

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT:  
INSPECTION OF THE NORTHEAST OHIO CORRECTIONAL CENTER**

**Prepared and Submitted by CIIC Staff**

**June 9, 2009**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>INSPECTION PROFILE.....</b>	<b>6</b>
 <b>STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Attendance at General Meal Period .....	7
Attendance at Rehabilitative or Educational Program	
 <b>PROGRAMS .....</b>	 <b>8</b>
Rehabilitative Programming	
Residential Programming .....	9
 <b>INSPECTION SUMMARY: Facility Structure, Inmate Concerns, Staff Concerns, Attendance at Meal Period and Program</b>	
 <b>CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF AMERICA .....</b>	 <b>15</b>
<b>INSTITUTION PROFILE- FACILITY DESCRIPTION</b>	
Overview	
Vision	
Mission .....	16
Guiding Principles	
Physical Plant	
Transportation Vehicles	
Housing Units	
Quality Assurance Department .....	17
ADO Report of Operation Indicators for April 9, 2009 to April 16, 2009	
Table 1. ADO Report of Operation Indicators .....	18
Fiscal Data	
Visitation	
 <b>CONTRACT FACILITY MONITORING .....</b>	 <b>19</b>
Summary of Six-Month Evaluation..	
Award Fee Self Assessment of Performance	
Highlights of the Assessment: Contract Responsiveness, Management of Quality Control Programs.....	20
 <b>STAFF ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEE DATA .....</b>	 <b>21</b>

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>INMATE PROFILE AND DATA .....</b>	<b>22</b>
BOP Inmate Nationality	
Table 2. BOP Inmate Nationality Totals at NEOCC .....	23
Intelligence Officer Report and Data for April 2009 .....	24
Inmate Assaults, Institutional Incidents or Events, Other Data Reported to BOP	
Table 3. BOP Requested Information from NEOCC for April 2009	
Inmate Population with Breakdown by Race, Age, Admission Type, and Length	
of Stay.....	25
Table 4. Inmate Breakdown by Race, Age, Admission Type, and Length	
of Stay	
Inmate Population with Breakdown by Age and Race.....	26
Table 5. Inmate Population Totals with Breakdown by Age Range and	
Race	
 <b>INMATE CONCERNS</b>	
Inmate Concerns Relayed During Inspection	
Table 6. Inmate Concerns Relayed During Inspection .....	27
Inmate Concerns Relayed to NEOCC Warden in Follow-up Communication.....	29
Inmate Concerns Relayed through Written Correspondence to CIIC	
Table 7. Number of Contacts and Concerns Received by CIIC .....	30
 <b>INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE .....</b>	<b>31</b>
Overview of NEOCC’s Inmate Grievance Procedure: Prisoner Grievance,	
Grievance Process, Time Guidelines, Emergency Grievances,	
Staff/Prisoner Communication.....	32
Inmate Communication Regarding the Grievance Procedure during Inspection...	35
NEOCC Grievance Log	
 <b>INSPECTION .....</b>	<b>37</b>
Entrance	
Pre-Inspection Conference	
Security Threat Group (STG) Office .....	39
Administrative Area	
Hallways Connecting Housing Units	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
Housing Units .....	40
Management Unit Alpha (A) – USMS Inmates.....	41
Management Unit Bravo (B) – General Population	
Pods B1, B2, and B3 – General Population	
Inmate Comments on B2 and B3 – General Population.....	42
Management Unit Charlie (C) – Unit Z Segregation	
Unit Z – Segregation	
Pod Z1 – BOP Segregation.....	43
Inmate Comments on Pod Z1 Segregation	
Pod Z2 BOP Segregation	
Inmate Comments on Pod Z2 Segregation.....	44
Management Unit Charlie (C) – General Population and Honors Pod	
Pod C1 – Honors Pod.....	45
Pod C5 – General Population	
Inmate Comments on C5 – General Population	
Management Unit Delta (D) – General Population and D7 Step Down	
Pod D7 Step Down Pod	
Inmate Comments on Pod D7 Step Down Pod.....	46
Food Service .....	47
Menu	
Tray Distribution	
Kitchen	
Dining Hall.....	48
 Medical Department	
 Education Department .....	 50
Library	
Inmate Tutors	
General Education – Computer .....	51
General Education – Residential Academic Programs .....	52
Vocational Programs	
Hobby and Craft Classes .....	53
Rehabilitative Programming	
“Wheels of the World” Program .....	54
Religious Services .....	55

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Recreation.....	55
Inmate Comments during Recreation	
<b>STAFF OPEN FORUM MEETING .....</b>	<b>56</b>
Inmate Laundry	
Communication among Administration, Management, and Staff	
Cross-Training	
Sick Leave and Mandatory Hours Related to the Management of Overtime.....	57
Increased Staff Input Toward Formation of Solutions to Operational Problems	
Challenges of Working with the Inmate Population.....	58
Systems to Track Inmate Accounts	
<b>EXIT MEETING WITH ADMINISTRATION.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>61</b>
Adult Expectations	
Questions and Responses to Expectations.....	62
Environment and Relationships	
Residential Units	
Overview	
Clothing and Possessions.....	64
Hygiene	
Staff Prisoner Relationships.....	65
Duty of Care	
Complaint/Grievance Procedure.....	66
Bullying and Violence Prevention.....	69
Self-Harm and Suicide.....	72
Activities .....	74
Learning and Skills and Work Activities	
Library.....	76
Good Order	
Security and Rules	
Security.....	77
Rules	
Services : Food Services.....	78

**Correctional Institution Inspection Committee Report:  
Inspection of the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center**

**INSPECTION PROFILE**

**Date of Inspection:** April 24, 2009

**Type of Inspection:** Unannounced

**CIIC Staff Present:** Darin Furderer, Inspector  
Greg Geisler, Inspector  
Carol Robison, Inspector

**Institutional Staff Present:**

Galey Gates, Assistant Warden of Operations, Candace Rivera, Manager of Quality Assurance, Rose Rubosky, Chief of Unit Management, Jillian Shane, Executive Assistant, Zak Courier, Contract Monitor, Unit Manager, Principal, Program Coordinator, Vocational Teachers (two), Residential Program Coordinator, Faith-Based Program Coordinator, Correctional Officers, Correctional Counselor, Unit Manager, Bookkeeper

**Areas/Activities Included in Inspection:**

Housing Units: B, C, Segregation, Honors Pod, D7 Step-Down Pod, General Population Pods, Residential Program Pods

Food Services

Medical Services

Education/Vocation Department

Library

Wheels on the World Program

Staff Open-Forum Meeting

Security Threat Group Office

Administration Area and Conference

Exit Meeting with Administration

**STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS**

The role of the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee relevant to the inspection of meals and programming, which are two fundamental components of incarceration with significant impact on inmates, is statutorily established pursuant to Section 103.73 (A) (1) and (2) of the Ohio Revised Code. This section of Ohio law states that the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee shall establish and maintain a continuing program of inspection of each state correctional institution used for the custody, control, training, and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime. The statute also requires that the Committee shall inspect each correctional

institution “each biennium,” and further, that *each inspection shall include attendance at “one general meal period” as well as observation of at least “one rehabilitative or educational program.”* Relevant to inmate programming, the statute requires the Committee to “*evaluate and assist in the development of programs to improve the condition and operation of correctional institutions.*”

***Attendance at General Meal Period.*** The lunch meal consisted of one soft tortilla, hot corn and green peppers, cold salsa (homemade), hot turkey filling (for the enchilada), shredded cheese, and warm bread pudding (homemade). Beverages included either water or a sweetened fruit drink. All food items on the tray were tasteful, seasoned and flavorful, appropriately hot or cold, colorful and nutritionally balanced, and portions were adequate. Food service staff relayed that milk is provided only at the breakfast meal. Staff relayed they may eat the same food as the inmates and frequently select it over other options because it is usually so flavorful.

In addition to the tray, which is customized for inmates with special dietary or religious requirements, the institution maintains a self-serve hot food bar. The hot food bar offers a few additional food items, always includes beans and rice, and is available to all inmates to consume as much as they wish without limits. The provisions of beans and rice on the hot food bar offer the predominantly Hispanic inmate population an option that is akin to the staple dietary components of their homeland.

***Attendance at Rehabilitative and Educational Programs.*** The inspection included observation of educational and vocational classes, several residential unit programs, and a unique community service program, which were all in progress during the hours of the inspection. All rehabilitative or educational programs were observed to be well-organized, and all staff assigned to direct these programs openly relayed their commitment and enthusiasm to the programs as well as their pride in the accomplishments of the inmates in the individual programs or classes. All inmates were visibly engaged in the classes and there was virtually no idleness among the students. The use of inmate tutors was clearly evident among all programs, with a larger number of NEOCC inmates either teaching or assisting other inmates than has commonly been observed during inspections of prisons operating under the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. CIIC considerations of the practice of using inmate tutors was shared with the NEOCC Warden in follow-up communication, as provided in a previous section, *Follow-up Communication and Inspection Summary*, of this report. The full descriptions of the programs that were observed during the inspection are provided in subsequent sections and sub-sections, *Education Department, Rehabilitative Programming, and “Wheels on the World” Program.*

## PROGRAMS

### Rehabilitative Programming

During the inspection, staff provided material on rehabilitative and life-skills programming. Three primary rehabilitative programs are in place: a *basic substance abuse* program, a *Self Improvement Group*, and *New Beginnings*. In addition, a *Life Principles Community Program (LPCP)* was written and is owned by the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) and the Institute of Basic Life Principles for use in CCA prisons nationwide. The substance abuse program is based on the *Twelve Step Program* of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and also the *Straight Ahead Transition* chapter on Relapse. The *New Beginnings* program was started in October 2008 and is designed to prepare inmates for release and reintegration into society. The *Life Principles Community Program* was observed during the inspection, therefore, the full LPCP inspection details are provided within the *Inspection* section of this report.

Aside from these specific rehabilitative programs, NEOCC inmates may engage in academic and vocational courses, which are described in the *Education Department* section of this report.

Through post-inspection communication from NEOCC administration, documentation was provided to illustrate inmate completion of rehabilitative programs. The communication, *Monthly Unit Program Utilization and Activity Report*, was provided to CIIC for April 17, 2009. The report provided a snapshot view of the variety of topics delivered, the number of hours completed, and the number of inmates engaged in rehabilitative programs on one unit, including the *Self Improvement Group*. The report shows that on April 17, 2009, in one housing unit, 94 inmates completed a grand total of 100 hours of rehabilitative or life-skills programming.

Of the 100 hours, 40 hours were collectively completed as part of the *Self Improvement Group*. The *Self Improvement Group* engages inmates in the following areas of personal understanding and development: motivation, understanding anger, ideas for communication, unlocking your thinking, and parenting. The report showed, within the *Self Improvement Group*, 48 inmates completed a total of 20 hours in components under the module *Brief Intervention*. The four components completed under the *Brief Intervention* cluster include *Getting Motivated to Change*, *Understanding and Reducing Angry Feelings*, *Ideas for Better Communication*, and *Unlock Your Thinking, Open Your Mind*. Also within the *Self Improvement Group*, 12 inmates completed 20 hours in the *Partners in Parenting* module of the program.

There were an additional 18 inmates shown as having completed 40 hours of programming in a different program, *Mapping Your Steps*, plus an additional 16 inmates, who completed 20 hours of programming in *Other New Beginnings – Release and Reintegration*.

It is CIIC's understanding that the components of the *Brief Intervention* program and implied topics under the *Other New Beginnings – Release and Reintegration* program are similar to some

of the components found in other residential programs such as *New Beginnings* and *Life Principles Community Program (LPCP)*.

### **Residential Programming**

The presence of a residential format for the delivery of rehabilitative programs at the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center was visibly evident and several examples were observed. Inmates were observably engaged with interest and were attentive to the instruction and interaction of the programming throughout the inspection. The overall mood among NEOCC inmates in residential programming activities on the inspection date was positive and even happy in some cases.

It may be noted that one of the benefits of delivering rehabilitative programming as a residential program in an environmentally-contained setting is that the program becomes the collective and continuous focus of inmates in the unit. The collective synergy and transformative efforts of each individual plays a necessary role in the acquisition of new knowledge and development of positive life skills for everyone involved in the program. In that regard, the program employs the instructional method of *immersion* to cause the lessons within the program to become more meaningful to each inmate through experiencing the lessons. As residential inmates 'live' the lessons among themselves throughout their daily interactions, a social framework is developed, which is intended to provide favorable support to individuals in their learning efforts.

