapers, and movies for viewing. Staff relayed that the USA Today is delivered daily. However, inmates inquired about the lack of local newspapers from the Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus areas. *According to staff, MACI has discontinued deliveries of local publications for the local newspapers due to budget concerns.*

A variety of educational material was available, including a study guide for the GED. Reflective of the increasing representation of Hispanic inmates in Ohio's prisons, there was at least one GED study guide published in Spanish.

MACI also has a system called Sharing Career Opportunities and Training Information (SCOTI) that allows inmates to work on their resumes. Reportedly, SCOTI is a job search and resume development system that links job seekers and potential employers together.

***EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:
LIBRARY***

1. Does the prison have an effective strategy for maximizing access to and use of a properly equipped, organized library, managed by trained staff? **Yes**
 - a. How do prisoners with mobility problems get access? **Blind aides, walking canes, and wheel chairs.**
2. Are the library materials broadly reflective of the different cultures and needs of the prison population, including Braille, talking books, and foreign language books? **Yes**
3. Do all prisoners have access to a range of library materials, which reflect the population's needs and support learning and skills? **Yes**
4. Does this include:
 - a. Literacy? **Yes**

b. Math? **Yes**

c. Language? **Yes**

d. Employability? **Yes**

e. Vocational training? **Yes**

f. Social and life skills? **Yes**

5. Do library materials include a comprehensive selection of up-to-date legal textbooks and DRC Administrative Rules and DRC Policies? **Yes**
-
-

CIIC STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:

EVALUATION OF THE INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The Statute requires the CIIC to evaluate and report on the grievance procedure at each institution. The grievance procedure is described in Administrative Rule 5120-9-31. The inmate grievance procedure is the administrative process through which inmates can attempt to have any problem resolved regarding nearly “...*any aspect of institutional life that directly and personally affects the grievant. This may include complaints regarding policies and procedures, conditions of confinement, or the actions of institutional staff.*” However, per the administrative rule, the grievance procedure will **not** address decisions on conduct reports “or those issues or actions which already include an appeal mechanism beyond the institutional level or where a final decision has been rendered by central office staff. Other matters that are not grievable include complaints unrelated to institutional life, such as legislative action, policies and decisions of the Adult Parole Authority, judicial proceedings and sentencing or complaints whose subject matter is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the courts or other agencies.”

The process consists of three steps, the informal complaint, the notification of grievance, and appeal to the Chief Inspector. The informal complaint is addressed to the supervisor of the staff member or department giving rise to the complaint. If the filing of an informal complaint does not resolve the issue to the inmate’s satisfaction, the inmate can file a notification of grievance with the Institutional Inspector, who will investigate the grievance. Upon conclusion of the investigation, the Inspector will issue a disposition to the inmate explaining the results of any investigation that was conducted. Inmates who are not satisfied with the Inspector’s disposition can appeal the Inspector’s disposition to the Chief Inspector at the DRC Central Office for further review of the grievance. The Chief Inspector can uphold (affirm), modify or reverse the Institutional Inspector’s disposition, or order the Institutional Inspector to investigate the matter further.

The facility staff shared that the most frequent subjects of *informal complaints filed by inmates pertain to Staff/Inmate Relations, Property, and Health Care Services*. This is consistent with the informal complaint data for January 2009 to November 2, 2009. The tables below show that the Staff/Inmate Relations category accounts for the highest number of *informal complaints*, followed by health care, and personal property. Inmates also filed the most *grievances* regarding health care, personal property, and staff inmate relations.

Table 15. Top Three Informal Complaint Categories for January 2009 to November 2, 2009 at the Madison Correctional Institution

Category of Complaint with Subcategory	Total Number of ICRs	Category Totals
Staff/Inmate Relations		
Supervision	216	
Unprofessional Conduct	86	
Abusive Language	45	
Other	41	
Intimidation	22	
Conduct Report for No Reason	10	
Retaliation	8	
Harassment	7	
Racial Slurs	7	
Accountability	65	
Use of Force	12	
Discrimination	10	
Use of Force with No Report	9	
TOTAL STAFF/INMATE RELATIONS		312
Health Care		301
Personal Property		220
Total		833
TOTAL NUMBER OF INFORMAL COMPLAINTS		1,780

According to the *Significant Incident Summary* data included in the most recent ACA report dated August 26, 2009, staff reported that there were *41 grievances resolved in favor of offenders from February 2008 to January 2009, of which 24 were regarding inmate property*.

The staff relayed that the health care concerns were mostly due to the medical department being in a period of transition related to the discontinuance of services of a medical provider. Other complaints frequently relayed were in regard to the physician requiring inmates to purchase over the counter medications from the commissary instead of prescribing them.

Inmate communication during the inspection relayed a generally negative perception about the grievance procedure, and the Institutional Inspector. Inmates reported frequent retaliation for filing informal complaints. Several inmates relayed being called into the Captain's office with several other staff for a "discussion" about their informal complaints. According to the inmates,

these “discussions” are intended to intimidate the inmates from pursuing their complaints through the grievance procedure.

A review of past communication to the CIIC from inmates at Madison CI contained similar content. One inmate relayed that when called into the Inspector’s office for a meeting, the interaction was “more like a trial” in which he was reportedly cross examined by the Inspector and the officer who was present. Other inmates referred to the inmate grievance procedure as a “joke” that only leads to retaliation in the form of shakedowns and the confiscation or destruction of property.

From January 1, 2009 through October 2009, *348 grievances were filed*. Information provided during the inspection shows *the top three categories which accounted for 179 grievances were health care services, personal property, and staff/inmate relations*. The information contained in the tables below is extracted from Institutional Inspector monthly reports which provide more detail on the subsections of each of the three categories. The categories of *Health Care and Personal Property* are self explanatory. However, the category *staff/inmate relations* encompasses a broader range of issues related to the interactions between staff and inmates that if left unmonitored can lead to an environment of hostility or animosity. The 71 Health Care grievances accounted for 20.4 percent of the institution’s grievances in the period. Within the subcategories of Health Care grievances, problems regarding Access/Delay in Receiving Medical Care accounted for 21.13 percent of the Health Care grievances.

The 58 Property grievances comprise 16.67 percent of their total grievances. The largest subcategory of property grievances is “Lost, Damaged, Confiscated by Staff” with 26, which comprises 44.83 percent of the Personal Property grievances.

**Table 16. Health Care Grievances: January 2009 to October 31, 2009,
Madison Correctional Institution**

Health Care	Number of Grievances Filed
Access/Delay in Receiving Medical Care	15 (21.13%)
Other	14
Delay/Denial of Medications	13
Medical Aid/Device	13
Medical Records	5
Improper/Inadequate Medical Care	4
Medical Transfer	3
Disagree with Diagnosis/Treatment	2
Eye Glasses	1
Medical Co-Pay	1
TOTAL	71

**Table 17. Personal Property Grievances: January 2009 to October 31, 2009,
Madison Correctional Institution**

Personal Property	Number of Grievances Filed
Lost/Damaged, Confiscated by Staff	26 (44.83%)
Stolen/Damaged by Inmate	13
Lost/Damaged during Transfer	10
Other	9
Total	58

**Table 18. Staff/Inmate Relations Grievances, January 2009 to October 31, 2009,
Madison Correctional Institution**

Staff/Inmate Relations	Number of Grievances Filed
Staff Accountability	
Other	11
Failure to Respond to Communication	6
Access to Staff	1
Failure to Perform Job Duties	1
Failure to Follow Policies	1
Total	20
Supervision	
Unprofessional Conduct	6
Harassment	4
Abusive Language	3
Racial Slurs	2
Intimidation/Threats	1
Retaliation for Filing Grievances	1
Other	1
Total	18
Force	
Use of Force with No Report	7
Other	2
Reported Use of Force	1
Total	10
Discrimination	
Other	2
Total	2
TOTAL	50

INSPECTOR ACTIVITY REPORTS

A review was made of the grievance information contained in the monthly reports from Madison Correctional Institution from January, 2009 through January 2010, which includes the monthly Inspector Activity Reports for 2009 and January 2010. The information has been entered in the tables below.

Administrative Rule 5120-9-29 outlines the duties of the inspector of institutional services as follows:

- **Facilitate all aspects of the inmate grievance procedure**, as established by rule 5120-9-31 of the Administrative Code.
- **Investigate and respond to grievances** filed by inmates;
- **Monitor the application of institutional and departmental rules and policies** affecting conditions of incarceration; and **report to the warden any noncompliance** including recommendations for corrective action;
- **Conduct regular inspections of institutional services and serve as a liaison** between the inmate population and institutional personnel;
- **Review and provide input on new or revised institutional policies**, procedures and post orders;
- **Provide training on the inmate grievance procedure** and other relevant topics;
- Perform **other duties as assigned by the warden or chief inspector which do not create a conflict** with (top two points)
- Submit all reports, documents, or other forms of **accountability of their work to the chief inspector and/or warden as directed.**

Areas Inspected

The following two tables provide information on the areas inspected by the Inspector, first by frequency, then in chronological order. As shown below, *segregation* referenced in the reports as Segregation, Adams A Segregation and Juvenile Segregation, received the most inspections from January 2009 through January 2010, with a combined 39 inspections.