### **INSPECTION SUMMARY**

The following summary of the inspection was shared with the Warden shortly after the inspection, and also relayed to the CIIC members during the CIIC meeting on May 6, 2009 as part of the CIIC Progress Report and Staff Briefing.

On April 28, 2008, the CIIC Director provided follow-up communication to the NEOCC Warden, who was not at the institution on the day of the inspection due to a conference. In response, on May 1, 2009, the Warden expressed his appreciation for the summary report and for the way CIIC staff interacted with NEOCC staff. He noted that he received very complimentary reports. The communication to the NEOCC Warden included the following:

This is to express my sincere appreciation for your staff's assistance in accommodating CIIC Inspectors Darin Furderer, Gregory Geisler and Carol Robison on the unannounced inspection at your facility on April 24, 2009. I regret that I was unable to be present due to the simultaneous inspection of the Ohio State Penitentiary. I have reviewed a summary prepared by staff, and note that your staff were described as hospitable, cooperative, and responsive to the inspection team's requests for information. Further, they relayed that the staff throughout the facility had positive attitudes, and were courteous, organized, and professional.

This is to provide you with prompt feedback regarding the inspection. It is not the inspection report, but the content below will be included or referenced as appropriate in the actual inspection report. The last section below with inmate names and their reported concern is for your information and hopefully for staff follow-up. No names will be included in our inspection report. I will provide you with an opportunity to preview the actual inspection report, and to provide feedback on any errors, inaccuracies or needed clarification, which will be incorporated in the report as follow-up communication. Our goal is to have the inspection report drafted in 30 days from the inspection date. Typically, it takes longer.

The following has been taken from the summary report submitted by CIIC staff.

Administrators relayed with a certain degree of pride that they have been able to establish and maintain a cost-effective operation. The administration indicated the diligent monitoring and restraints on excessive overtime, have been shown to be effective in cost containment. The institution submits to the American Corrections Association (ACA) audit, a Bureau of Prisons audit every six months, and also to institutionally-developed internal audits. The variety of audits that are completed draws frequent attention to many details. Administrators indicated that some audits have over 1,000 indicators, and successful passage of these audits has given the administration assurance that they are operating above expected standards required by the contracts.

The inspection included the medical department, numerous living units, and a staff open-forum at the close of the day. NEOCC is reportedly not overcrowded, although administrators did indicate that a few of the double-man cells are housing three inmates. Because NEOCC has some vacant cells, it was not understood why three inmates were housed in some two man cells, instead of using the empty cells.

NEOCC administrators reported that NEOCC is not understaffed. Staffing levels are reportedly positively impacted by staff cross-training. Staff indicated that in certain cases, the cross-training and diminishing distinctions among some job title duties have caused stress to staff in their efforts to complete their primary assigned duties and simultaneously cover the job obligations of more than one position.

***Facility Structure.*** Structurally, the facility is under one roof, but there is no contact or connection between the two groups of inmates housed within the complex. Housing units for the two groups are at opposite ends of the complex, and services received by the two groups are staggered so that inmates from the

two groups have no contact or simultaneous sharing of common space in accessing departments that serve both groups. The April 24, 2009 inspection focused on the Federal Bureau of Prison side of the facility. The facility is designed so that every entrance into the complex is crash-gated, essentially creating a sally port at every entrance.

The complex is architecturally in impressive condition and repair, having appeared to be very well maintained. The observed level of cleanliness and neatness throughout all parts of the NEOCC complex was exceptionally high. Floors were spotless and shiny with a deep gloss. Every wall and trim surface was immaculately clean, almost as if freshly painted. Every shower bank on the units was bright, odorless, free of mold and scum, and framed by a secure, esthetically appealing, bright brushed steel framework and ceramic tiles free of any mildew or mold. The complete absence of institutional odors was immediately apparent on every unit and also in the common areas. Units were all architecturally well-lit and also pleasant with natural light.

Institutional security is also addressed impressively through the efforts of the Security Threat Group Coordinator. A separate office is dedicated to the oversight of security threat groups (STG) at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center. The STG Coordinator has assembled a large bulletin board displaying photos of inmates who are associated with any form of threat to the security of the institution. Inmate photos are clustered by gang affiliation, history of specific violent acts, history of consistent and problematic behavior in institutions, high profile inmates in the media, etc.

***Inmate Concerns.*** Although inmates expressed various complaints about facility operations, there did not appear to be any tension between inmates or inmates and staff. Of particular note, was an atypically large volume of inmates who eagerly clustered around the CIIC team to voice their comments and concerns. The NEOCC staff were notably obliging to both inmates and the inspection team, by permitting ‘unrushed’ dialogue for considerably long stretches of time, particularly in the inmate dining hall. Inmate concerns centered on several key issues:

- Inadequate access and quality of medical and dental services,
- A new sales tax placed upon phone privileges, and
- Upcoming plans to limit the hours of access to showers and the number of daily showers per inmate.

Some inmates complained that the daily menu consists of beans and rice without variation. Inmates also spoke of a punitive unfairness due to the denial of

privileges to certain “transition” inmates, who are housed in Unit D7 following their obligatory period in segregation. These “transition” inmates are reportedly housed among inmates who are in the D7 unit for noncompliance issues, such as refusing to pay their court costs or refusal of educational programming. The “transition” inmates are reportedly subjected to the same restrictions or denial of privileges associated with the punitive nature of the unit; thus, transition inmates perceive that they are being forced to endure an unfair extension of their segregation experience. Other inmates felt that because they are illegal citizens, they are not treated the same as U.S. citizens in terms of constitutional rights and privileges. There is a predominance of Hispanic inmates among the inmate population, and there was some discontent voiced from inmates in the minority of that demographic, from inmates who are not Hispanic, that the daily food options are not diverse, and that beans and rice are served much too frequently. Some inmates of various religious orientations relayed concerns about the absence of appropriate accommodations for their religions, including meals, worship time, and their religious leaders being denied approval to serve the inmates in the institution. In fact, one inmate relayed that there are religious tensions among the inmates and that tensions could even “jump off” at any time.

- Various inmates voiced complaints as to why they must pay sales taxes for phone privileges as inmates believe they are exempt for phone privileges
- Several inmates relayed dissatisfaction with new shower schedule effective April 27, 2009. Inmates reported that they cannot shower between 7:30 A.M. and 5:30 A.M.
- Allegations of legal mail being confiscated. Several inmates believe that mail does not leave mail room
- One inmate voiced concern about not getting hot water, towels, laundry, t-shirts. Several other inmates relayed that they do not receive hygiene products and only get one roll of toilet paper per week
- One inmate believes that the grievance system is designed to confuse inmates. Others relayed allegations of complaints and grievances not getting answered
- A few inmates stated that they only receive beans and rice for meal periods. One inmate voiced complaints about not receiving fruits in the morning or natural juice. Inmate stated that they have restricted access to chow, that they only have a five minute window and if they do not leave during that time they miss out
- A few inmates were dissatisfied with recreation hours stating that sometimes they must miss because of job assignments. They stated that the recreation schedule depends on the unit and it never rotates between morning and evening on the weekends
- A few inmates mentioned that they have limited access to the library. Upon further questioning it was relayed that they receive approximately 12 hours/week
- Complaints about count taking 45 minutes
- Several inmates relayed concerns regarding three man cells in cells designed for two inmates. Inmates believe there is a lack of room for third person

- One inmate stated problems about laundry service and believes they do not wash clothes with detergent. Inmates also mentioned they are supposed to get clothes every six months from the quartermaster
- One inmate voiced allegations that the Spanish program does not have a Spanish speaking teacher

**Staff Concerns.** Staff concerns were limited to a few key issues, which included:

- Some frustration with a budget that does not allow the quartermaster to provide adequate whites to inmates,
- An inadequate laundry operation that too-frequently misplaces inmate clothing,
- A system of requiring mandatory hours from employees for using their sick time,
- An absence of respect from management toward staff relevant to staff input to solutions to operational problems, and
- A previous communication model that was of poor quality. The previous communication model was described as being fragmented and sparse in connecting and communicating among administration, middle management, and staff. Staff relayed hope that a newly formed 'Round Table' model, created under the institution's new Warden, might likely bring improvements to the previous communication model.

During the inspection, staff were willing to share their suggestions for improvements and their ideas to eliminate some of the concerns that they raised. The representative staff relayed that one of their ongoing challenges in working with the NEOCC inmate population is the nature of outspoken inmates, often younger individuals, who come into the institution straight from the streets, and embody anger and disrespect. Staff noted that individuals of this nature typically are found among those under the authority of the U.S. Marshal, as the Federal Bureau of Prisons inmates are often quieter in nature. Nonetheless, staff noted that a small percentage of outrageous inmates can effectively command a majority of the available time that staff may spend with the overall inmate population.

**Attendance at Meal Period and Program.** The inspection encompassed the statutory requirement to attend a meal period and to attend an educational or rehabilitative program. An impressive preparation area and delivery system to inmates was noted for the preparation and distribution of special trays: religious meals, special diet meals, etc. Both administrators and staff presented a visible affirmation and appreciation for the programs that serve approximately 600 NEOCC inmates daily. There are several distinctive programs provided at NEOCC. In addition to the customary education options of Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Education Diploma (GED), and several vocational tracks, the inspection team observed three *residential-unit* programs specific to NEOCC: INEA, Colbach, and the Life Principles Community Program, which is a Corrections Corporation of America faith-based contracted program. A fourth

unique program, known as Wheels of the World, refurbishes wheelchairs for charity organizations to donate to individuals who cannot afford to have a wheelchair.

In spite of the fine examples of programming, inmates relayed concerns about the lack of supervision in the schools, in that there are reportedly too few teachers. In some cases, one teacher floats between blocks to deliver programming while inmate tutors are placed in positions of 'instructional leadership' in the teacher's absence. The use of tutors is a positive, but placing any inmate in a position of authority is considered a dangerous practice that threatens the safety and security of any institution.

The following are concerns of specific inmates reported to the CIIC team during the inspection.

- Problem with dental department. Has an infected tooth and previously requested that it be pulled. Problem has existed for over two years and still has not had tooth pulled. Received medication. Experiencing pain and believes he needs tooth pulled.
- Problem with medical. Does not believe medical takes care of inmates.
- Stated problem regarding shakedowns and property. Believes that inmates who are not American do not receive same treatment and have fewer rights than American prisoners. Expressed concern regarding the failure to receive protective gloves while cleaning.
- Voiced concerns regarding privileges in D7. Believes inmates are punished twice for same offense.
- Institution is violating religious rights diet. Denied right to celebrate the Muslim holiday the day after the pilgrimage (Eid al-Adha).
- Given wrong medication. Asked doctor who allegedly said he did not prescribe medication. Face turned black. Still has blurry vision reportedly as a result of receiving wrong medication.
- Believes that the institution is unconstitutional. Maintains that no inmate under federal law may be placed in a private facility.
- Problem with kidney and states that he has not received adequate medical care. Medication has not done anything and reports that he has blood in his urine
- Problems with his hand that was previously broken. Had a cast put on it. Maintains that it did not heal properly. Reports that he cannot use hand and believes it needs surgery.
- Needs to see doctor for eye problem
- Denied hygiene supplies such as toothpaste and toothbrush. Denied other inmate supplies clothing
- Reported that he has problems urinating. Maintains he has kidney stones.
- Problem with leg. Reports that he needs bottom bunk restriction
- States that he is not eligible for deportation. Birth date is wrong on file. Actual birth date is 7-30-57
- Institution is run like a maximum security institution. Cubans do not get deported. Wants to know why Cubans are there if they cannot qualify for deportation
- Refused special diet. Needs a no meat diet

- Placed in segregation for not standing for count. Placed in D7 after leaving segregation. Later placed in three man cell. Hurt back and went to medical. Only received ice. Did not receive anything for the pain. Had to purchase medications from commissary
- Needs dentures. Has trouble eating and swallows food whole. Impressions were taken six months ago. Has not heard anything since then
- Has not received pills for heart medication in 28 days
- Has hernia and fever and is in a lot of pain
- Has infection in his leg. Piece of metal stuck there from an accident
- Relayed that filling fell out. Went to Nurse Sick Call six months ago. Never called out. Kept being told he was on the list and has been called since. The rest of the tooth fell out two weeks ago now they are going to schedule him after he brought it up again.
- Pain in liver and stomach. Has not seen doctor in three or four months. Needs to know the results of his test.
- Reports that he cannot get filling unless he is at prison for six months

## **CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF AMERICA**

The parent company that owns and manages the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center is Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), headquartered in Nashville, Tennessee. The CCA website indicates that the company was established in 1983 and founded the private corrections industry. The company reports that it owns more than 64 correctional facilities and detention centers nationally, employs nearly 17,000 professionals, and serves more than 75,000 residents.

## **INSTITUTION PROFILE – FACILITY DESCRIPTION**

### **Overview**

The website for the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center shows the center under private ownership and operation of Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) since 1997. The prison operates with a total of 2,016 beds and serves the U.S. Marshals Service and the Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP) as their customer base. The center sits on approximately 135 acres in Youngstown, Ohio, provides incarceration for low-security adult males, and is accredited by the American Corrections Association (ACA). Institutional staff relayed that the inmates under the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service are held under parameters and conditions more resembling a jail setting than a prison environment.

### **Vision**

As published in the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center's 2009 Welcome Handbook for visitors and interested individuals, the vision of the parent company, Corrections Corporation of America, is *to be the best full service adult corrections company in the United States.*

## **Mission**

Likewise, the corporate mission is stated as follows: *In partnership with government, we will provide a meaningful public service by operating the highest quality adult corrections company in the United States.*

## **Guiding Principles**

Further, the handbook presents four guiding principles applicable to corrections professionals and eight guiding principles applicable to the company. The guiding principles identified for corrections professionals include *integrity, trust, respect, and loyalty*. The guiding principles applicable to the company are identified as *safety and security, quality, accountability, service-driven, cost effectiveness, teamwork, communication, and innovation*.

## **Physical Plant**

The institution is essentially under one roof, with access to nearly all areas through wide and well-lit interior hallways. The facility is surrounded by a double razor-edged fence system and extra razor coils in some locations. The Welcome Handbook describes a Central Control office that controls the vehicular sally port gates, the front entrance gates, perimeter lighting, perimeter intrusion device, the fire alarm system, the key lock boxes, and hand held radios. Central Control can assume command of any housing unit control centers. There is a telephone with outside-facility and long distance capability. A complete set of emergency keys is maintained in two separate locations, both inside and outside the institution, to ensure access at all times.

## **Transportation Vehicles**

The institution reportedly maintains a variety of vehicles for the transportation of inmates. The fleet includes one large 42-inmate vehicle, which resembles a recreational vehicle and was acquired at a cost of \$330,000. In addition, a smaller vehicle has capacity for 24 inmates, and ten vans complete the fleet.

## **Housing Units**

The Welcome Handbook describes the institution's inmate housing as having four *management units*: Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, and Delta. Staff commented that the institution maintains multiple segregation pods and operates with four observation cells (including two negative pressure rooms), which are located within the Medical department. Located among the four management units are sixteen operational housing modules.

The four *units* are similar in architecture, with each unit containing approximately four *modules*. Within each module, there are two or three *pods* with double-occupancy cells on two tiers. Inmate capacity within each of the modules ranges from 112 inmates in modules with two pods, to 128 inmates in modules with three pods.

In the *Special Housing Unit (SHU)*, there are five outdoor recreation cages and six enclosed showers with “High Security” doors, with one shower equipped for use by handicapped or disabled inmates. Each cell has locking food ports installed in the doors.

### **Quality Assurance Department**

The institution’s Welcome Handbook provides details associated with quality assurance measures applicable to institutional operations. Essentially, two staff are dedicated to *quality assurance* and the Quality Assurance Department serves as the hub of a network of tasks and evaluations, data collection and analysis, and the presentation of findings to provide assurance to the Corrections Corporation of America and to the customer, that all programs are operating within CCA and BOP policy, and are free of waste, abuse, and mismanagement. Under a *Quality Control Plan*, monthly reports are submitted from respective department heads to the Quality Assurance Manager, who compiles the information, details deficiencies and corrective action plans, and forwards the compilations to the Warden and to the U.S. Marshals Service.

In addition to the institution’s self-imposed quality assurance system, the institution is subjected to meeting specific standards set forth by the American Corrections Association in order that the institution achieves ACA accreditation and also is in compliance with *Statements of Work (SOW)*, which are contracted performance requirements as set forth for the management and operation of Community Corrections Centers (CCC) providing community-based services for federal offenders under the authority of the federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP).

### **ADO Report of Operation Indicators for April 9, 2009 to April 16, 2009**

The Northeast Ohio Correctional Center provides a weekly *ADO Report* to divisional offices of the Corrections Corporation of America. The report provides several statistics under the heading ‘Operations Indicators.’ The list of operations indicators provides minimal, yet helpful, information pertaining to areas of operations that are monitored and recorded. The following table shows the data collected for the institution under each indicator for the week ending April 16, 2009.

**Table 1. ADO Report of Operations Indicators for April 9, 2009 to April 16, 2009****Northeast Ohio Correctional Center**

<b>OPERATIONS INDICATORS</b>	<b>NUMBER ONLY</b>
Number of False Alarms from perimeter detection system	85
Number of inmate drug tests administered	52
Number of inmate drug tests yielding positive results	0
Number of inmate grievances	3
Number of inmate disciplinary reports written	26
Number of inmates without work or education assignments	107
Number of STG related incidents	0
Dollar amount of weekly commissary sales	\$81,781.40
Number of full-time positions vacant for more than 30 days	7
Number of new hires	0
Number of employees terminated	0
Number of employee PSNs completed	0
Number of overtime hours paid	48.97 hours
Number of first-step staff grievances	1

**Fiscal Data**

As a private, for-profit business, the institution's financial records are not fully public. During the inspection, administrators relayed that the institution is operated with diligent attention to cost containment, and that the careful monitoring and control of staff overtime hours has proven to be one effective measure in limiting costs. Only limited and dated financial data was published for December 2005 in a Welcome Handbook, which was provided to CIIC under a previous NEOCC administration; however, no current financial information is available.

**Visitation**

The visitation privilege is cherished by inmates throughout the prison system. Provisions and arrangements for visitation may vary among institutions, which exercise individual latitude in structuring a visitation schedule. The visitation privilege to inmates at NEOCC is reportedly more open than most institutions with a schedule that provides visitation hours every day of the week except Tuesdays and Wednesdays. As relayed to the CIIC through a NEOCC Staff Memorandum of June 2008, USMS inmates may see visitors on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday, while inmates held under the BOP may see visitors on Saturday evening, Sunday, and Monday. The visitation rules include that with the exception of attorney visits, all USMS visits are non-contact visits; and with the exception of Protective Custody inmates, all BOP inmate visits are contact visits. A review of the Inmate Visitation Rules reveals that inmates at NEOCC must follow basically the same requirements placed upon inmates held under the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. As shown in NEOCC documentation, visitation stipulations include the following inmate behavioral requirements:

- a. Assigned seating.
- b. Remain in seats unless authorized to use restroom or have a photo taken.
- c. No inmates may visit with other inmates.
- d. No inmate access to vending machines.
- e. Limited contact between inmate and visitor, outside of initial greeting.
- f. Initial greeting may include a brief hug and/or kiss.
- g. Not inappropriate touching or behavior during visit by either inmate or visitor.
- h. All hands of inmate and visitor will be visible during visit.
- i. Visitors have sole responsibility to maintain control of children.
- j. Visitors and inmates may not exchange or pass items to one another, except vending machine purchases.
- k. Inmates may not visit with other visitors without prior approval.

## **CONTRACT FACILITY MONITORING**

As a privately-owned institution, the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center differs from the institutions under the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, by providing its services under a contract. The facility is subjected to a bi-annual review and evaluation. The most recent evaluation of the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center was conducted on February 24-26, 2009 and a *Contract Facility Monitoring Report* was issued on March 9, 2009. The monitoring was reportedly a comprehensive examination of the facility's operations with attention given to vital functions. The Monitor-in-Charge at NEOCC certified that the monitoring was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

### **Summary of Six-Month Evaluation**

The monitoring report provided positive general comments, which include that the areas of Correctional and Health Services have shown significant improvement, internal controls and oversight by management staff has ensured that problems are identified, and effective corrective action is developed and monitored to ensure policy and procedural compliance. The report did identify, however, ten details as deficiencies in the areas of Correctional Programs, Education, Food Service, Health Services, and Inmate Systems. The deficiencies were identified with references made to the specific CCA policies or institutional Standards of Work (SOW). By including the specific CCA policy or Standard of Work associated with each identified deficiency, the determinations of 'deficiencies' are established with objectivity rather than as subjective judgments. The process of linking deficiencies to policies contributes to the validity of the examination.

### **Award Fee Self-Assessment of Performance**

Information supplied to CIIC on the NEOCC self-assessment indicates there is opportunity provided to the institution to earn an 'award-fee' through a provision of the contract held by the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) and the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). The information available defined the award fee as a fee above the fixed-price of the contract,

commensurate with the achievement of performance above the acceptable level defined and established in the contract. The appraisal period reflected in the self-assessment was shown as October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009. The Award Fee Determination Plan (AFDP) used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) lists three factors essential for the consideration of an award fee: *Quality of Work*, *Contractor Responsiveness*, and *Management of Quality Control Programs*. A review of the materials provided to CIIC revealed that NEOCC received a 'superior' rating in all three factors.

### **Highlights of the Assessment**

Within the areas of Contractor Responsiveness and Management of Quality Control Programs, there were some operational and statistical details that help to illustrate quality and/or issues relevant to operations within the institution.

***Contractor Responsiveness.*** The report indicated there were no unusual events during the reporting period, with CCA crediting this achievement to enhanced communication between staff and the inmate population and adjustments in operations to effectively manage the specialized criminal alien population. NEOCC reportedly has successfully provided comprehensive services for 181 continuous days with no significant incidents. Further, the report indicated improvements due to training and networking of the NEOC Intelligence Office (IO) and enhanced property procedures have resulted in an increase in the discovery of contraband. Other notable security measures during the period included the placement of an additional staff member in the visitation area to increase coverage, and the installation of thirty-two (32) cameras and five (5) additional monitors to increase the visibility in key areas of the institution. Alcohol testing was also increased, per the BOP's request, according to the report. Additional improvements were provided in the report to include: STG Officers attending a gang seminar, a new podium in the Visitation area, twenty-six (26) new radios, updated metal detector at the entrance, four (4) new DVD cameras, development and implementation of the facility's breaching plan, and the removal of recreation bags, cleaning carts, and back braces from the inmate population. In January 2009, NEOCC reportedly responded quickly to the BOP's request to house approximately 200 inmates as a result of an incident that occurred at another BOP contract facility. Although the services were *not* needed, NEOCC was reportedly responsive and prepared to assist in the situation. Last, an updated grievance policy was reportedly implemented by CCA/NEOCC in October 2008. The new policy provides inmates with an Informal Resolution Process that allows staff to address inmate concerns at the lowest level possible. As a result, the number of inmate grievances filed during the period was reportedly forty-one (41) as compared to the previous review period total of seventy-seven (77).

***Management of Quality Control Program.*** The management of quality control is addressed through *self-initiated service improvements* and investments. The self-assessment reported that NEOCC continues to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of the Quality Control Plan (QCP) and that a *new and amended* Quality Control Plan was completed during the review period.

Inspections of the new plan identified deficiencies to include eighty-four (84) “needs improvement” and eleven (11) “non-performing” findings over the six-month period. Corrective action and additional monitoring was reportedly implemented in these areas to bring the deficiencies into compliance. The report relayed that deficiencies require a *Plan of Action* (POA) to ensure correction and follow-up. POA *documents* are generated by the QA Department, developed by the appropriate Department Head(s), and approved by the Warden. BOP Oversight staff review and monitor these documents and are provided with status updates on a monthly basis, or upon request. The report also relayed that *concentrated efforts have been made by the Quality Assurance (QA) Department to closely review documentation submitted by the Department heads prior to submission to the BOP.* According to the self-assessment report, a total of twenty (20) Plan of Action documents were generated during the current review period, ten (10) of which are pending completion/certification.

### **STAFF ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEE DATA**

The institution’s Welcome Handbook presents an organization comprised of 42 position types. The NEOCC *Warden* has seven direct reports: Manager of Human Services, Assistant Warden of Security and Programs, Administrative Supervisor, Executive Assistant, Manager of Quality Assurance, Business Manager, and Assistant Warden of Operations.