The area that received the second most frequent inspections was *Infirmary/Medical* include the Zone A Infirmary, Zone B Infirmary, and Zone A and Zone B Medical, with a total of 28 inspections in the period. *Housing units* received from 13 to 25 inspections, plus six inspections consisting of three each of unspecified Zone A Housing Units and Zone B Housing Units. *Adams* received the most inspections at 25, followed by *Jefferson Unit* at 20, *Monroe* and *Washington*, each with 14 inspections, and *Banneker* with 13 inspections. *Food Services* received 11 inspections, including nine of Zone A Food Services. Six inspections were made of *Education*, with four in Zone A. *Libraries*, *Receiving and Recreation* each received five inspections in the 13 month period. Three inspections each occurred in *Commissary*, *Maintenance and the Warehouse*. *Ohio Penal Industries* was inspected twice. Only one inspection each occurred in *Visiting*, *Mental Health*, *Laundry/Quartermaster*, *Chapel* and *ADA*.

**Table 19. Areas Inspected by Madison Correctional Institution Inspector
January 2009 through January 2010 by Frequency**

Areas Inspected	Frequency of Inspections	Grouped Areas Inspected	Frequency of Inspections
Segregation	23	Segregation	39
Adams A Segregation	14		
Juvenile Segregation	2		
Zone A Infirmary	15	Infirmary/Medical	28
Zone B Infirmary	4		
Zone A Medical	8		
Zone B Medical	1		
Adams A	8	Adams Unit	25
Adams B	5		
Adams C	4		
Adams D	5		
Adams Housing Units (Unspecified)	3		
Jefferson A	4	Jefferson Units	20
Jefferson B	7		
Jefferson C	4		
Jefferson D	4		
Zone B Jefferson Housing Units (unspecified)	1		
Monroe A	3	Monroe	14
Monroe B	3		
Monroe C	5		
Monroe D	3		
Washington A	2	Washington Units	14
Washington B	1		
Washington C	2		
Washington D Housing Units	5		
Washington Units (Unspecified)	4		
Zone B Banneker A	2	Banneker Housing Units	13
Banneker B	1		
Banneker C	5		
Banneker D Housing Units	5		
Zone A Food Service	9	Food Service	11
Zone B Food Service	2		
Zone A Housing Units, Dorm Inspections	3	Housing Units (Unspecified)	6
Zone B Housing Units	3		
Zone A Education	4	Education	6
Zone B Education	2		
Zone A Library	4	Libraries	5
Zone B Library	1		
Zone B Receiving	3	Receiving	5
Zone A Receiving	2		
Zone B Recreation	3	Recreation	5
ZA Recreation	2		
Zone B Commissary	3	Commissary	3
Zone B Maintenance	2	Maintenance	3
Zone A Maintenance	1		
Warehouse	3	Warehouse	3
OPI	2	OPI	2
ZA Chapel	1	Chapel	1
ZB Visiting	1	Visiting	1
Zone B Mental Health	1	Mental Health	1
Zone B Laundry, Quartermaster	1	Laundry/Quartermaster	1
Ada (ADA)	1	ADA	1

**Table 20. Areas Inspected by Madison Correctional Institution Inspector,
January 2009 through January 2010, by Date**

Dates	Inspected Area
1-22-09	Law Library – Zone A, Segregation, Zone A Food Service, Zone A Infirmary
1-30-09	Adams A Segregation, All Zone B Housing Units & Recreation, Zone B Infirmary & Warehouse
2-11-09	Zone A Housing Units, Adams A Segregation
2-12-09	Segregation, Zone A Medical, Zone A Library, Zone A Receiving Area
2-17-09	Adams C/D Housing Units
2-20-09	Segregation, Zone A Medical
2-24-09	Warehouse
2-26-09	Zone B Jefferson Housing Units, Zone B Banneker C/D Housing Units, Segregation, Washington D Housing Units (observed 2.4 shakedown)
3-10-09	Zone B Mental Health
3-11-09	Segregation, ZA Food Service, Adams A & Adams A Segregation, Ada
3-12-09	Jefferson A/B
3-13-09	ZB Receiving, Commissary, Laundry, Quartermaster, ZB Maintenance
3-18-09	Segregation
3-23-09	Adams A, Adams A Segregation
3-24-09	Jefferson C/D, Banneker C/D, Monroe C
4-16-09	Jefferson C/D, Banneker A/B
4-17-09	Adams A Segregation, Segregation, WB, WC, WD, AA, AC, AD
4-23-09	AB, WA, ZA Food Service, ZB Recreation, ZB Education, ZB Library, OPI, Zone A Dorm Inspections
5-1-09	Segregation, ZA Infirmary, ZA Education
5-7-09	Segregation, ZA Infirmary
5-11-09	Adams D
5-12-09	ZA Housing, ZA Medical
5-15-09	ZB Housing, ZB Visiting
5-28-09	Segregation, ZA Medical
6-2-09	Zone B Medical
6-4-09	AA, AA Segregation, AB
6-9-09	Segregation
6-10-09	Zone A Medical
6-15-09	Zone A Medical, Adams Units, AA Segregation
6-18-09	Zone B Maintenance, Zone B Food Service, MC, MB
6-24-09	Zone A Food Service, Zone A Medical
6-26-09	Segregation
7-10-09	Juvenile Segregation
7-17-09	Segregation, Zone A Medical
7-27-09	Segregation, AB, AC, AD, WA, Zone A Food Service, Zone A Medical
7-30-09	Zone A Food Service, Juvenile Segregation

Dates	Inspected Area
8-7-09	Zone B Receiving, JA/JB, JD, Segregation
8-13-09	Zone A Infirmary
8-20-09	Zone A Education
8-26-09	Banneker A
8-28-09	Zone B Housing, Zone B Infirmary, Zone B Commissary
9-2-09	Jefferson B, Jefferson D
9-3-09	Segregation, AA Segregation, Adams & Washington Units, ZA Infirm
9-8-09	ZA Receiving, ZA Infirmary
9-11-09	Warehouse
9-15-09	ZB Food Service, ZB Receiving, ZB Infirmary, ZP OPI, ZB Commissary
9-22-09	Segregation, AA Segregation, Adams A, ZA Infirmary
9-24-09	Observed WA 2.4 Inspection
9-30-09	Observed AC 2.4 Inspection
10-2-09	ZA Food Service, Segregation, ZA Infirmary
10-5-09	Adams D
10-6-09	ZA Infirmary
10-15-09	Segregation, AA Segregation, AA, AB, AC, MC
10-19-09	WD
10-20-09	ZA Recreation, ZB Recreation
10-21-09	MA, MB, MC, MD, Banneker C/D
10-22-09	JA, JB, JC, JC, AA Segregation
11-3-09	MC/MD, ZA Receiving, ZA Maintenance, WD, ZA Library
11-4-09	MA
11-6-09	Segregation, ZA Infirmary
11-10-09	JA/JB ZB Education
11-12-09	AA, AA Segregation
11-17-09	Banneker C/D, ZA Infirmary, ZA Library/Education
11-23-09	Segregation, ZA Infirmary, AZ Food Service, JB
12-1-09	MA/MB, JB
12-4-09	Adams, Washington, AA Segregation
12-17-09	Segregation, ZA Infirmary
12-22-09	ZA Chapel, ZA Recreation, WA
12-24-09	ZA Food Service
12-28-09	ZA Infirmary, MD
1-8-10	Segregation, ZA Infirmary, ZA Education/Library
1-12-10	AD, WD, WC, AB, AA, AA Segregation
1-19-10	JC, BC/BD
1-20-10	Segregation
1-28-10	ZB Infirmary

Grievance Procedure Orientations

In the 13 month period from January 2009 through January 2010, the Inspector conducted 56 orientation sessions for inmates on the inmate grievance procedure, an average of 4.3 sessions per month. Five sessions were provided for staff in the period. The inmate sessions ranged in size from as few as five inmates to as large as 86 in a group. There was a monthly average of 213 inmates present at each session. Staff attending the orientation sessions ranged from as few as one to as large as five in a session. A total of 22 staff in the 13 month period attended an orientation session.