Reporting to the *Assistant Warden of Security and Programs* are four positions: Chief of Unit Management, Chief of Security, Intelligence Officer, and Chaplain. Reporting directly or indirectly to the *Chief of Unit Management* are six position types: Unit Manager, Case Manager, Correctional Counselor, Correctional Officer, Case Management Coordinator, and Records. Reporting directly or indirectly to the *Chief of Security* are 13 position types and institutional areas: Assistant Chief of Security, Shift Supervisor, Assistant Shift Supervisor, Senior Correctional Officer, Correctional Officer, Key Control, Armory, Special Housing Unit (SHU), Laundry, Transport, Receiving and Discharge, Property, and Recreation. The *Intelligence Officer* has supervision of the Mailroom. The *Manager of Quality Assurance* oversees the Quality Assurance Coordinator, while the *Business Manager* oversees the Warehouse and the Commissary. Finally, reporting to the *Assistant Warden of Operations* are seven position titles and areas: Computer Services Manager, Health Services, Maintenance, Training Manager, Safety Manager, Food Service, and Education. The *Manager of Human Resources*, *Administrative Supervisor*, and the *Executive Assistant* do not have any direct reports.

During the inspection, both administrators and staff members identified that there is no shortage of staff. Administrators indicated that one Unit Manager serves 500 inmates; and on each Unit, there is one Administrative Clerk, three Case Managers, three Correction Counselors, and two Unit Correctional Officers (CO) per 120 inmates (one CO on the floor and one CO in the bubble/control booth).

The Corrections Counselors reportedly function much as a unit sergeant. In that capacity the Corrections Counselors address daily issues and concerns relayed by inmates, security duties, assignment of jobs to inmates, and serve as the first line in handling unit problems. Case Counselors reportedly assign jobs to inmates according to inmate classification levels under a Classification Plan. Case Managers reportedly address the details associated with inmate transfers and changes in inmate classification.

While no current staff demographic data was provided to CIIC, demographic breakdown of staff was published in a Welcome Handbook from a previous NEOCC administration. Staff demographics of 2005 were shown to include 166 female and 277 male staff, for a *total staff number of 443*. The breakdown of staff by race was shown in 2005 to include 302 white staff, 106 African American staff, 34 Hispanic staff, and 2 staff of 'Other' races.

### **INMATE PROFILE AND DATA**

Staff relayed a perception that a majority of the inmate population at any time may be of direct or indirect Hispanic origin at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center. Data showing inmate demographics was provided to the CIIC in post-inspection correspondence, and this information shows, however, that Hispanic inmates account for approximately 34 percent of the BOP inmate population, and approximately 28 percent among the combined BOP and USMS inmate population, based on NEOCC inmate counts taken on April 27, 2009 and May 18, 2009 respectively. The majority of the inmates held under authority of the federal Bureau of Prisons reportedly will eventually be deported under U. S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and returned to their countries of citizenship. Communication supplied after the inspection provided additional inmate statistics.

#### **BOP Inmate Nationality**

The Northeast Ohio Correctional Center is unique among the adult institutions in Ohio in that there are numerous nationalities represented among the inmate population. The determination of institutional assignment for inmates held under the Bureau of Prisons' authority is made by the Bureau of Prisons; and each facility is contracted to provide housing for the inmates who are sent to its doors. Each federal prison has its own distribution of inmate nationalities, which may be dissimilar to the distribution found at the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center. The range of nationalities of inmates held under the authority of the BOP at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center was provided to CIIC in post-inspection correspondence and is shown in the following table.

**Table 2. BOP Inmate Nationality Totals at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center with Breakdown by Percent of Total – Representative Date: April 27, 2009**

<b>Nationality of BOP Inmate</b>	<b>Percent of Total Combined Inmate Population</b>
Mexico	33.85 %
United States of America	24.93
None	2.33
Nigeria	1.02
Vietnam (Ref. Only)	0.78
Other	0.63
Lebanon	0.34
Korea (Ref. Only)	0.29
Laos	0.29
Pakistan	0.29
Nicaragua	0.24
Afghanistan	0.19
Belize (British Honduras)	0.19
Jordan	0.19
<b>Nationality of BOP Inmate (continued)</b>	<b>Percent of Total Combined Inmate Population (continued)</b>
Panama	0.19
Africa (Ref. Only)	0.15
Liberia	0.15
Peru	0.15
Albania	0.10
Argentina	0.10
Niger	0.10
Not Listed	0.10
Antigua and Barbuda	0.05
Aruba	0.05
Azerbaijan	0.05
Bahrain/Bahrein	0.05
Balearic islands	0.05
Barbados	0.05
Belgium	0.05
Bolivia	0.05
Kuwait	0.05
Malaysia	0.05
Mali	0.05
Moldova	0.05
Unknown Place of Birth	0.05
Uruguay	0.05
Vietnam	0.05
Western (Spanish) Sahara	0.05
<b>Percent of BOP Inmates at NEOCC</b>	<b>67.32%</b>
<b>Percent of USMS Inmates at NEOCC</b>	<b>32.68%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Intelligence Officer Report and Data for April 2009

Follow-up communication from Northeast Ohio Correctional Center shows that the Intelligence Office monitors inmate activity and conducts alcohol and urinalysis tests as part of the institution's ongoing intelligence measures. Monthly intelligence data is collected at NEOCC through alcohol and urinalysis testing, documentation of unusual events, ongoing updates to gang and inmate leader files, protective custody requests, weapons discovered, cases pending prosecution and FBI referrals, and through telephone monitoring. The preceding categories are typical of those also in place within institutions operating under the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

### Inmate Assaults, Institutional Incidents or Events, Other Data Reported to BOP

The Northeast Ohio Correctional Center's administration provided CIIC with two examples of monthly reports that are submitted to the BOP. In the first example, monthly statistics are collected and recorded under a variety of categories, including among others: Admissions, Releases, Medical Trips, Transfer Requests, Inmates Transferred, MGTV Requested, Urine and Alcohol Tests, Status of Inmates in Special Housing Unit, Commissary Sales, a variety of institutional expenditures for the period, a summary of activity under Human Resources, and the number of completions for each of the programs within the Education Department.

In the second example, institutional data and statistics in 14 categories reflecting specific incidents or events with possible relevance to institutional safety and security were provided to the Federal Bureau of Prisons at the request of the BOP. The data in this report reflects activity for April 2009 and includes three categories related to 'assault' or 'fight,' and for those categories, explanations and results of investigation of each incident are provided to the BOP. The following table displays each category and its frequency during April 2009.

**Table 3. BOP Requested Information from NEOCC for April 2009**

Institutional Incident, Event, or Subject at NEOCC	Number of Occurrences in April 2009
<i>Assaults offender/offender not involving weapon and not requiring outside medical treatment.</i>	3
<i>Fight offender/offender.</i>	3
Assaults offender/staff.	0
Firearm discharge.	0
Discovery of homemade weapon.	0
Discovery of illegal drugs.	0
Escapes under CCA supervision.	0
Discovery of homemade alcohol.	0
Attempted suicides.	0
Power outages.	0
Death of inmate.	0
Discovery of unauthorized communication equipment.	0
Use of Force.	0
Lock-down.	0

### Inmate Population with Breakdown by Race, Age, Admission Type, and Length of Stay

Additional inmate data, showing the distribution of race, age, admission type, and length of stay for the combined total of USMS and BOP inmates at NEOCC, was provided by Northeast Ohio Correctional Center administration in post-inspection correspondence. The following table displays the breakdown for each of the targeted demographic categories on April 27, 2009. All inmates in the institution are male, so there is no breakdown by gender to report.

**Table 4. Inmate Breakdown by Race, Age, Admission Type, and Length of Stay  
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center – All Agencies - April 27, 2009**

<b>Number of Inmates</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Contracting Agency</b>	
Bureau of Prisons	1,484
U.S. Marshals Service – Western District of Pennsylvania	175
U.S. Marshals Service – Northeast Ohio	152
U.S. Marshals Service – Eastern District of Pennsylvania	103
U.S. Marshals Service – Western New York	57
U.S. Marshals Service – District of Maryland	30
U.S. Marshals Service – Middle District of Pennsylvania	24
U.S. Marshals Service – Northern West Virginia	19
U.S. Marshals Service – DCSC	18
<b>Race</b>	
White	831
Black	588
Hispanic	571
Asian or Pacific Islander	52
Unknown	10
American Indian or Alaskan Native	6
Other	4
<b>Age</b>	
26-35	767
40-69	756
36-39	327
18-25	205
70 and over	6
Under 18	1
<b>Admission Type</b>	
Sentenced	1,445
No Admission Type Assigned or Other	336
Sentenced/Awaiting Designated Transfer	278
Pretrial/Unsentenced	3
Detainee	0
Weekender	0
<b>Stay</b>	
1-2 years	404
180 days – 1 year	383
Less than 30 days	314
90-180 days	254
2-3 years	226
3-5 years	169
60-90 days	167
30-60 days	145
More than 5 years	0
<b>Average Length of Stay</b>	379.79 days

### **Inmate Population with Breakdown by Age Range and Race**

Inmate data was provided in post-inspection correspondence by the facility's administration that shows a breakdown by age and race for the total inmate population at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center, that is, all inmates held under the combined authorities of the U.S. Marshals Service and the Bureau of Prisons. Data reflects the inmate count for May 18, 2009 and is displayed in the following table.

**Table 5. Inmate Population Totals with Breakdown by Age Range and Race  
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center - May 18, 2009**

<b>Age Range</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian or Pacific islander</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>American Indian or Alaskan</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>26-35</b>	308	214	206	20	2	1	2	753
<b>40-69</b>	308	237	160	22	4	3	1	735
<b>36-39</b>	144	89	74	7	3	1	2	320
<b>18-25</b>	66	34	95	1	1	1	0	198
<b>70 +</b>	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	6
<b>Total</b>	831	575	535	51	10	6	5	2,013
<b>Percent</b>	41.3%	28.6%	26.6%	2.5%	.5%	.3%	.3%	100%

### **INMATE CONCERNS**

#### **Inmate Concerns Relayed during Inspection**

The inspection of Northeast Ohio Correctional Center on April 24, 2009 garnered inmate commentary on a variety of issues and concerns. Inmates were not hesitant to approach the inspection team to relay issues, and NEOCC staff was obliging in not restricting inmate verbal communications with the CIIC. The following issues, which are clustered by 'operations,' 'supervision,' and 'grievance procedure,' were brought forward by the inmates who spoke directly with CIIC inspectors during the inspection.

**Table 6. Inmate Concerns Relayed during Inspection at NEOCC - April 24, 2009**

<b>Inmate Concerns Relayed during Inspection at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center April 24, 2009</b>	
<b>CONCERN TYPE</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<b>Operations</b>	
Medical	<p>Delay in receiving medications.            Medical services for pain and hernia are sought.            Medical services for leg infection, metal fragments are sought.            Sick call delays of two weeks to three months; response time lags (relayed by three inmates).            Medical tests and test results are delayed.            Medical staff are standoffish and do not give an actual exam.            Medical staff are not responsive to phone calls from units.            Doctor response to one emergency situation was to advise the inmate to file a health service request (HSR).            Wrong, not prescribed, medication was given to inmate.            Medication has been ineffective, but not altered.            Neglected medical care for a kidney problem; also for a hand problem.</p>
Dental	<p>Dental services are terrible.            Delay in dental services for six months, finally will see dentist now that the tooth has fallen out.            Dentures denied.            Cannot get a tooth pulled.</p>
Mail	<p>Incoming and outgoing mail that is considered "controlled" mail may be confiscated. Staff relayed that controlled mail must be logged in the mailroom and it is delivered to inmates within 24 hours.            Legal mail is confiscated.            Outgoing mail does not leave the mailroom.</p>
Quartermaster	<p>Denied hygiene products and clothing.            Unit management exercises its own discretion in clothing exchanges.</p>
Meals/Food Service	<p>Kosher meals are not sufficient in calories (relayed by two inmates); also Kosher food preparation is questionable and no Kosher foods are sold in commissary.</p>
Religious Services	<p>Jewish religious services are inadequate.            No religious DVDs are available or are limited.            Chaplain is not helpful to inmates.            Religious rights of Muslims are denied.</p>
Job Assignments	<p>No work holidays are provided for inmate workers.            Better jobs are needed.</p>
Institutional Assignment	<p>Institutional placement is violation of federal law because a federal inmate cannot be held in a private facility.            Hardship transfer is sought.            Inmates (Cuban) who are ineligible for deportation should not be at NEOCC, but are there by default because federal government does not deport to Cuba, to spare inmates from being killed.</p>

Unit Privileges	<p>Televisions on units are in quantities disproportionate to inmate nationalities and languages.</p> <p>Level of privileges/operations is like maximum, rather than medium security.</p> <p>Unit inmate count process takes too long, may be 45 minutes.</p> <p>Pod D7 continues denial of privileges for transition inmates exiting Segregation; constitutes double punishment.</p>
Cell/Bed Assignment	<p>Three-month delay for cell relocation when cellie was seriously sick.</p> <p>A lower bunk medical restriction is sought, not yet granted.</p> <p>Placement of three men in one cell.</p>
Visitation	<p>Visitation time is reduced due to inmate 'lock down' and immobilization to the visitation room when inmates from the other side of the prison (US Marshal Inmates or BOP inmates) are in movement to the dining hall (relayed by two inmates).</p>
Phone Service	<p>Inmate is denied outgoing calls to his wife at another prison, even though her prison has approved her to receive calls.</p> <p>Tax on phone calls is questioned if legal. (relayed by two inmates)</p>
Cell Conditions	<p>Unit B-3 cells: rain water to leak into cells, need drainage system repaired.</p>
Recreation	<p>Limitations on access.</p> <p>Soccer field in uneven and dangerous; without tools or resources to repair it; inmates get injured.</p> <p>Warden does not listen to inmates on Recreation Committee.</p>
Inmate Relations	<p>Tensions are reportedly edgy among inmates due to racial imbalance.</p>
Law Library	<p>Limitations on access.</p>
Education	<p>Required classes, regardless of inmate's prior education.</p>
Hygiene - Showers	<p>Shower access is restricted, reduced availability, reportedly for cleaning of showers.</p> <p>Some type of worm comes out of shower in B-3.</p> <p>Shower cleaning tools, protective gloves, and chemicals are inadequate.</p> <p>Length, frequency, and water pressure for allotted showers is inadequate.</p> <p>Denial of showers is violation of religious practice to shower before prayer.</p>
<b>Supervision</b>	
Administration	<p>BOP Monitors do not address anything and talk down to inmates.</p> <p>New Warden has not established inmate contact.</p>
Supervision – Discrimination	<p>Discrimination toward illegal aliens compared to American inmates relevant to property and shakedowns, inmate rights.</p> <p>Discrimination against transition inmates in D7, whose privileges are not restored following release from segregation.</p>
Supervision – Retaliation	<p>Segregation placement for filing a lawsuit.</p>
<b>Grievance Procedure</b>	
Inmate Grievance Procedure	<p>Procedure is designed to confuse inmates.</p> <p>Complaints and grievances do not get answered.</p>

### **Inmate Concerns Relayed to NEOCC Warden in Follow-up Communication**

In keeping with the practice of post-inspection communications between the CIIC Director and the inspected institution, a comprehensive list of inmate concerns, as represented in the preceding section and table on *Inmate Concerns Relayed during Inspection*, was provided by the CIIC Director to the NEOCC Warden, in order that the Warden would be apprised of these matters.

### **Inmate Concerns Relayed to the CIIC Office through Written Correspondence**

Inmates throughout the adult institutions in Ohio may contact the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee to relay concerns that they may experience as part of their incarceration. Indeed, it is through these communications from stakeholders in the correctional system that the CIIC is able to maintain daily awareness and speak to specific concerns as they might rise above other concerns in frequency or degree of priority. As contacts are received from inmates, families, and institutional staff, their concerns are logged into a database maintained by the CIIC for that specific purpose. The following table provides a breakdown of the number of contacts and concerns from the adult institutions under the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and from the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center for the cumulative period beginning January 1 through May 4, 2009. The data is ranked from high to low by the number of *concerns* per institution. For the period, there were 43 concerns relayed to the CIIC office regarding the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center, placing the institution twenty-first among the adult institutions that reported concerns. *The concerns relating to NEOCC include fumes on a unit without a working fan, denial of medical treatment/medical aides, certified mail concerns, absence of grievance materials, increases in commissary prices, inadequate time to finish meals, offensive behavior from officers, unsanitary use of barber tools, and concern about a perceived negative impact on inmate safety due to Spanish television programs.*

**Table 7. Number of Contacts and Number of Reported Concerns Received by CIIC****January 1, 2009 to May 4, 2009 by Prison**

<b>PRISON</b>	<b>CONTACTS</b>	<b>CONCERNS</b>
Southern Ohio CF	200	1,057
Toledo CI	56	297
Mansfield CI	59	250
Lebanon CI	44	202
Pickaway CI	46	186
Chillicothe CI	49	160
Marion CI	36	151
Ohio Reformatory for Women	24	145
London CI	29	140
Trumbull CI	27	134
Ohio State Penitentiary	25	105
Warren CI	21	105
Allen CI	27	101
Madison CI	21	99
Grafton CI	22	76
Lake Erie CI	15	58
North Central CI	13	55
Ross CI	14	49
Other	14	47
Belmont CI	14	45
<b>Northeast Ohio Correctional Center</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>43</b>
Oakwood CF	5	27
Hocking CF	7	26
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	10	25
Richland CI	7	22
Lorain CI	8	19
Southeastern CI	4	19
Noble CI	3	10
Corrections Reception Center	6	7
Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center	2	6
Franklin Pre-Release Center	1	2
Dayton CI	1	1
Correctional Medical Center	1	1
Not Categorized	(11)	
<b>TOTAL PRISONS</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>3,670</b>

## INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The Correctional Institution Inspection Committee is statutorily required under Section 103.73 of the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) to evaluate institutional operations, programs, conditions, and the *Inmate Grievance Procedure*. During institutional inspections, the inspection team observes and actively listens for indicators of the effectiveness of the institution's inmate grievance procedure in solving problems of inmates according to its intended purposes. Indications of a functional or dysfunctional inmate grievance procedure are commonly revealed through inmate communications during the inspection, but may also become known through the comments of administrators, management, and staff. For this reason, the comments from inmates taken during the inspection become a key component in assisting the understanding of the grievance system within the institution as well as the range of specific grievable concerns or issues that inmates are reportedly experiencing.

Separate from the comments from inmates, which are collected during the inspection, the CIIC office receives monthly summaries on inmate use of the grievance procedure from the institutions under the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. There has not been a similar history of data submission from Northeast Ohio Correctional Center. However, recent communication between the institution and the CIIC office has paved the way for institutional data to be provided on a monthly basis. Therefore, data regarding inmate use of the grievance procedure may be available in the future.

A review of existing institutional information submitted from Northeast Ohio Correctional Center since 2005, provided a brief orientation to the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center's inmate grievance procedure. The information, provided by the previous administration at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center, indicates that inmates are versed on the inmate grievance procedure at intake and may also refer to their inmate handbook. A copy of the inmate handbook, referred to as *Prisoner Handbook*, describes an inmate grievance procedure that is predominantly similar to the procedure available to inmates under authority of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

Follow-up communication with the current NEOCC Administration verified that the Inmate Grievance Procedure details are available to inmates in their Inmate Handbook and also in a folder in the NEOCC library. Inmates reportedly can access *policies* of CCA in the library as well, and the grievance procedure is reportedly incorporated into the policies. The institution's inmate handbook is currently under revision, and approval is pending from the institution's Customers (USMS and BOP). The Administration indicated that a copy of the revised inmate handbook would be provided to CIIC upon its publication. In the interim period, NEOCC Administration provided CIIC with a copy of CCA policy number 14-5 on the inmate grievance procedure, effective October 14, 2008.

## **Overview of NEOCC Inmate Grievance Procedure**

The inmate handbook of June 7, 2005 provides the following information regarding the inmate grievance procedure:

**Prisoner Grievances:** Any prisoner residing at NEOCC has the opportunity to file a formal complaint, which is considered a grievance. The complete policy is located in the prisoner policy manual in the library. It is important that the procedures be followed correctly in order to ensure adequate and appropriate resolution. Grievances filed improperly will be returned without review. It is the policy of CCA/NEOCC to encourage informal resolution of complaints at the lowest possible level since grievances should be, whenever possible, resolved through direct contact or via prisoner request form with staff responsible for the particular problem area and with two-way communication encouraged between staff and inmates. However, all inmates shall have access to formal grievance procedures any time the informal process has not provided successful resolution of the complaint. Neither employees nor inmates shall be subject to retaliation, reprisal, harassment, or discipline for use or participation in the Grievance Procedure. Any allegations of this nature will be thoroughly investigated by the Facility Warden/Administrator and reviewed by the Vice President, Facility Operations, and Vice President, Legal Affairs.

**Grievance Process:** CCA encourages good staff and prisoner relations through the communication process. Most of the time, you will be able to resolve problems by honest and open communication with staff. When a prisoner believes his rights have been violated, he should discuss the problem with his assigned Counselor. At that time, the Counselor should attempt to resolve the problem or assign a staff member for this purpose. If the problem cannot be resolved informally in this manner, the prisoner may then file a formal grievance. Once a prisoner decides to file a formal complaint, a Grievance Form can be obtained from the POD Officer in the living unit. The formal grievance must have all supporting documentation showing that an informal attempt at resolution was made. To maintain confidentiality, grievance mailboxes are placed in every living unit. All grievances and grievance appeals are to be placed in the Grievance mailbox. Remember to attach all supporting documentation. When appealing, both page one and page two are needed to start the appeal process. Please reference the prisoner policy manual in the library for complete information on grievable and non-grievable matters.

**Time Guidelines:** The total time for the grievance process will be no more than fifty (50) days from filing to a final appeal decision, unless unusual circumstances

are present. You must file the grievance within seven (7) days of the alleged incident. Within fifteen (15) days of receiving the grievance an investigation will be conducted and a decision will be rendered. You will have the opportunity to appeal this decision up to five (5) days after receipt of the grievance response. The Warden/Administrator will render a written decision on the grievance appeal within fifteen (15) days.

**Emergency Grievance:** If the subject matter of the grievance is such that compliance with the regular time guidelines would subject t the prisoner to risk of personal injury, the prisoner may detail the basis for a need of immediate response and ask that the grievance be considered an emergency grievance. If the Grievance Officer, after reviewing the grievance determines that an emergency does exist, action shall be taken to resolve the grievance with twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the grievance. The grievance officer will prepare and give to the inmate, within seventy-two (72) hours, a written decision. If the prisoner appeals the decision, the Warden/Administrator or designee will respond with a written decision within five (5) days.

**Staff/Prisoner Communications:** Intermittently, there are times and issues when a prisoner must initiate written communication with a particular staff member. In order to do this, inmates must complete a Prisoner Request Form. These forms are available from the Pod Control Officers. Address the forms to the person responsible for the area, briefly state your concern and drop the form in the Mailbox in your housing unit. (See posting on prisoner bulletin board).

A sample Prisoner Request Form is included in the inmate handbook. It includes the following:

CCA-NORTHEAST OHIO CORRECTIONAL CENTER PRISONER REQUEST FORM	
TO: _____	Date: _____
(List Name of Staff and/or position)	
FROM: _____	_____
PRISONER NAME (PRINTED)	PRISONER NUMBER
Housing	
SUBJECT: _____	
REQUEST: _____	
_____	
PRISONER SIGNATURE	
(REQUIRED): _____	
STAFF RESPONSE: _____	
_____	
STAFF SIGNATURE: _____	DATE: _____
ORIGINAL – PRISONER	
YELLOW - PRISONER RECORD	
THIS IS NOT A GRIEVANCE FORM	

In order to present an interim understanding of the NEOCC inmate grievance procedure, a review was completed of CCA policy 14-5. The following synopsis is taken from CCA policy 14-5 of 2008. The key components of CCA Policy 14-5 are provided in the following list, represented in the same language that is used in the CCA policy.

- Any NEOCC prisoner residing in the institution has an opportunity to file a Formal Grievance, which is considered the grievance.
- The procedure is a means for all inmates/residents to address complaints regarding facility conditions, treatment, and policies and procedures.
- All inmates/residents have access to an informal resolution process to resolve their complaints prior to filing a formal grievance. Informal resolution is encouraged at the lowest possible level, and when possible, through verbal or written two-way communication between inmate and staff. NEOCC inmates are to verbally discuss concerns with their assigned Counselor first, followed by written submission of the matter on an Informal Resolution form.
- Inmates/residents can invoke the grievance procedure regardless of disciplinary, classification, or other administrative decisions to which the inmate/resident may be subject.
- Resolution in the best interest of the inmate/resident and the facility should be the primary goal. *This concept is explicitly stated in the CCA policy.*
- The complete grievance policy is located in the inmate handbook and the institutional library.
- Procedural steps must be followed correctly in order to ensure adequate and appropriate resolution.
- Grievances filed improperly will be returned without review.
- Neither employees nor inmates shall be subject to a response of retaliation, reprisal, harassment, or discipline for use or participation in the grievance procedure.
- Allegations of the above responses will be investigated at the administrative level and reviewed at the corporate level.
- Grievance forms are available on living units at NEOCC. NEOCC inmates must attach supporting documentation showing that an informal attempt at resolution was made.
- NEOCC inmates place both grievances and appeals in a mailbox on their unit.
- Grievance decisions may be appealed, and NEOCC inmates submit appeals to the division Managing Director.
- Timelines apply to filing a grievance and for a decision to be rendered.
- Emergency grievances may be filed under certain conditions. NEOCC inmates may file an emergency grievance if the subject matter is such that compliance with the regular timeline would place the prisoner at risk for personal injury.
- The NEOCC grievance system allows for extensions to be factored into the grievance process. In certain instances it may be necessary to extend response deadlines to allow for a more complete investigation of the claim(s). Justification for the extension must be provided to the inmate/resident on the grievance Extension Notice. The extension will be determined by the Warden/Administrator and will not exceed 15 calendar days.