Table 21 . Inmate Grievance Procedure Orientations Presented with Number of Staff and Inmates in Attendance by Date January 2009 through January 2010

Orientation Dates	Inmates Attending IGP Orientation	Inmate Monthly Total	Orientation Dates	Staff Attending IGP Orientation	Staff Monthly Total
1-9-09	30				
1-16-09	61				
1-23-09	37				
1-30-09	86				
January 2009		214			0
2-6-09	84				
2-13-09	70				
2-20-09	40		2-19-09	2	
2-27-09	47				
February		241			2
3-6-09	68				
3-13-09	55				
3-20-09	50				
3-27-09	56				
March		229			0
4-3-09	52				
4-10-09	55				
4-17-09	44				
4-24-09	51				
April		202			0
5-8-09	60		5-7-09	2	
5-15-09	56				
5-22-09	53				
5-29-09	52				
May		221			2

Orientation Dates	Inmates Attending IGP Orientation	Inmate Monthly Total	Orientation Dates	Staff Attending IGP Orientation	Staff Monthly Total
6-5-09	43		6-5-09	2	
6-12-09	52				
6-19-09	37				
6-26-09	67				
June		199			2
7-3-09	33				
7-10-09	51		7-10-09	6	
7-17-09	59				
7-24-09	41				
7-31-09	47				
July		231			6
8-7-09	36		8-7-09	2	
8-14-09	51				
8-21-09	60				
8-28-09	55				
August		202			2
9-4-09	47		9-4-09	1	
9-11-09	56				
9-18-09	56				
9-25-09	64				
9-30-09	66				
September		289			1
10-2-09	5				
10-9-09	59		10-9-09	5	
10-16-09	56				
10-23-09	41				
10-30-09	51				
October		212			5
11-6-09	23		11-6-09	1	
11-13-09	54				
11-20-09	45				
11-27-09	42				
November		164			1
12-4-09	35		12-1-09	1	
12-11-09	20				
12-18-09	52				
12-25-09	29				
12-31-09	36				
December		172			1

Orientation Dates	Inmates Attending IGP Orientation	Inmate Monthly Total	Orientation Dates	Staff Attending IGP Orientation	Staff Monthly Total
1-8-10	46				
1-15-10	66				
1-22-10	42				
1-29-10	35				
January 2010		189			0
TOTAL	2,765	2,765		22	22
Monthly Average	212.69 Inmates	4.3 Groups/ Sessions		1.69 Staff	
Range	5-86 Group Range	164-289 Monthly Range		0-6 Group Range	0-6 Monthly Range 0-1 Sessions
Number of Groups/Sessions	56 Sessions			5 Sessions	

Kites

In the 13 month period from January 2009 through January 2010, the Inspector received a total of 1,557 kites from inmates, a monthly average of 120, with a range of 50 in October to as high as 229 in June 2009.

Court of Claims Property Investigations/Approved Settlements

According to the Administrative Rule, if an inmate has a claim against the DRC for the loss of or damage to personal property and the amount claimed does not exceed \$300, before commencing an action against the DRC in the court of claims of Ohio, the inmate must file the claim as a grievance directly to the Inspector of Institutional Services. The Rule further states that the Inspector must provide a written response to the claim as a grievance within 30 days of receipt, and if the inmate's claim is determined to have merit, the Inspector, subject to the Warden's concurrence, "shall make an offer to compromise the claim to the inmate." If the inmate accepts the offer to compromise, a payment "shall be made to the inmate's institutional account from general revenue funds appropriated to the DRC." If the DRC denies the grievance or does not compromise the claim at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the time allowed for the commencement of a civil action based upon the loss or damage, the inmate may commence an action in the court of claims of Ohio to recover damages.

According to the Inspector's Monthly Activity Reports, in the 13 month period from January 2009 through January 2010, the Inspector only conducted two Court of Claims investigations, both in April 2009, yet there were 16 approved settlements in the period, an average of 1.23 per month. It is CIIC staff's understanding that an investigation would in all cases precede any approved settlement, and the number of investigations would in all cases be equal or exceed the number of approved settlements.

DRC Follow-Up Communication:

Settlements do require an investigation, however; they are calculated on separate tracks. We provide the following to help explain our procedures:

- *AR 5120-9-32 paragraph A states: If an inmate in a state correctional institution has a claim against the department of rehabilitation and correction for the loss of or damage to personal property and the amount claimed does not exceed three hundred dollars, before commencing an action against the department of rehabilitation and correction in the court of claims of Ohio, the inmate shall file the claim as a direct grievance to the inspector of institutional services. This AR also states the IIS is to complete an investigation and provide written response to the inmate within 30 days of receipt of the grievance and the response shall include steps taken to investigate the claim and a summary of the findings. If the IIS finds the inmate's grievance to have merit, then the IIS, with Warden's approval, can offer to compromise the claim to the inmate. The claims settled under AR 5120-9-32 are a resolution to an inmate grievance filed under the inmate grievance procedure, not through the Court of Claims. Court of Claims investigation requests come directly from legal counsel.*

**Table 22. Madison Correctional Institution Inspector Activity Reports,
January 2009 through January 2010:
Number of Kites, Court of Claims Investigations, Approved Property Settlements, Outside Agency Contacts,
and Other Outside Contacts by Month with Monthly Average and Range**

Month	Kites	Court of Claims Investigations	Approved 5120-9-32 Settlements	Outside Agency Contacts (i.e. CIIC, A.G.)	Other Outside Contacts (i.e. Inmate family, friends)
January 2009	138	0	1	0	1
February	138	0	0	1	1
March	128	0	0	0	2
April	118	2	1	0	2
May	111	0	2	1	2
June	229	0	0	0	5
July	201	0	4	1	0
August	97	0	4	0	0
September	124	0	1	1	0
October	50	0	0	2	3
November	44	0	0	1	0
December	84	0	1	0	2
January 2010	95	0	2	1	1
TOTAL	1,557	2	16	8	19
Monthly Average	119.77	.15	1.23	.62	1.46
Monthly Range	44-229	0-2	0-4	0-2	0-5

Outside Contacts

As shown above, based on the monthly reports from January 2009 through January 2010, the Inspector only received eight contacts from outside agencies, such as the CIIC and the Attorney General's office. The highest number of such contacts in any month was two.

The number of other outside contacts such as inmate families and friends totaled 19 in the period, with an average of 1.46 per month. The highest number of such contacts in any month was five.

Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars

A review was made of the special assignments, meetings and seminars included in the monthly Inspector Activity Reports. The listings show that the Inspector attended *27 executive staff meetings* in the 13 month period from January 2009 through January 2010, the largest number in the category.

**Table 23. Inspector Activity Reports, January 2009 through January 2010:
Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars by Frequency**

Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars	Frequency in 13 month period
Executive Staff Meetings	27
CQI, CQI Medical and/or CQI Mental Health Meetings	11
Department Head Meetings	8
Training: Serve Safe Training, Stress Mgmt. Training, John Reid Tech Training @ OPOTA (3 days), Executive Staff Training, Additional Training – Technique for Interview & Interrogation	6
SPART Meetings	5
In-Service Instructor	5
Audits: Internal Mgmt (3 days), ACA (3 days), DCI (3 days), LOCI (2 days), Central Office (3 days)	5
Law Enforcement Breakfast	4
Attended In-Service	3
CIM Table Top and Full Scale CIM	2
Mgt. Representative for Pre-Disciplinary Hearings	2
Supervisor's Meetings	2
Dorm Inspections	2
AD 2.4 Shakedown, WD 2.4 Shakedown	2
Present Inmate Grievance Procedure Part for New Inmate Orientation Video @ TEC and Visit PNN @ MCI to Organize New Inmate Orientation Video	2
Arts & Crafts Meeting	1
Security Meeting	1
Yard Day	1

**Table 24. Inspector Activity Report:
Special Assignments, Meetings, Seminars, January 2009 through January 2010 by Month**

Month	Special Assignment, Meetings, Seminars
January 2009	Day 3 In-Service Instructor (Inmate Grievance Procedure) (3 days), Executive Staff Meeting, CQI Mental Health Meeting, Present Inmate Grievance Procedure Part for New Inmate Orientation Video @ TEC, Visit PNN @ MCI to Organize New Inmate Orientation Video, Executive Staff Meeting, CQI Medical Meeting, Mgmt. Representative for Pre-disciplinary Hearings, Mgmt. Representative for Pre-disciplinary Hearings, Department Head Meeting
February	Internal Management Audit (3 days) Law Enforcement Breakfast, SPART Meeting, Supervisor's Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Department Head Meeting, CQI Medical
March	Executive Staff Meeting, SPART Meeting, ACA Audit (3 days), Department Head Meeting, Instructed In-Service, Executive Staff Meeting, Attended In- Service
April	DCI Audit (3 days), LOCI Audit (2 days), Law Enforcement Breakfast, Executive Staff Meeting, SPART Meeting, Department Head Meeting
May	Executive Staff Meeting (CIM Table Top), CQI & SPART Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Supervisor's Meeting
June	Law Enforcement Breakfast, Executive Staff Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Serve Safe Training, Instructed In-Service, Serve Safe Training, CQI Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Department Head Meeting
July	CQI/SPART Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, CQI (Medical) Meeting
August	John Reid Tech Training. @ OPOTA (3 days), Executive Staff Meeting, CQI Medical Meeting, Executive Staff Training, Additional Training – Technique for Interview & Interrogation
September	Dept. Head Meeting, Arts & Crafts Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Full Scale CIM, Executive Staff Meeting, Stress Mgmt. Training, In-Service, Executive Staff Meeting, Dept. Head Meeting, Medical QA Meeting
October	AD 2.4 Shakedown, Security Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, WD 2.4 Shakedown, Yard Day, Executive Staff Meeting & Dorm Inspections, CQI Meeting & Dorm Inspections, Central Office Audit (3 days)
November	Law Enforcement Breakfast, Executive Staff Meeting, CQI Medical Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting
December	Executive Staff Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting
January 2010	Executive Staff Meeting, In-Service, Executive Staff Meeting, Executive Staff Meeting, CQI Meeting, Department Head Meeting, QA Meeting, Day 3 In-Service (Offender Supervision & Cultural Sensitivity) (1/4/10-1/31/10)

Informal Complaints/Grievances Received

During the 13 month period from January 2009 through January 2010, the Inspector received a total of 2,317 informal complaints, an average of 178 per month, ranging from as low as 125 to as high as 306. However, the Inspector is not responsible for answering informal complaints. Responses to informal complaints are made by the appropriate supervisor. The Inspector does have responsibilities to ensure timely responses to the informal complaints by the supervisors. In the same time period, the Inspector received 459 grievances, an average of 35 per month, from as low as 17 grievances in both January and February 2009, to as high as 66 in July 2009.

**Table 25 . Institution Grievances Statistics:
Number of Grievances and Informal Complaints Received at Madison Correctional
Institution by Month, January 2009 through January 2010**

Month	Grievances Received	Informal Complaints Received
January 2009	17	125
February	17	142
March	30	154
April	21	169
May	28	165
June	53	170
July	66	306
August	54	219
September	37	193
October	27	133
November	27	183
December	40	181
January 2010	42	177
Total	459	2,317
Average Per Month	35.3	178.23
Monthly Range	17-66	125-306

Granted Grievances

As shown below, from January 2009 through January 2010, the Inspector granted 59 grievances, ranging from none in November to as high as 13 in July 2009, with an average of 4.54 per month. Of the “granted” grievances, the largest volume (49.15%) was categorized as “Problem Noted, Correction Pending.” Only 15 of the “granted” grievance decisions were categorized as “Problem Corrected.” Another 15 of the “granted” grievance decisions were reported as “Problem Noted, Report/Recommendation to Warden.” The 59 granted grievances comprise 13.26 percent of the total 445 grievance decisions in the period.

Table 26. Madison Correctional Institution Grievances Statistics: Number of Granted Grievance Dispositions with Status of Problem Correction and Month from January 2009 through January 2010

Month	Problem Noted, Correction Pending	Problem Corrected	Problem Noted, Report/Recommendation to the Warden	Total Granted
January 2009	3	0	0	3
February	4	0	0	4
March	0	2	1	3
April	4	0	1	5
May	3	3	0	6
June	2	2	0	4
July	4	4	5	13
August	3	3	2	8
September	1	0	1	2
October	2	0	1	3
November	0	0	0	0
December	1	1	2	4
January 2010	2	0	2	4
Total	29	15	15	59
Percent	49.15%	25.42%	25.42%	100%
Monthly Average	2.23	1.15	1.15	4.54
Monthly Range	0-4	0-4	0-5	0-13

Denied Grievances

In the same period, 386 grievances were denied, comprising 86.74 percent of the total 445 grievance decisions. Of the reasons for denial, the largest group was denied due to “No violation of rule, policy or law,” a total of 168 denials or 43.52 percent of the denials, followed by “Insufficient evidence to support claim,” with 149 denials or 38.6 percent of the denials.

As shown below, there was only one denial for “False claim” in the 13 month period, and only ten were denied for failure to use the informal complaint procedure.

Table 27. Madison Correctional Institution Grievances Statistics: Grievance Dispositions Denied by Month in January 2009 to January 2010 with Reason for Denial

Month	No Violation of Rule, Policy, or Law	Insufficient Evidence to Support Claim	Not Within Scope of Grievance Procedure	Not Within Time Limits*	Staff Action Was Valid Exercise of Discretion	Failure to Use Informal Complaint Procedure	False Claim	Total Denied
January	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	9
February	5	8	0	1	0	0	0	14
March	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	16
April	11	13	0	0	1	2	0	27
May	4	6	0	0	5	0	0	15
June	12	20	3	3	4	0	0	42
July	28	19	9	3	0	3	1	63
August	18	8	4	1	1	1	0	33
September	20	10	5	1	0	3	0	39
October	19	9	2	3	0	0	0	33
November	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	14
December	19	15	3	4	1	1	0	43
January	18	17	0	2	1	0	0	38
Total	168	149	27	18	13	10	1	386
Percent	43.52%	38.60%	6.99%	4.66%	3.37%	2.59%	.26%	100%
Monthly Average	12.92	11.46	2.08	1.38	1	.77	.08	29.69
Monthly Range	3-28	4-20	0-9	0-4	0-5	0-3	0-1	9-63

***Not Within the Time Limit:** According to Administrative Rule 5120-9-31 on the Grievance Procedure, the time limit for filing an informal complaint is “within 14 calendar days of the date of the event giving rise to the complaint.” Similarly, “All inmate grievances shall be filed by the inmate no later than 14 calendar days from the date of the informal complaint response or waiver of the informal complaint step.” Further, “The appeal shall then be filed to the office of the Chief Inspector within 14 calendar days of the date of the disposition of grievance.”

Expectations Questions and Responses: Duty of Care, Complaint/Grievance Procedure

1. Are there effective complaint procedures in place that are easy to access, easy to use, and provide timely responses? **AR 5120-9-31 in place. Inmates may request informal complaints from officers and unit staff. Inmates may kite inspector for grievance and appeal forms.**
2. Do prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are they aware of an appeal procedure? **Yes- inmates are submitting informal complaints and in some cases, following up with a grievance. They also submit kites to inspector to request appeal forms.**
3. Is information about the grievance procedure reinforced through notices and posters that are produced in English and other languages and displayed across the prison? **Yes**
 - a. Are there posters in prominent places on all residential units, including for those with literacy problems and those with disabilities so that they can understand and are able to access the procedures? **Yes-also use orientation video every Thursday.**
 - 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-resources available through the library and the Inspector.**
 - c. Is information on the units/blocks always displayed and do prisoners understand it? **Yes-and replaced throughout the year when torn down.**
 - d. What are the procedures for blind prisoners? **Also, have audible orientation video every Thursday.**
4. Are prisoners encouraged to solve areas of dispute informally, before making official complaints? **Yes-advised to kite appropriate department head/supervisor or see during office hours.**
5. Can prisoners easily and confidentially access and submit complaint forms? **Yes, see unit staff or dorm officers.**
 - a. Are forms required to access complaint forms? **No-can make request to dorm officer or Unit staff.**
 - b. Are there forms, and at least one kite box on each block/dorm? **Forms and kites available; place in mailbox at chow hall.**

- c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer? **Yes-notice made by officer to unit staff or inspector when more are needed.**
 - d. Are form dispensers always stocked with forms? **Yes, mailroom officers.**
 - e. Are informal complaints and grievance files secured on a limited access basis? **Yes-in the Inspector's office.**
6. Do prisoners make use of the procedures, and are they free of pressure to withdraw any complaints or grievances? **Yes**
- a. What are the procedures for prisoners with learning or other disabilities? **Seek assistance from the unit staff or the inspector.**
7. Are all complaints and grievances, whether formal or informal, dealt with fairly and answered within three days, or 10 days in exceptional circumstances, with either a resolution or a comprehensive explanation of future action? **Most staff reply to informal complaints within 7-10 days per AR 5120-9-31.**
- a. Are complaints resolved? **Primarily; if not, inmate submits a grievance.**
 - b. Are complaints answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances? **See above. AR 5120-9-31 allows 7 days.**
 - c. Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure? **Not generally; inmate advised of problems for future filings.**
 - d. Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner? **The inmate is advised to re-submit due to timeliness in AR 5120-9-31. Staff do not forward.**
 - e. Are target return times recorded? **Yes**
 - f. Are letters of complaint/concern from third parties, such as legal representatives, family or voluntary organizations, logged and answered? **Yes**
8. Do prisoners receive responses to their complaints/grievances that are respectful, legible, and address the issues raised? **Primarily, if not, it is addressed by inspector's office.**
9. Are formal grievances signed and dated by the respondent? **Yes.**
- a. Regarding the quality of responses, is there a quality assurance system in place? **Yes,-may appeal to the Chief Inspector.**

- b. Does the staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly print their name on the response? **Primarily.**
 - c. Are staff responses to confidential complaints returned in sealed envelopes? **They are placed in the inspector's mailbox.**
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? **To see the unit staff or inspector.**
11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered? **Yes**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for urgent help? **Yes**
12. Are prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners protected from possible recrimination? **Yes**
- a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice? **Staff are advised of confidentially; confidential statements.**
 - 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 that I am aware of.**
 - 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? **You will need to ask the Chief Inspector's office, however, seem to be.**
 - b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms? **Yes**
 - c. How many have appealed in the last six months? **132 appeals total from 4-1-09 to 10-31-09.**