- Grievable matters:
  - Violation of law, regulation, or court decisions, to include violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, constitutional rights, etc.
  - Application of rules, policies, and/or procedures towards inmate/residents over which CCA has control;
  - Individual staff and inmate/resident actions, including any denial of access to the informal resolution or grievance processes;
  - Reprisals against inmates/residents for utilizing the informal resolution or grievance processes; and
  - Any other matter relating to the conditions of care and supervision within the authority of CCA.
- Non-Grievable Matters:
  - State and Federal court decisions and laws and regulations;
  - Final decisions on grievances;
  - Contracting agency policies, procedures, decisions or matters;
  - Disciplinary actions;
  - Property issues;
  - Classification status.
- An inmate's use of the grievance procedure may be suspended by the Warden if the Warden determines that the inmate is deliberately abusing the system through excessive filings or repeated refusal to follow procedures.
- Grievance filings are considered to be confidential. Grievances filed by NEOCC inmates are to be read only by the Grievance Officer, assuming the inmate has sealed it in an envelope labeled "Grievance."

### **Inmate Communication Regarding the Grievance Procedure during Inspection**

As previously mentioned, during the inspection, the NEOCC inmates were given many opportunities to speak directly with the inspection team on units, at the meal period, during programming sessions, and at recreation. Among the specific concerns that NEOCC inmates verbally communicated during the inspection, were complaints that the *inmate grievance procedure available to them is actually "designed to confuse inmates,"* and that the *"complaints and grievances are not answered."*

### **NEOCC Grievance Log**

Following the inspection, the NEOCC administration provided a representative Facility Grievance Log, which displays a summary of data regarding the use of the grievance procedure by inmates incarcerated at NEOCC. The information provided was representative of inmate grievance activity from January 1 through March 7, 2009. The data shows a total of 39 grievances were filed for the period. There were 30 grievances assigned numbers and filed from inmates under the authority of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and nine grievances were assigned a number and filed from inmates under the authority of the U. S. Marshals Service. Under the NEOCC inmate grievance procedure, there are 21 grievance categories. Grievied issues and concerns are identified and assigned to one of the categories. Some categories appear to

encompass a broader range of issues or concerns than the grievance identification system used by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

In a simpler system than that employed by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction inmate grievance procedure, grievances filed at NEOCC may fall into the following categories:

Facility Staff  
 Access to Legal Materials  
 Denied Access to Informal Resolution/Grievance Procedure  
 Reprisal for Using Informal Resolution/Grievance Procedure  
 Safety/Security  
 Sanitation  
 Medical Services  
 Dental Services  
 Mental Health Services  
 Trust Account  
 Commissary  
 Food Service  
 Mail  
 Intake  
 Housing  
 Laundry  
 Recreation  
 Visitation  
 Programs (Education, Work, Religious, etc.)  
 Federal or state  
 Other

The breakdown of grievance data supplied to CIIC in post-inspection correspondence shows that zero grievances were found in favor of the inmate/resident, and that *100 percent of all grievances filed were not found in favor of the inmate/resident*. Of the total 39 grievances filed and determined, there were 23 grievances that were appealed, 14 grievances were not appealed, one grievance was extended, and one grievance entry shows that no disposition or extension was ever issued. Of the grievance decisions that were appealed, 23 or *100 percent of the appeals were not found in the inmate's favor*.

## **INSPECTION**

### **Entrance**

The entrance of the facility is a single wide sidewalk through an electronically-controlled double gate, which creates a pair of crash gates or sally port. An intercom system allows verbal communication between the control center and visitors during entrance and departure. The lobby at the entrance was small and contained chairs. Passage through the metal detector leads one into another single-gated section. Located within this section is the office of the Security Threat Group (STG) Coordinator and an open hallway to the administrative offices.

Institutional staff were professional, responding to CIIC's arrival cordially; and the entry proceeded quickly, with the Chief of Unit Management arriving within minutes in lieu of the Warden, who was off site for a conference on the inspection date. Entry security steps and metal detection were appropriately completed.

### **Pre-Inspection Conference**

A pre-inspection conference was conducted with the Assistant Warden, Chief of Unit Management, Quality Assurance Manager, and the CIIC Inspectors. The conference included a brief dialogue of subjects specific to the privately-owned and operated facility. It was noted that incoming inmates arrive weekly on Fridays ranging from seven to 70 inmates, who receive orientation materials and speeches from each of the significant departments. The reportedly predominant Hispanic inmate population prompts some distinctions in institutional culture, such as a supplemental hot-food bar of beans and rice, served in addition to a corporate-dictated five-week menu rotation.

Administrators relayed that the facility opened in 1997 with inexperienced staff and experienced inmates. A temporary closure from 2002 to 2004 was reportedly due to contract expiration; yet the escape of seven inmates in 1998 preceded its closure. During the closure, the building was modified structurally to increase security measures. The current structure observably looks like a high-security prison, and administrators relayed there is an extra row of fence, staffed towers, and crash gates at every entrance. Security measures reportedly include two perimeter patrol vehicles. An overview of inmate housing included that each unit is divided into two modules, which are divided into either two or three pods. Cells are designed for double occupancy, except for a few cells in each pod, which may hold three inmates. There is no dormitory housing in the facility; but an open cell door policy is generally implemented.

An agreement, known as the 9.07 Agreement, between the City of Youngstown and the institution, requires the facility to house inmates no higher than medium security level. Under the agreement, if an inmate arrives with a high-level security, that inmate is placed in an administrative segregation cell for a period of 45 to 60 days, remaining no more than 90 days, and then must be transferred to a higher security institution. The majority of the NEOCC inmate

population is low-level security classifications and is serving less than five years to their end-of-sentence date.

Administrators relayed there are numerous layers of oversight. Several different agencies reportedly visit the institution for inspections, accreditation, and audits. The institution is required to meet specific standards set forth by the American Corrections Association (ACA) in order that the institution achieves and maintains ACA Accreditation. The Contract Facility Monitors (CFMs) reportedly complete audits on a six-month cycle; and the institution reportedly completes its own internal quality checks to assure there is both knowledge of operational performances and compliance with associated standards. The self-imposed quality assurance system falls under management of the institution's Quality Assurance Department. The Welcome Handbook reports that in addition to American Correctional Association standards, the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center maintains compliance with Statements of Work (SOW) requirements, which are contracted performance requirements set forth for the management and operation of Community Corrections Centers (CCC) providing community-based services for federal offenders under the authority of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP). During the Pre-Inspection Meeting, administrators relayed with a sense of pride that they have passed their audits with very high scores, only receiving nine deficiencies among more than a thousand indicators on their most recent audit, and that they operate above the accepted level and provide a good service.

The pre-inspection conference concluded with administrators reporting that a primary means of containing operating costs at NEOCC is the careful management and restriction of overtime hours worked by staff. Administrators relayed there is no shortage of staff, but many staff members are required to cross-train and be capable of working other positions as may be needed to reduce excessive overtime and provide shift coverage. (On the topic of staff cross-training and minimized overtime, while some staff members during the inspection spoke approvingly of this strategy, other staff shared that there is occasional staff frustration associated with fulfilling the requirements of more than one job and covering shifts).

Separate from the pre-inspection conference with administrators at the beginning of the day, two opportunities for communication were scheduled for the end of the day. Administrators and staff met with the inspection team during a *Staff Open-Forum* and an *Exit Conference with Administration*. These meetings gave representatives of the institution the opportunity to share any comments they wished about operations, conditions, programs, or miscellaneous subjects related to the correctional facility. Summaries of these meetings are provided in the final sections of this report, *Staff Open Forum* and *Exit Conference with Administration*.

### **Security Threat Group (STG) Office**

The office of the Security Threat Group (STG) Coordinator was observed as well organized in its means of identifying and tracking inmates who are part of gangs or otherwise may pose a threat to institutional security. One STG staff reported there are over 200 inmates at NEOCC who have been identified as potential security risks, individuals with known gang membership, inmates with a history of behavior such as taking hostages, a specific felonious history such as arson, or have affiliation with a nationally-linked crime group like the Russian or Italian Mafia. As a method of keeping STG staff knowledgeable of individuals being monitored, a large wallboard containing photos of specific inmates is maintained. Familiarity with these inmates' faces and body markings, tattoos, etc. has reportedly helped STG staff in their efforts to visually track those inmates and their behavior while incarcerated at NEOCC. STG staff complete customary security measures such as randomly monitoring phones, walking the institution, keeping records of certain inmates under their watch, and maintaining incident-tracking systems in the STG office as well as on the units. The STG staff members reportedly complete 40 hours of training each year, with additional training completed through video conferencing.

The inspection team perceived the STG security philosophy and implementation through the STG Office at NEOCC to possibly be broader than what is routinely found in the adult institutions operated by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. The NEOCC model for STG management includes continuous observations of inmates, beginning at intake, for indicators of imbalance or static behavior that could be indicative of unrest or suggest a potential threat to institutional security. The STG office proactively directs its attention toward more than merely gang members, suggesting a broad rather than a narrow implementation of the extended job duties of the STG staff. This perceived broader security definition and the work of the NEOCC STG staff likely have a positive impact on the fundamental requirement for safety and security for all individuals within the facility. Without proper safety and security, all other components of daily life within a correctional facility are compromised and may become ineffective or rendered futile.

### **Administrative Area**

The administrative area includes executive offices, conference rooms, and other areas vital to the institution's operations. Individual offices are located along a long hallway that extends from the front entrance. The administrative area is gated on both ends as part of the institution's security structure. The area was visibly exceptionally clean and organized.

### **Hallways Connecting Housing Units**

The inmate housing units, and associated service areas, at Northeast Ohio Correctional Center are accessible from a system of central interior hallways. Painted lines on the floors serve as placement indicators for inmates, who walk on the right side of a center line. A wide color-

specific stripe, painted along the walls, indicates where each unit begins and ends. The hallway stripe color changes with the unit.

Staff relayed that they monitor inmate ‘movement’ in the hallways under a system that allows for “ten-minute moves.” Hallways contain boxes that serve as receptacles for kites, commissary requests, and mail. Postings for education department, library, recreation, and other departments are posted in the hallways. Notices of this type are color-coded by the unit color. Follow-up documentation from the institution confirmed multiple daily ten-minute time allocations for the ‘open movement’ of inmates, with consideration for ‘no-contact’ requirements between inmates under the authority of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) and inmates under the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) within the institution.

The hallways also serve as a neutral location where the inmates may have a moment, if they wish, to speak with a Contract Monitor, who reported to inspectors that they circulate throughout the prison frequently to engage in inmate dialogue. For example, following the meal period, the institution’s *Contract Monitors* were available to inmates in the hallway adjacent to the dining hall. Three Contract Monitors serve Northeast Ohio Correctional Center.

### **Housing Units**

The inspection team was escorted through several housing units serving BOP inmates because the U.S. Marshals side of the institution was not incorporated into the inspection agenda. At the entrance of some units, the inspection team noted the presence of Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) posters. The federal inmates wear khaki color pants and shirts and identification badges that are color-coded to their unit. This color system reportedly helps staff accurately identify inmates with their unit assignments; thus, assists in identifying inmates who may be out of place. Inmates may enter only their assigned unit.

On the inspection date, inspectors entered housing units during inmate count, several residential programming periods, and inmate waiting periods prior to their recreation and a meal. All units were notably quiet. Each unit was observed to be exceptionally clean and organized.

Architecturally, one standard feature among all units was an impressively clean shower bank for inmate use. The five or six single-occupancy shower stalls per pod were framed in a steel structure and permanently attached to the building infrastructure within the concrete walls. Ceramic tiles and either half-doors or shower curtains were spotless, odorless, and without mold, mildew, or discoloration on surfaces or in the grout. The shower structures were reportedly the product of a local contractor, purchased at a reported cost of approximately \$80,000, and were built using inmate labor. Inmate porters maintain the daily cleaning of the showers using diluted cleaning products. Inspectors noted the shower system to be among the highest quality among all prisons in Ohio.