- d. What was the outcome, and how promptly were they answered? **Check with the Chief Inspector's office.**
14. Do all prisoners (and staff) know how to contact members of the Ohio General Assembly's Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, and can they do so in confidence? **Yes**
- a. Is CIIC contact information posted in dorms, blocks, library and other areas to ensure that staff and inmates are aware of how to contact CIIC? **Yes**
- b. Are there any difficulties with access to the CIIC? **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**
- a. Do blocks/dorms have contact details and information? **Through law libraries.**
17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need to? **Yes-for other institutions.**
- a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisers or making direct applications to the courts? **Through law libraries.**
- b. In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector? **Four grievances, 13 appeals.**
- c. What do they tend to be about? **Food service, health care, property issues.**
- d. What proportion are generally resolved? **Three had dispositions as of 11-9-09.**
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? **Not to such detail, "hot spots" reported to Warden on a weekly basis.**
- Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge? **Yes**

***EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:
STAFF-PRISONER RELATIONSHIPS***

1. Are prisoners treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions? **Yes, professionalism is taught in In-Service training annually. Inmates are also held to standards by the Rules Infraction Board.**
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? **There is a healthy atmosphere and environment for staff and inmates at Madison.**
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? **This is taught each year in In-Service training by the Institutional Inspector and it is also monitored by the Inspector.**
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? **This is the standard we strive for, does it always happen, no.**
6. Do staff positively engage with prisoners at all times? **Again, this is what we strive for, does it always happen, no.**
7. Is interaction between staff and prisoners encouraged by the senior management team? **All inmates are encouraged to utilize the facilities including the elderly, youthful offenders, blind, etc.**
 - a. Does staff help and encourage older and less able prisoners to participate in and access all facilities offered across the prison? **All inmates are encouraged to utilize the facilities including the elderly, youthful offenders, blind, etc.**
8. Does staff routinely knock before entering cells, except in emergencies? **Inmates are alerted before staff enter the cell.**

9. Are prisoners encouraged by staff to engage in all activities and routines, promoting punctuality, attendance and responsible behavior? **Yes-passes to work and programs are to be honored.**

a. What methods are used to encourage prisoners to get involved? **Bulletin Boards, assessments, evaluations.**

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? **Staff are taught inter-personal communication skills.**

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

ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE INSPECTION

Zone B Visitation Room

The visitation room has a capacity to accommodate 140 individuals at one time, and has an area for visitors and inmates to sit outside during good weather. It was observed to be clean and well lit with natural light. In response to the larger prisoner populations, staff has attempted to accommodate more visits by allowing reservations on weekends, as well as “walk-ups.” According to the inmate handbook, inmates on the Zone B are permitted to have *three visits from approved family members each month, and two visits each month from approved friends. Inmates on the Zone A side are permitted to have three visits a month from approved family members. The staff has also focused more on addressing the needs associated with visitation in a more professional, customer-service oriented manner. This innovative approach has reportedly reduced the number of complaints associated with visitation.*

The visitation’s reading room was also observed. This is a space provided so inmates can read to their children during visitation in an attempt to strengthen the relationship between children of incarcerated parents.

Vending machines are available for the inmates and their families to purchase food and drinks during their visits. The Department has departed from using machines that accept cash, and are now using vending machines that use vending cards. These cards can be purchased at the visitor registration desk, and can be reused by inmates and their families.

Medical Services

Zones A and B in the prison have an infirmary. However, the main infirmary is located on the Zone A side of the prison. The infirmary on Zone B was considerably smaller and shared space with both the mental health department and the special services department. *Overall, both infirmaries were observed to be in excellent condition.*

During the walk through of the infirmaries, inmates were observed to be waiting for their appointments. According to the Warden, a new Nurse Practitioner just began working at the institution that was observed meeting with a patient in one of the three examination rooms. In another exam room, an inmate was observed meeting with his Physician via Tel-med, which is technology that uses video conferencing for appointments over long distances. In another area of the infirmary contained several isolation rooms. *They were observed to be clean.* They were occupied by inmates with various maladies, one of which was an inmate who was on close suicide watch being observed by a staff member. Other inmates were observed in the infirmary waiting for the distribution of their afternoon medications. Staff relayed that pill call occurs three times a day in two hour intervals.

Staff and Inmate Concerns Regarding Medical Services

A variety of concerns regarding medical services were relayed by both staff and inmates throughout the inspection. *Staff relayed that inmates frequently express that their medical needs are not being adequately addressed.* They attributed some of these comments to the intermittent care the former contract medical doctor provided. According to staff, they recently hired a new doctor, and have begun to address the accumulated backlog of cases in need of attention. However, the temporary vacancy created a challenge for the staff who reported a significant backlog of inmates with chronic diseases. The Department has begun to move away from contracting with private medical providers and is beginning to hire Physicians who will occupy civil service positions.

Several staff expressed ideas regarding how the Department could operate their medical services more cost effectively. The staff relayed that certain expenditures should receive greater scrutiny. *Staff identified several contributors that they believe add to the enormous cost of medical care:*

- *Round trips to OSU for procedures considered routine or nonessential;*
- *The cost and time associated with continuing to prescribe over the counter medications to inmates that inmates can purchase in the commissary; and*
- *The reported lack of understanding the medical specialists at OSU have regarding the limitations of care and medications that prisons can provide on-site that in turn require more round trips to be conducted. There was considerable frustration directed at the OSU specialists' apparent lack of understanding of the Department's limitations. It was*

recommended that the Department and the hospital communicate to agree upon a set of standards that reflects the limitations of prison health care to ensure that the quality of care is not sacrificed due to orders recommended by the specialist that cannot be fulfilled by the prisons. The staff relayed that this adds to the tension between the prison staff and the inmates when the recommendations of the specialists conflict with the formulary or services that the prison can actually provide. Staff relayed that the recommendations that cannot be fulfilled at the institution ultimately result in further trips for inmates to OSU.

In regard to the concerns that inmates are being prescribed over the counter medication instead of requiring them to purchase the medications from the commissary, staff believe that there are many inmates that are simply seeking prescription pain medication. In these situations, the doctors often times prescribe over the counter medications instead of more potent medications. Reportedly as a result, the number of inmates that are constantly “seeking pain-killing drugs” reduces the amount of time that the staff can spend with inmates who have legitimate medical conditions. Staff believe that if inmates can afford it, they should be required to purchase the over the counter medications available in the commissary instead of having them prescribed by the prison. However, *staff relayed that the doctors continue to reinforce the behavior of the inmates by not instructing them to purchase medications like ibuprofen or antacids at the commissary because inmates know that it is less expensive for them to have these medications prescribed than purchasing them from the commissary.* While many inmates tell staff they cannot afford to purchase these medications, staff relayed that a review of their account balances and commissary purchases reveals that many inmates can afford the purchase, but choose to purchase “junk food” instead. Staff communicated that this could have a positive impact on reducing the amount of money the State spends on these medications. *Based on previous inspections at other institutions in which this subject was discussed, it has been relayed that the key is to have close communication between the commissary and medical staff so that doctors are aware of exactly what over the counter medication can be purchased by inmates in the commissary.*

Throughout the inspection, inmates expressed their concerns regarding the medical services provided at the institution. Most of the complaints communicated were in regard to the delay in receiving services, and the reported failure of medical staff to promptly reply to kites, or informal complaints addressed to the medical department. One inmate relayed that part of his collar bone had been removed, and the pain medication he was reportedly prescribed had caused an allergic reaction. According to the inmate, it took *several months for staff to answer his informal complaint regarding the matter.* Staff acknowledged that the delay in responding to informal complaints addressed to the medical department was identified by the Chief Inspector’s office as an area in need of improvement. However, staff noted that inmates can sign up for sick call and be seen within 24 hours or less if it is an emergency without waiting for staff to respond to a kite.

Inmates shared different points of view on the quality of *dental care* they have received. Some inmates relayed that their concerns were addressed relatively quickly when they brought their concerns to the attention of staff. However, several inmates relayed that it takes too long to see a

dentist for severe pain. One inmate stated that he had to wait several weeks for what the inmate considered emergency care.

The table below contains information from the institutional monthly medical report that provides a snap shot of the work performed by institutional medical staff, the type and amount of services performed, and other information relevant to the health of the inmate population.

Table 28. October 2009 Institution Monthly Medical Report for MaCI

Primary Health Care	
Physician Appointments/Doctors Sick Call Totals	251
Nurses Screening/Nurses Sick Call Totals (non-segregation)	751
Referred to Physician	296
Intake Nurses Screening	212
Emergency Triage	
Inmate Injuries Treated Onsite	14
Sent to local ED (Emergency Department)	34
Sent to OSU ED from local ED	6
Sent to OSU ED (Emergency Department)	16
Emergency treatment of staff	16
Emergency treatment – visitor	0
Infirmiry Care	
Bed days used for Medical	43
Bed days used for Mental Health	19
Bed days used for Security	62
Dental Care	
Scheduled appointments	332
Emergency Appointment	80
Total Visits	412
Against Medical Advice	12
Optometry	
Consults	53
Number of Inmates Seen	48
Emergencies Seen	0
Hours on site	9
Podiatry	
Consults	52
Number of inmates seen	42
Emergencies Seen	0
Hours on site	6
Pharmacy	
Medical Refills	2,457
Mental Health Refills	167
Medical New Prescriptions	2,472
Mental Health New Prescriptions	494
Total Prescriptions	5,590
Medical Control Prescriptions	79
Mental Controlled Prescriptions	280
Lab Data	
Blood draws	276
Blood draws for mental health	8
Number of X-Rays	38
EKG's	7
DNA Blood Draws	0

Infectious Disease Data	
Number of Inmates Tested for TB	0
Positive PPD	0
Staff PPD	52
Inmates Completed INH	0
Inmates Incomplete INH	0
Inmates Refusing INH	0
HIV Positive Inmates	0
Inmate HIV Conversions	0
Deaths	
Within Institution	0
Local Hospital	0
OSU	0
CMC	0
Suicides	0

The institution contracts with professional agencies to provide a variety of services to fill vacancies, or where a full time staff person would not be necessary. The information in the table below is extracted from the institution's medical monthly report and contains information on the hours in which the contractor was on site in the month.