During the inspection, some unit staff members were working from a slightly elevated officer booth that is centrally-positioned between the pods within the unit. The officer booth has tinted-glass and is concrete-enclosed, with only electronic access. Staff members working on the unit floors were cordial, professional, and responsive to questions. As relayed by STG staff, all units reportedly maintain a unit map system and push-pins to track every location where an incident has occurred. The push-pin tracking system has reportedly become an effective tool in understanding developing hot spots and areas that may need to be addressed.

Staff relayed that the day begins with a systemic schedule that calls for unit cell inspection at approximately 8 am, after the morning count and prior to breakfast. All inmates clean their cells, pick up clutter, and make their beds. Televisions are required to be off and no phone calls are permitted. This required morning routine reportedly serves as a management tool for all units.

During the inspection, staff reiterated the comments of administrators that job cross-training and an absence of overtime hours and pay have reportedly been instrumental to the institution's ability to contain costs and fill job vacancies quickly.

#### **Management Unit Alpha (A or A Wing) – USMS Inmates**

The inspection did not include A Wing, but focused on the remainder of the housing units, where inmates under the authority of the Federal Bureau of Prisons are held. The NEOCC administration provided information that A Wing is used solely to house inmates under the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS). The administration relayed that A Wing is comprised of Pods A1 through A8 for general population and Pod A9 for USMS segregation inmates. Inmates housed in A Wing wear yellow uniforms if sentenced and orange uniforms if presentenced.

#### **Management Unit Bravo (B) – General Population**

Management Unit B serves inmates in general population. The color designation for the unit is orange. Inmates in general population wear khaki uniforms. Three housing pods within the unit were inspected. The physical condition of the entire unit was observably as clean and neat as other inspected units in the institution. The exceptional cleanliness of the shower banks in the inspected pods was also noted. Unit B inmates were generally willing to speak with inspectors.

***Pods B1, B2, and B3 – General Population.*** The pods in Unit B provide general population housing and also serve as pods for residential programs. In Pod B1, inmates are recipients of a Mexican government-sponsored educational program that is the equivalent of an American General Education Diploma (GED). Inmates in this residential unit spend the majority of their incarcerated time on the unit and are engaged in this specific programming. Staff relayed the rationale of the Mexican government in providing this programming is based on the belief that when these inmates are deported back to Mexico, they will be better able to integrate back into their society and become productive citizens.

***Inmate Comments on B2 and B3 – General Population.*** *Inmates in the second pod in Unit B communicated relatively freely with the inspection team. Multiple inmates in this pod voiced complaints about three-person cells, stating that each pod has approximately six cells that house three inmates. They indicated a desire for information on the procedures associated with three-man cells, and maintained that their situation is a violation of requirements to provide specified square footage per inmate. One inmate indicated that he has an issue with how staff members interact with inmates, considering the shortage of space in the three-man cells. The inmate relayed that anything that he might place on top of his locker box due to a lack of space, which may even include a wet towel so that it can dry, is taken by staff on rounds. Additional concerns relayed by inmates in Pod B2 include an alleged inappropriate cell placement for failure to stand for count, inadequate medical response or a medical response unrelated to the medical concern, failure to provide medications causing inmates to have to purchase over-the-counter drugs from commissary, and denial of ladders to enable access to the top bunk. Inmates relayed that clothing issue is not compliant with the six-month schedule, wrong-sized clothing has been issued and not corrected for more than a year, and clothing that is returned from laundry is not clean, appearing to have been washed without detergent. Inmates indicated they are not receiving hygiene products such as toothpaste and toothbrushes, and they receive only one roll of toilet paper per week. One inmate shared frustrations over required educational programming, adding that teacher knowledge is inadequate for the class taught and in some cases, there are no teachers. Last, questions were asked about whether the Court of Federal Regulations overrides the policies of the Corrections Corporation of America. Additional inmate comments from B3 included a shortage of “whites,” complaints of the increasing commissary prices combined with denial of indigent status assigned to inmates, a change in the shower schedule that reduces shower access, and inadequate cleaning chemicals. Inmates complained of inadequate hygiene items, including toilet tissue, toothbrushes and toothpaste. Inmates also relayed there are inadequate religious provisions and the institution’s disapproval of religious leadership has created the absence of religious services.*

### **Management Unit Charlie (C) - Unit Z Segregation**

Management Unit Charlie (C) includes the Special Management Unit (SHU), known by staff as the Z Unit, which serves as the Segregation Unit for inmates held under authority of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). The BOP side of the prison includes three segregation pods, in contrast to the previously mentioned single segregation pod on the USMS side of the prison. Two of the BOP segregation pods, Z1 and Z2, were incorporated into the inspection of the prison. Inmates in the BOP *segregation unit* wear *blue* uniforms.

***Unit Z – Segregation.*** The BOP segregation pods inspected are designed to hold a maximum of 40 inmates. Segregation inmates may be housed two inmates per cell, in 20 cells, located on two tiers. Inmates may be assigned to the Segregation Unit under Disciplinary Control (DC), Administrative Segregation, or Protective Custody (PC). Inmates assigned to Disciplinary Control are typically single-celled. It was noted that Protective Custody (PC) cells are located in

a different part of the unit. Inmates assigned to Protective Custody are always single-celled. Segregation cells were observed to include two metal shelf beds, attached to a cell wall in upper and lower bunk fashion. Cells also include a small table and two chairs, which are also attached to the wall. A stainless steel toilet and sink complete the components of each cell.

Inmates *requesting* a protective custody separation are reportedly given placement in the Special Housing Unit (SHU) if they are cooperative in identifying the reason or person that prompted their request. While an investigation is ongoing, an inmate may remain in segregation. Also, inmates awaiting transfer are typically placed in the segregation unit. Staff relayed there is no tolerance for acting-out by segregation inmates, and an inmate who acts out would be moved to a different segregation pod. The atmosphere in both of the segregation pods that were inspected was calm, which complimented the observably very clean physical environment.

Staff relayed each inmate's segregation status (administrative or disciplinary) is indicated on a magnetic tag that is posted on each inmate's cell door, and referenced by officers during rounds on the pod. The information on the tag pertains to inmate commissary privileges and allowable movement on the unit. Pod rounds are completed every shift and every day on a required schedule, yet exact times reportedly may vary to avoid a pattern. The security system on the unit reportedly engages a man-down system and utilizes hundreds of cameras, with upgrades scheduled. In order to increase inmate security within the segregation unit, there are reportedly two officers with each inmate during out-of-cell time. Segregation inmates receive 23 hours in the cell and one hour of recreation out of the cell per 24-hour day.

***Pod Z1 – BOP Segregation.*** The dayroom in Pod Z1 includes several steel tables with attached seats. One table is dedicated to the phone system and is installed with four phones. A portable phone attached to a cart allows cell-confined inmates to engage in calls. Unit staff reported that a local barber provides haircuts in the dayroom on weekends, under staff supervision. The shower bank was immaculately clean and staff relayed that segregation inmates have an opportunity to shower once every other day, in accordance with the standard of once every 72 hours.

***Inmate Comments on Pod Z1 Segregation.*** *Inmate comments suggested that the correctional officers need to receive sensitivity and verbal communications training, and officers do not know how to interact with inmates. One inmate relayed the food needs to be improved, while another inmate shared that hot water is lacking, and towels, laundry, and t-shirts are inadequate. An inmate countered that the institution is “beautiful” and he is “straight” with everything. Last, an inmate shared there were many things wrong, but gave no details.*

***Pod Z2 – BOP Segregation.*** The pod was observed to be clean and organized. There were some segregation cell vacancies to meet the requirement that a number of segregation beds must be set aside and kept available.

A staff member relayed that the Segregation Unit maintains its own clothing supply and laundry services to maintain security and reduce contraband entering or leaving the unit. An inventoried supply of inmate clothing and segregation uniforms was observed to be neatly stored in a locked clothing cage in Pod Z2. Clothing and inmate trays are reportedly absent of names to reduce possible tampering by others. Staff relayed that the personal property of inmates entering segregation placement is inventoried once by a Correctional Officer in the unit that the inmate is leaving and again by the Property Officer in the segregation unit. Subsequently, inmate property is locked in the unit's property vault.

Institutional services are brought to inmates within the segregation pods. The librarian reportedly makes rounds to the segregation unit once per week, but inmates may also kite the librarian to request materials. Medical Nurses reportedly visit the unit once on every shift. During the inspection, unit staff were distributing meals to inmates in their cells.

*Inmate Comments on Pod Z2 Segregation.* One inmate indicated discontent at not receiving lotion in this pod, while staff explained that limitations on segregation property require that lotion must be a medical prescription. An inmate relayed discontent about the quality of kosher meals and his preference for a more expensive kosher menu; but also relayed that the current kosher menu is approved by the Rabbi. One inmate in the pod indicated his belief that he was assigned to segregation in response to a lawsuit that he filed against the institution.

### **Management Unit Charlie (C) – General Population and Honors Pod**

Unit C is also a general population unit, which also houses an Honors Pod, C1. The color green designates Management Unit Charlie (C). Unit staff reported this unit to be typical of other units, with approximately three Correctional Counselors, and staff managing a range of 150 to 175 inmates in addition to fulfilling some of the job responsibilities associated with Case Manager and Security positions. Inmates who are reporting for sick call or pill call go to Unit C for those services.

The inspection of Unit C included Pod C1 and Pod C5. Both pods are designed to allow a generous amount of natural light into the dayroom and surrounding cells. The pods also provide amenities that include shower banks, tables, phones, ice machine, and televisions at an equivalent level as observed in the other residential units.

Inmate movement on Pods C1 and C5 is reportedly addressed under an "inmate accountancy" system. Under this system, inmates on the Honors Pod and the General Population pods in the unit tell the Correctional Officers where they are going based on a "call onto" list that is posted for each day. The list displays where each inmate is required to be; and if he is a 'no show' at a designated location, a search system is immediately activated using cell and landline phones and walkie-talkies. If the missing inmate is not located within 20 minutes, an "emergency count" is activated and all inmates are called back to their unit for an emergency count.

***Pod C1 – Honors Pod.*** Pod C1 is the Honors Pod of the institution. Staff indicated that inmates in the Honors Pod have either a GED or high school diploma, or have completed 240 hours of education, have completed all other requirements placed upon them, and are free of disciplinary reports. Institutional documentation indicates that Honors requirements include that inmates must be active in programming associated with education, work assignment or another qualified program, have completed their Financial Responsibility Program, and have two years or less to their release date. Honors inmates receive privileges that include receiving meals first, having extra exercise equipment, permitting larger commissary purchases, access to movies, a popcorn machine in the pod, and having more latitude regarding lockdown hours. Honors pod cell doors are reportedly open from 6:30 am until midnight on weekdays, and until 2 am on weekends.

***Pod C5 – General Population.*** Pod C5 is a general population pod. During the inspection, inmates were sitting in the common area awaiting their turn to leave the pod and proceed to the dining hall for the noon meal. The pod was clean and orderly, and inmates were quiet, mostly keeping to themselves. Inspectors took note of the pod’s arrangement that included multiple televisions, a microwave oven, a table equipped with phones, multiple general-purpose tables, a game table, wall-mounted ironing board and iron, an ice machine, a sink and hot water dispenser, and the customary shower bank. Inmates in the pod have individual ear buds to allow audible access to select television channels without disturbing other inmates.

***Inmate Comments on C5 – General Population.*** *Inmates relayed concerns about inadequate dental services, increasing commissary prices, requiring educational programming of an inmate who already has advanced degrees, and the reportedly questionable tax that is placed on phone privileges.*

### **Management Unit Delta (D) – General Population and D7 Step Down Pod**

The Delta unit houses general population inmates. Unit D also maintains one unique pod, D7, which houses a mixture of inmates, including inmates in unit transition and also inmates who are removed from the general population pods due to inmates’ lack of cooperation and compliance in fulfilling financial or program requirements. Staff referred to Pod D7 as the ‘step-down’ pod.

The color blue/aqua designates Unit D. Inspectors observed Pod D7 dayroom to be typical of other dayrooms in the institution, with steel tables and attached seats, phones attached to one table, and one game table. Showers were exceptionally clean and odorless. The cells included beds anchored to a wall, locker boxes for inmates, a small table and seats attached to the cell wall, and a stainless steel sink and toilet.

***Pod D7 – Step-Down Pod.*** Specifically, Pod D7 is used to house inmates transitioning from segregation to a general population unit, inmates placed in a Financial Responsibility Program (FRP) because they have refused to pay their fines and court costs, and inmates who have refused to comply with educational or work requirements. Inmates in D7 are subjected to the

denial or restriction of privileges. Staff stated that Pod D7 is used as a management tool that allows for easier management of a difficult inmate population.