Table 29. MaCI Contractual Staff Utilization for October 2009

Contract Staff Utilization by Type	Number of Hours
Contract Utilization RN	432
Physician Projected	264
Physician Actual	177
Dentist Projected	191
Dentist Actual	191
Dental Assistant Projected	420
Dental Assistant Actual	420
Dental Hygienist Actual	155
X-Ray Tech Projected	64
X-Ray Tech Actual	42
Diet Tech Projected	64
Diet Tech Actual	56

Mental Health Services

According to literature provided on site, a variety of mental health services are available to every inmate incarcerated at the facility *at no charge*. When an inmate arrives at the institution, they are assessed by a member of the mental health treatment staff who explains the range of services and the limitations of the services provided. Inmates in need of mental health services are encouraged to kite the mental health staff to relay their needs. The services provided by the staff include the following:

- Screenings for Mental Health Problems,
- Crisis Intervention,
- Psychiatric and Psychological Evaluation,
- Individual and Group Counseling, Education, and
- Reports Required for the Parole Board.

During the inspection, mental health staff relayed that they had a caseload of about 105 inmates on zone B. They reportedly facilitate several programs intended to enhance quality of life and improve the life skills of inmates. *Staff believe that much of inmate's antisocial behavior and poor decision making is rooted in events in their lives such as child abuse and neglect that has interfered with their ability to lead productive lives.* The treatment staff lauded a particular program appropriately named ***Abused Boys, Wounded Men***, which works to help individuals address problems associated with these life events, and move beyond them.

The most recent data made available to the CIIC regarding the number of mentally ill at MaCI is from the month ending in November 2009. Madison's caseload data reports that the institution had a *total caseload of 374 inmates*. There were 329 inmates on the institutions psychiatric caseload, plus 45 inmates on the mental health caseload, but not requiring psychiatric services.

Suicide Data

According to the information relayed during the inspection and medical data provided on a monthly basis, there have been no suicides in the past year at the institution. Based on a review of Incident Reports on DRC inmate deaths, one suicide occurred in February 2010 at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. In 2009, there were three suicides system-wide, with one in February at the Pickaway Correctional Institution, one in August at the Lebanon Correctional Institution, and one in October at the Lorain Correctional Institution Reception Center.

No suicide attempts occurred at the Madison CI in January or February of 2010. In calendar year 2009 there were 72 attempted suicides in Ohio prisons, but none are reported to have occurred at Madison Correctional Institution.

EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES: SELF-HARM AND SUICIDE

1. Does the prison work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach? **Yes**
2. Are prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide identified at an early stage, and is a care and support plan drawn up, implemented and monitored? **Yes**
3. Are prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity?

Yes

4. Are all staff aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, appropriately trained, and have access to proper equipment and support? **Yes**
5. Is there a safer custody strategy in place that recognizes the risks to prisoners, particularly in the early days in custody, and sets out procedures, which help to reduce the risk of self-harm?
 - a. Are the specific needs of different prisoner groups recognized, as are the levels of risk in different areas of the facility? **Yes**
 - b. Does the strategy recognize the specific needs of the population e.g. women and minority groups, those with substance misuse problems, and those not on normal location? **Yes**
 - c. Is staff training appropriate? **Yes**
 - d. What is the availability and use of safer cells, particularly in areas of the prison where risks of self-harm are higher? **At all times.**
 - 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? **No-our policies mandate safe cells.**
6. Does a multi-disciplinary committee effectively monitor the prison's suicide prevention policy and procedures? **Yes**
7. Is the committee chaired by a manager responsible for the policy and does membership include prisoners, staff representatives from a range of disciplines, and a member of the local community mental health team? **No**
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? **Do not know-when information is received we act on it.**
 - a. Are there posters in the visiting room about who to contact with concerns and is that information sent out with visiting orders alerting families to the help available? **Yes**
9. Is there a detailed care and support plan prepared with input from the prisoner, which identifies needs, as well as the individuals responsible including a key worker? **Yes**
10. Are personal factors or significant events that may be a trigger to self-harm identified? **Yes**

11. Do regular reviews take place involving staff from a range of disciplines and family and friends as appropriate, which provide good support and care for all prisoners at risk? **Family and friends are not part of the team.**
12. Are arrangements in place for following up after a care and support plan has been closed? **Yes-per policy**
- a. Do unit officers have knowledge of policy and support plans? **Usually not unless informed by a treatment team for a specific reason.**
 - b. What level of training have they received? **In-service/specialized training.**
13. Are prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm held in a supportive and caring environment with unhindered access to sources of help including peer supporters? **N/a**
- a. Is a care suite available to support the work of Listeners?
 - b. Is there access to counselors, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times?
 - c. Are appropriate free telephone help lines/interventions available, in particular, to address specific aspects of women's prior victimization such as rape crisis, domestic violence and others? **N/a**
14. Are prisoners encouraged to express any thought of suicide and/or self-harm, and encouraged to take part in all purposeful activities as part of the support plan? **Yes**
- a. Are prisoners given the opportunity and assistance to make a written contribution to their review? **N/a**
 - 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? **N/a**
15. Are all staff, including night staff, fully trained in suicide prevention and clear on what to do in an emergency? **Yes**
- a. Is there a program of refresher training in place? **Yes-In-service annually.**
 - b. Do staff have access to first aid kits and shears? **Yes**
 - c. If facility does not have a first night center, do night staff know where first night prisoners and those at risk are located? **N/A**
16. Are incidents of self-harm closely monitored and analyzed at regular intervals to establish any trends and to implement preventive measures? **Yes-SPART**

17. Are serious incidents properly investigated to establish what lessons could be learned and to promote good practice? **Yes**
18. Where appropriate, are family or friends of the prisoner informed through a family liaison officer? **No-N/A**
19. Is an action plan devised and acted upon promptly as a result of an investigation into an apparent self-inflicted death? **Yes**
- a. Is this reviewed following subsequent findings of an investigation? **Yes**
 - b. Are there attempts to understand underlying causes and/or trends? **Yes**
 - c. Have there been any reviews of recommendations from previous deaths in custody?
Yes
20. Is all information about prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide communicated to people who are able to offer support in the community? **N/A**
-
-

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING UNIT (SEGREGATION)

The institution's special management housing unit in zone A is divided into two wings and has only 25 cells with a total capacity of 50 beds. Staff relayed that when the institution was built, it was *built with a smaller than normal segregation unit disproportionate to the size of the institution. This makes it difficult to house inmates who need to be celled alone, or hold inmates for longer periods of time. This has reportedly required staff to use more creative forms of punishment at the unit level such as cell isolation, commissary and phone restriction, etc.*

On the day of the inspection, there were 24 black inmates, 24 white inmates, and one inmate classified as "Other" housed in segregation unit.

There were 27 inmates assigned to Security Control status, five inmates classified to Disciplinary Control, and 16 inmates assigned to Local Control. One inmate was reported to be housed in segregation temporarily.

There is one dry-cell at the front of each segregation wing. One inmate *was in a dry cell for throwing his tray at one of the Officers, and was being fed a meal loaf for breakfast and lunch. The inmate denied throwing a tray at the Officer, and several other offenders voiced their support from their cells.*

In light of the above, a review was made of the DRC policy on Dry Cell Separation (310-SEC-06). It defines "dry cell" as "Any area, room or cell where an inmate does not have access to

running water, standard toilet facilities, or other inmates.” It further describes the purpose of the DRC policy on Dry Cell Separation as:

...prevention and/or detection of contraband. In order to facilitate this mission, when there is reasonable suspicion that an inmate has ingested contraband and/or is hiding contraband in a body cavity, it may be necessary to place the inmate in dry cell separation to recover such contraband.

Nowhere in the policy does it authorize use of dry cells for punitive purposes for throwing a tray or any other rule violation.

Several inmates relayed concerns about the *unresponsiveness of staff to kites and informal complaints while in segregation*. One inmate relayed that he and his cellie kited religious services for a Bible and *never received a response*. Another inmate relayed he had waited *nearly two months for a response to his informal complaint addressed to the Health Care Administrator*.

HOUSING UNITS

The housing units on zone A and zone B are built differently to reflect the security level of the population housed there. Zone B inmates are housed in open-bay dormitories, while inmates housed in zone A are housed in two tiered cell blocks. *The common areas, bathrooms, and cells of the housing units inspected in both zones of the institution reflected the staff's attitude toward the importance of good sanitation practices*. There did not appear to be any major structural issues either in any of the housing units inspected.

However, many of the observed cells were cluttered with inmate property. According to literature provided on site, inmates are permitted to have property purchased from the commissary or from a vendor approved by the Department. Inmates are permitted to possess property that can be stored in a 2.4 locker box, which at Madison CI, is supposed to include all state issued blues, legal materials, and personal property. Large titled property, linens, state-issued coats and educational material provided by the state are exempt from this policy.

The units inspected included a walkthrough of Adams A which houses the youthful offenders, Adams D that houses general population and some of the blind inmates, Washington A/B which houses many inmates over the age of 40, the SORRC dormitory, and Monroe D which houses inmates enrolled in the Faith Based re-entry program.

Washington A& B

According to an inmate, the unit is mostly for inmates over the age of 40. The inmate seemed content with the population in his unit, stating that other inmates do not bother each other. However, inmates expressed *serious concerns regarding the “idleness” of the younger inmates who do not understand that older inmates respect each other's property*. *Reportedly, many of the younger inmates do not consider stealing from other inmates to be a serious offense*. *Reportedly,*

in spite of attempts by the older inmates to try to counsel younger prisoners, the insight passed on to the younger inmates seems to have little impact on their behavior.

One inmate relayed that a significant contributing factor to the actions of the younger inmates is due to the belief by some that they do not have an outlet such as boxing. The inmate relayed that recreation equipment, like heavy bags and speed bags would help reduce the tension. It was also suggested that restoring boxing programs to institutions with lower security levels would hopefully alleviate the boredom and idleness of incarceration.

Adams A: Youthful Offender Housing Unit

One of the unique missions of the institution is to house youthful offenders aged 17 and under. The unit holds up to 100 youth, and on the day of the inspection there were 78 youth, with one documented as Out to Court. These youth are bound over to the adult prison system and are housed in the youthful offender unit until they are 18 years old. According to the institution's webpage:

The youthful offender program at Madison houses young men between the ages of 14 and 17 years old. They are received into a living unit specifically designed for this population. The Youthful Offender Program is maintained by ensuring a structured daily schedule, as well as placing a high priority on each young man obtaining his high school education. The program is driven by an incentive based system which is structured to encourage mature behavior. Reentry programming is also offered with this housing unit.

At the time that a walkthrough of the youthful offender housing unit was conducted, most of the youth were *quietly sitting at tables in the common areas engaged in some sort of a structured learning activity*. Reportedly, the other half of the youth were out of the unit attending school at the time. The youthful offender housing unit is structurally like the other units on zone A. Youth either cell alone, or with a cellie.

Overall, the unit also reflected an emphasis on a *clean and safe environment as the showers, common area, and cells observed all appeared clean and organized*. Staff relayed that the youth are expected to follow the same rules as the adult offenders, and are held to the same standards with reported incentives for appropriate behavior. Staff relayed that *two-thirds of the youth are security level 3, and the remaining youth are a mixture of other security levels*.

If youth must be segregated for disciplinary reasons, approximately *20 segregation cells are located in the unit in an area secluded from the cells of other youth*. At the time of the inspection, most of the cells were occupied by youth who were being disciplined for violations of the rules of conduct, with some in the outside recreation pens attached to the unit.

Gang graffiti and other drawings were observed to be scrawled all over the walls and cell doors of the segregation cells, and some of the cells had a very bad odor. The unit's safe cells, which

were vacant were observed to be clean. According to staff, if an inmate draws or otherwise damages the doors and walls, he is charged for a gallon of paint to cover the vandalism.

Monroe D

The inmates who are housed in this dormitory are enrolled in the *faith-based reentry program*. Staff proudly relayed that *only one offender has come back to prison since participating in the program*. To participate, inmates must be *less than one year to release and have no conduct reports for at least six months*. Inmates who were enrolled in the program did not express any problems with the living arrangements in this dormitory. They were aware that staff held them to a higher standard of conduct. Several expressed that the program's emphasis on religious studies provided a peace of mind unavailable in general population housing units.

In this housing unit, inmates live in open bays, but are provided a modest amount of privacy because of dividers similar to partitions used in office cubicles that are placed in-between each of their bunks. These areas were observed to be *uncluttered and maintained at a higher standard of organization and cleanliness*. *While the showers and restrooms displayed the effects of normal wear and tear, overall the unit was exceptionally clean.*

EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES: RESIDENTIAL UNITS

1. Do prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions? **Yes**
2. Are cells and communal areas (blocks, dorms, dayrooms) light, well decorated and in a good state of repair? **Yes, maintained by maintenance department.**
3. Do all prisoners occupy accommodation that is suitable for the purpose and for their individual needs? **Yes**
 - a. Are there cell sharing risk assessments? **All inmates may speak with Sergeants, case managers, or unit managers if there are issues with their cellies.**
 - b. Are cells sufficiently warm in winter and cool in summer? **Yes, monitored by maintenance (temperature readings)**
 - c. Are cells ventilated and do they have sufficient daylight? **Yes, vents and windows in cells.**
 - d. Do prisoners have their own bed, corkboard, lockable cupboard/locker box, and use of a table and chair? **Yes-each cell has a wardrobe and a desk.**

- e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks? **Lower bunks are assigned by medical needs, age, disabilities, etc.**
 - f. Do shared cells have screened toilets? **No on Zone A, toilets in cells. Yes on Zone B (commons/shared) facilities.**
4. Are reasonable adjustments made to ensure that prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems can access all goods, facilities, and services? **Yes-ramps, bridges, blind aides are used for mobility issues.**
- a. Do prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems have ease of access to different locations and services? **Yes, Madison has blind aides and wheelchair “pushers.”**
 - b. Are older, infirm and disabled prisoners assigned to landings, which hold most of the communal facilities? **Yes, bottom range-lower bunk.**
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-aides are assigned and receive a monthly salary.**
- a. How are volunteers identified, trained and assigned? **Assigned and trained by unit staff.**
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, through a health and safety officer.**
 - b. Are there visible markers on cell doors? **Yes**
 - c. What system is in place to highlight to other staff that any prisoners with disabilities and/or mobility problems may need assistance in an emergency? **Inmates wear badges, i.e. blind inmates, deaf inmates, wheelchair inmates.**
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? **Youthful offenders may be single celled. Youthful offenders are housed in a separate unit from adults.**
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, seats and handrails are provided in showers. No floor barriers-lips (steps) were removed.**
13. Do prisoners feel safe in their cells and in communal areas of the residential units? **There are no complaints of inmates feeling threatened, however, if they were to complain, an investigation would be conducted.**
- a. Is there a suitable design of residential units e.g. good sightlines, and supervision in high-risk areas? **All units are well lit-officers stations centrally located for good sightlines.**
14. Are notices displayed in a suitable way for the population? **Bulletin boards are in every unit.**
- a. Is adequate provision made for any prisoners who cannot read notices because of literacy, language, or eyesight problems or any other disability? **Unit staff are available to help-interpreters are provided-TDZ phones are available and large print books ad magazines are provided.**
15. Are residential units as calm and quiet as possible both to avoid incidents and to enable rest and sleep, especially at night? **Yes-monitored by correction officers and staff.**

EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES: CLOTHING AND POSSESSIONS

1. Do prisoners have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs? **The quartermaster measures the inmate and distributes clothing. State clothing can be exchanged every 90 days.**

- a. Are older prisoners provided with additional clothing and bedding, if required, without the need for medical permission? **Yes**
2. Do prisoners have at least weekly access to laundry facilities to wash and iron their personal clothing? **Washers and dryers are in every unit and are to be used daily.**
 - a. Do they have access to laundry/exchange facilities outside the weekly rotation? **Yes-if there is a need, unit staff or dorm officer can make the exchange happen.**
3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request? **Inmates maintain their own property in their cell.**
4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage? **Yes-inmates use the inmate grievance procedure.**
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 at Madison.**
 - a. Is there a standard list also employed for male facilities of the same security category? **Yes-DRC#2055-Inmate Property Record**
6. Are suitable clothes and bags available to discharged prisoners who do not have them? **Inmates are supplied "going home clothing."**
7. Are facilities available before discharge to launder clothes that have been in storage for long periods? **Yes-Institution Laundry-washers/dryers in all units.**

EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES: HYGIENE

1. Are prisoners encouraged, enabled and expected to keep themselves, their cells and communal areas clean? **Yes-staff complete monthly dorm inspections.**
 - a. Are older and disabled prisoners enabled to keep themselves and their cells clean? **Chemicals are supplied-if inmate is not capable of cleaning his own cell, prisoners are made to get the cell clean.**
2. Do prisoners have ready access to both communal and in-cell toilets, baths and showers in private? **Every cell has a toilet seat on Zone A, therefore, access is readily available. Zone B toilets are communal and have half walls between the toilets. Showers are individual and private.**
 - a. Are screened toilets in shared cells? **Yes on Zone B.**

- b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older, less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles? **Yes, disabled showers have seats.**
- 3. Are prisoners able to shower or bathe daily, and immediately following physical activity, before court appearances and before visits? **Yes**
 - a. Is there access at any time during the day? **Access to showers is available daily at times in the morning, afternoon and evening.**
 - b. Are older, less able or disabled prisoners helped to have a bath or shower every day? **Older inmates with such a need as this would be transferred to an institution that handles Medical 3's and 4's.**
- 4. Do prisoners have access to necessary supplies of their own personal hygiene items and sanitary products? **Yes-institution supplies soap, laundry detergent and toilet paper. The commissary also supplies hygiene items.**
- 5. Is fresh laundered bedding provided for each new prisoner on arrival and then on at least a weekly basis? **Yes.**
 - a. Is there a system for the replacement of mattresses in operation? **Yes, mattress are replaced when needed through the unit sergeant, dorm officer or unit staff.**
 - b. Are clean pillows available for new prisoners as well as other bedding? **Pillows are provided, they are also available in the commissary.**
- 6. Is a prisoner's valuable property routinely security marked before it is issued? **Yes.**

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

Infrastructure

1. Is DRC/DYS being encouraged, wherever practical, to use faith-based and community programs that address documented criminogenic needs? How? By whom? **Allowing programs to address problem of self-esteem, life skills, behavioral and attitude changes-giving hope and love by dedicated volunteers.**
 - a. Is DRC/DYS in conjunction with the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, making available to the faith community, examples of evidence-based programming shown to impact offenders' lives? What examples? How are they being made available? **Yes-Examples are the programs that are working such as family oriented, family participation and community based interaction-ODRC are facilitating such programs that promote wholeness and reintegration.**
 - b. Is information being used and disseminated to faith-based and community organizations so that they provide programs that are evidence based and can truly impact the lives of ex-offenders and their families? **Yes**
 - c. What is in place to ensure that the recommendation is implemented? **Reentry both into the communities and household.**
 - d. What methods of program evaluation are being explored to further document program success? What methods are in place? **Examining the recidivism rate of offenders who participate in the faith-base re-entry program prior to their release.**
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? **Their support for innovative events and activities for a faith based re-entry dorm and family oriented services and seminars.**
 - a. Is the culture within the institution continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers? Explain. **Yes-through those volunteers and facilitating their services through mentorship and biblical teachings of biblical truths.**
 - 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? **(No answer provided)**

- c. How is the DRC/DYS administration working with wardens/superintendents to collaboratively develop protocols that will proactively assist with changing the culture? **(No answer provided)**
 - d. Have such protocols been developed? **(No answer provided)**
 - e. What are they? **(No answer provided)**
 - f. Have policies been reviewed to determine if they might inhibit use of community volunteers, and have necessary changes been made accordingly? **No**
 - g. What policies have been reviewed? By whom? **New volunteers policies-by the institution's administrators.**
 - h. What policies have been changed so that they do not inhibit use of community volunteers? **None.**
3. Has DRC/DYS developed a marketing plan to assist in recruiting volunteers from the community and faith-based institutions? **Yes**
- a. Does the plan discuss educating volunteers about the justice system? **Yes**
 - b. Is there a need to increase programming for incarcerated offenders to improve the likelihood they will be reintegrated into the community successfully upon release from prison? **Parenting, Anger Management, Life Skills.**
 - 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-they come in weekly to teach and mentor-when inmate leaves, the volunteer continues to support the inmate's entry into society.**
 - d. Has a marketing plan been developed to overcome the public's misperceptions of offenders?
 - e. Has DRC developed an educational program to motivate the faith community to get involved in volunteering, including a video to educate volunteer groups about offenders and their needs in institutions? **Yes**
 - f. Is information provided on how individuals and groups can volunteer in the prisons? **Yes**
 - g. Does the marketing campaign include information on the needs of the adult/youthful offenders, information on how the justice system works, and information on the different ways to volunteer? **Yes**

4. Has DRC/DYS developed a standard training program for staff, volunteers, and the community to facilitate working in institutions together? **Yes-SB 113 is taught at in-service to all staff and during orientation of volunteers.**
- a. Does the program include information on:
- Ethics of working with offenders? **Yes**
 - Confidentiality issues? **Yes**
 - Ensuring safety and security of volunteers? **Yes**
 - Working with volunteers? **Yes**
 - Rules and regulations for volunteers? **Yes**
- b. Does the program include information to volunteers on the security requirements for the institution, why the requirements are in place, and how to properly work with offenders? **Yes**
- c. Has a standardized training program been developed for volunteers to facilitate their work in institutions? **Yes**
- d. Has DRC/DYS established an orientation program for volunteers, held at preset intervals to allow community organizations to plan for the training as part of their program planning? **Yes**
5. Has Ohio law been revised to remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions that inhibit offenders' successful reentry? **(No answer provided)**
6. What improvements have been made regarding communication about programs and services between: **(No answers provided)**
- Staff and volunteers?
 - Staff and the community? .
 - Other parts of the criminal justice system and the community?
- a. What improvements have been made in effectively communicating among staff within the facilities, as well as with the community? **(No answer provided)**
- b. Has an improved communication mechanism been developed in order to ensure these efforts? **(No answer provided)**
- c. Has the system been developed collaboratively with staff and volunteers to address observed problems? **(No answer provided)**

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? **(No answers provided)**
 - 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.
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? **(No answers provided)**
 - a. Is DRC/DYS working with community organizations and probation departments to expand services available for offenders? How?
 - b. Has a community model been created that will help meet the basic needs of offenders within the community? Is it being created? Explain.
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? **(No answers provided)**
 - 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?
 - 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?

- 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?
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. **(No answers provided)**
- a. Has a job placement program been implemented?
- b. Does it provide:
- Information on job fairs to ex-offenders?
 - Education of businesses/employers on the benefits of hiring ex-offenders?
 - Incentives for employers to hire ex-offenders (i.e., tax breaks)?
 - Increased involvement of faith-based and community groups?
- c. Is there collaboration between the DYS, DRC and Job and Family Services who started the employment centers in Ohio? In what way?
- 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?
- e. Has the DRC Omnibus Reentry legislation been enacted to reduce unnecessary sanctions in the law and thus made training more relevant?

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

- b. Dynamic risk factors that impact offender behavior and risk of reoffending include: antisocial personality, companions, interpersonal conflict, social achievement, substance abuse, and criminogenic needs. Treatment programs can influence and change offender behavior during the time they are in an institution. Programs that address criminogenic needs are programs designed to change offender attitudes, cognitions, behavior toward authority, employment instability, education, housing, and leisure time.

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

- c. Have specific life skills programs been developed in the following areas? **Yes. Volunteers are teaching these skills in their programs.**
- Budgeting?
 - Parenting?
 - Job searches?
 - Anger management?
 - Appropriate leisure-time activities?
- d. Is emphasis centered on using a mentor-type relationship for such training? Yes-we do have several mentors.
- 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.?
- f. Have video-conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders, been expanded? Are they used as an incentive program? Yes
- 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-such organizations as Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Prison Fellowship**
- 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?
- 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. **(No answer provided)**

- a. Are community actors and organizations a part of reentry planning for those offenders who will shortly be returning home? Explain.
- 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**
- c. Is there a mentorship program for offenders at your facility? **Yes**
- d. Are faith-based and community volunteer groups actively developing such a program for participation by offenders at your facility? Explain. **Yes-they work with offenders both inside and outside-some provide housing for sex offenders.**

Reentry Programming

14. Have methods been developed to increase and encourage the involvement of the faith community in various reentry efforts, and to encourage collaboration among faith groups? What are they? **Yes-they include meetings and forums. Communication through letters and phone calls.**
 - a. What has been done to make the faith community aware of programs and training for the faith community's involvement? **Through special meetings, conferences, phone calls and invitations to visit and participate in programs/activities.**
 - b. What has been done to create awareness among the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and the avenues to get involved? **Same as above**
 - c. What effort has been made to inform the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and volunteer opportunities available? **Public announcements and attendance at various religion institutional events and programs to make the needs known.**
 - d. Have leaders among the faith community been identified? How? When? **Yes-we have a current list of them.**
 - e. Have staff been used to accomplish this, using existing organizations, groups and established relationships? Explain.
 - f. Has this educational opportunity been extended to faith groups of all kinds? **Yes**
 - g. Has an easily visible section been added to the DRC (or DYS) web site for the faith community that identifies different programming opportunities for volunteers? **Yes**

- 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? **Yes**
15. Are offenders informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release? How is this done? **Sometimes-through the case managers, the volunteers and mentors.**
- a. Although the offender is no longer in prison, he/she is still subject to housing restrictions due to the crime committed (i.e. sex offenders), which creates more difficult circumstances and specialized needs. Are seminars, with free legal or consultation services provided, along with increased involvement of the faith community? **Yes**
- b. Is legal advice in these situations available? Have partnerships been formed with local law schools to achieve this end?
- 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?
- d. How has DRC/DYS made better use of existing federal programs that aim to address the issue of housing?
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? **(No answers provided.)**
- 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.
 - Inform the public of the many needs of ex-offenders to help them transition successfully back into society?
- 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?