For the pod's other category of inmates, those who are there because of their refusal to pay their fines and court costs or refusal to participate in required programming, the unit serves as an environment where strict controls and limitations are placed on daily activities and privileges as a measure of discipline and control over inmate behavior. Staff relayed that the institution has a good record of inmate repayments to the government for their fines and court costs. It was explained that at the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center, the collection effort occurs at the unit level of the inmate's incarceration. Unlike the state-operated institutions, this private institution cannot withhold inmate pay to recover debt owed by the inmate. Most inmates are reportedly paying their debt at approximately \$25 per month on a set schedule. The collections are monitored and records are kept. Staff relayed that inmates who refuse to pay court costs and fines are placed on 'maintenance' pay and have a \$5.25 per month spending cap on commissary.

Limitations on privileges include cell lock-down at 9:00 pm rather than 12:00 am, a termination of television viewing at 9:00 pm, no movies, only one television in the pod, no iron or ironing board, no microwave oven, and reduced recreation time. A single sit-up machine was observed in the D7 common area for recreation. Documentation provided from the institution further indicates that Step-Down inmates have no ice machine in the pod, they are called last to chow, last on the commissary schedule, and are not permitted to have hobby crafts in the pod. Staff relayed that each phone call must be no longer than 15 minutes, yet the number of calls is unlimited. Aside from the pod restrictions, each inmate in D7 is issued a plastic patio chair that he may bring in and out of his cell during 'open door' periods of the day. The cells in the pod were observed to be large and included large wall lockers.

Staff relayed that the inmates in the D7 pod are, for most of their day, free to enter and leave their cells and visit other inmates on the pod at will; however, even the 'step-down' inmates do not leave the pod, except in compliance with assigned schedules in order to fulfill required programs. Inmates in D7 receive one library visit per week by the librarian, and books may be brought back to the unit from the library.

***Inmate Comments on Pod D7 – Step Down Pod.*** *Inmates in the step-down or transition pod complained of inadequate recreation. During the inspection, inmates in the D7 pod voiced concerns about delay and denial of dental services. One inmate reported his ongoing suffering from an infected tooth for two years and has only received medication, yet he maintains the tooth needs to be extracted. Another D7 inmate relayed nonspecific problems with medical services, and shared his perception that the institution does not take care of inmates. During the inspection, transition inmates also relayed their perception of unfairness directed toward them as they are subjected to a continuation of privilege restrictions and denials following the completion of their segregation obligation. One inmate in particular complained during the inspection that after spending two months in the Special Housing Unit (SHU), he then received*

*placement in D7 for five months. He maintained that the experience is similar to receiving two punishments for the same incident or rule violation and inquired about the legality of the practice.*

## **Food Service**

The inspection included a generous amount of time in the dining hall and food preparation area. The dining hall seats up to 350 inmates, and it was full and busy during the inspection. Staff relayed they have no difficulty keeping inmates moving quickly through the lunch period because most inmates look forward to going to optional recreation after they finish eating. The overall demeanor among the inmates was cordial and even friendly. Inmates approached staff without hesitation, yet with respect, to ask questions or discuss a topic.

**Menu.** All menus are provided from the parent corporation, created and approved by a dietician, and are followed on a five-week rotation schedule. The most frequently served meat is chicken, and Food Service Staff indicated that meals include some form of chicken approximately four times per week. Chicken is most frequently baked, served as leg and thigh quarters, with skin removed for low fat diet trays. Chicken fillets and chicken parmesan patties are also included among meat entrees. In addition to the tray menu, NEOCC inmates may partake of additional food items from a self-serve hot food bar, which offers beans and rice as a daily staple. Beverages are obtained from a beverage bar, and salad is served from a salad bar.

**Tray Distribution.** The distribution of meal trays at NEOCC was observed to be particularly efficient and precise in assuring that inmates receive their standard-menu tray quickly through two windows. Those inmates on special diets received the correct tray through a meal scan-card system, with specific or special meal type information, coded for each inmate. Inmates receiving a special dietary tray present their scan-card through a separate designated food window and their number and tray type is verified against a list that is updated daily. The special diet system is designed to reduce knowledge among inmates of special diets.

**Kitchen.** The kitchen, including the food preparation area, tray assembly and serving area, and the dish room were all bustling with activity during the inspection. Inmates and staff appeared to be efficient, fast, and focused on their individual tasks. The kitchen environment was not noisy, yet there was a 'productive hum' and a sense of purpose and nearly choreographed coordination among the inmates as they completed their job duties. The kitchen was noticeably clean, with inmates promptly addressing the cleaning of one area of the floor due to water spillage from lunch preparations. Food service staff were cordial and hospitable to the inspection team. Inmate workers were also observably respectful to each other, to CIIC inspectors, and to NEOCC staff during the inspection.

The NEOCC kitchen operates with 45 BOP inmates per shift. The kitchen inmates are reportedly carefully screened and trained to function in this busy environment, where numerous inmates

work in quite close proximity to one another. There are no US Marshal inmates employed in the kitchen or on the dining room floor.

Within the kitchen, the kosher preparation cage was clean and large, and it included a separate kosher tool room. All Kosher meals are approved by the Rabbi and are supplied by Global Medley, a kosher food distributor that offers a reasonable variety of kosher foods. During the inspection, a single inmate worker worked alone in the locked cage. The inmate relayed no problems.

The *dish washing room* is a separate section apart from food preparation and tray distribution areas. The dish cleaning section is equipped with racks holding calf-high rubber boots for inmates to wear, as a safety measure, in carrying out their duties. The provision of dish room boots is believed to be unique among Ohio's prisons.

The *food storage* area lies within the kitchen complex and includes two walk-in coolers, reportedly kept locked, and with 40 degree temperatures recorded on a specified schedule. Coolers were clean and organized, with some meals already prepared for future cooking. The freezer temperature is kept at -20 degrees and was observed to be clean and in good condition. There are also two dry storage areas, and items are rotated on a schedule to assure use of items by specified dates. The spice room has only controlled access and is stocked with a variety of spices that reflect the ethnicity of the NEOCC inmate population. Staples such as sugar, oatmeal, and baking supplies are also kept in the spice room.

***Dining Hall.*** The *dining hall* at NEOCC can seat 350 inmates at one time and the hall was full to capacity during the lunch meal period, with inmates occupying nearly every available seat. Inmates appeared at ease and not intimidated in helping themselves to the self-serve hot food bar, which provides unlimited extra food items in addition to the menu-meal on the tray. Much conversation was also observed among inmates, yet there was minimal audible noise. Within the dining hall, numerous inmates approached the CIIC inspectors. Comments and concerns that were relayed by inmates are provided in the *Inmate Concerns* section of this report.

### **Medical Department**

The medical services department at NEOCC provides an inmate-waiting area for inmates with scheduled appointments. The waiting area is, however, surrounded by a large fenced cage, so that inmates who might enter the department on an emergency or unscheduled basis, may walk past the waiting area to the treatment rooms and infirmary and have no contact with inmates in wait. The separation of waiting inmates from other people entering the department makes the NEOCC medical department different from prisons under the DRC. The reason for this structural difference is that inmates from the U.S. Marshal's side and the Federal Bureau of Prison's side are not permitted to have any contact. To accommodate the requirement, each side of the prison's population is assigned separate days on which appointments are scheduled, and if an inmate needs an emergency sick call on a day reserved for inmates of the opposite side of the

institution, the 'sick' inmate may enter the medical department without walking through the waiting inmates.

The medical department operates with three examination and treatment rooms, shared by a Doctor and Physician Assistant. In addition, the department houses the mental health services under a Mental Health Coordinator, one Psychologist, and one Chronic Care Practitioner. A Psychiatrist serves the inmates one day per week. The institution employs the services of one full-time Dentist, a second contracted part-time Dentist, and two full-time Dental Assistants. A staff member reported that employment of a Dental Hygienist is pending. There are two dental chairs available for delivery of dental services and the dental room was observed to be very clean and adequate in resources and equipment. Dental services are reportedly delivered to new inmates within the first three months of reception and routine care and cleaning is provided every six months. Staff reported that there is no backlog on dental services.

The nursing staff includes seven or eight full-time Registered Nurses, approximately 15 full time Licensed Practical Nurses, and three part-time Specialty Nurses, who work as needed. Specialty Nurses include one for infectious diseases, one for pharmacy needs, and one for quality assurance. A phlebotomist is also part of the medical staff. An Optometrist visits the clinic once per week. Last, a bilingual Bureau of Prisons staff provides language services at sick calls as needed.

Medications are available through an on-site pharmacy supply and also through a local contracted pharmacy, which supplies 24-hour service for medications in cases of emergency or on weekends. No medications are acquired through mail orders. Staff relayed that inmates who are being released from the institution are provided with a minimum of three to seven days of medications. Medications are delivered to each of the housing management units and inmates pick up their medications through pill call windows located in each of these units.

Staff relayed that all inmates receive a medical evaluation within the first 24 hours of intake, usually within 12 to 14 hours of their arrival at the institution. Tuberculosis (TB) screenings and respiratory assessments are completed on all inmates. Inmates with negative test results may be placed in one of two negative airflow cells. The negative airflow cells have a separate access from a side-door entrance, which serves to assure negative airflow is maintained and infectious diseases are contained.

There are two cells in the medical department that serve as suicide cells, known as safe cells. Inmates on "constant watch," who may have suicidal tendencies, receive the customary 24-hour constant monitoring. Inmates on a less serious "close watch" are checked by staff every 15 minutes. Suicide cells are equipped with the customary stationary platform bed and a toilet and sink. Inmates assigned to a safe cell are given a paper gown and a blanket, and receive finger foods rather than the regular food tray.

## **Education Department**

A copy of the *Education Handbook* is provided to every inmate and a copy was provided to the inspection team. The handbook outlines educational options under three categories: general education, vocational education, and hobby/craft courses. General education includes courses in GED and ESL, Life Skills, two computer courses, INEA and COBACH, and Basic Spanish. Vocational courses include CORE, Masonry, Residential Electrical Wiring, Carpentry, and Horticulture. Hobby and Craft courses include Painting, Drawing, Stick Work, and Bead Work.

The Principal of the institution's school and education department accompanied the inspection team and provided additional information about several of the courses offered to the approximate 600 inmates who daily participate in educational programming. A schedule of educational classes revealed that the education department is engaged in instructional activity, beginning at 8:00 am, and ending at 3:30 pm daily. Staff members described the Education Department as an accredited satellite school. Six classrooms are dedicated to inmate instruction and one classroom is used for staff training. Typical of most prison educational services, the General Education Diploma (GED) program is very well attended. There is a reported fifth-grade average education among inmates at intake. Courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) are also prevalent at NEOCC. Future classes reportedly are planned to include an additional computer course, and additional courses in English and Spanish. The inspection included observations of several classes in session.

**Library.** The NEOCC library, located within the education department, is a modest room with book shelves lining all four walls and tables and chairs in the middle of the floor. Compared to the volume of books routinely found in the prison libraries under Ohio's DRC, there appeared to be fewer overall books available to the NEOCC inmates. Staff relayed, however, that the library is connected to Ohio's interlibrary loan system, making a much larger range of books available to inmates. A portion of a single wall was dedicated to 'leisure reading,' with consideration given to providing books appealing to the institution's Hispanic population. Books comprising the law library appeared to occupy the majority of the shelves within the room. Case studies and statutes are available through West Law, accessible from computers rather than in print format.

During the inspection, numerous inmates were engaged in reading or research, while several inmates were taking the GED examination. The librarian was not in the library room during the inspection, but institutional staff relayed that inmates submit their identification card to check out materials. Three inmate library aides on each shift assist the librarian and make photocopies of materials for inmates.

**Inmate Tutors.** Inspection observations of inmates serving as educational tutors or instructional aides at NEOCC during the inspection created an impression that generally stands out in a positive manner among prisons in Ohio. Inmate tutors and translators, who were observed serving fellow inmates as primary instructors of a class or as instructor aides to assist the

NEOCC-employed teacher, were all visibly and actively engaged in their roles of responsibility and leadership. Aside from academic classrooms, the inspection team observed some *residential programs* in which the employed teacher was not at all present in a specific pod, yet was working in the unit and in another pod, coordinating programs running simultaneously in multiple pods. To reiterate, the positive benefits of engaging inmates as tutors was visible during the inspection, yet the CIIC office did not neglect to offer cautionary comments to the Warden in the follow-up communication regarding the risks that may be associated with the practice of leaving inmates in a relatively authoritative position over other inmates for unsupervised periods of time. CIIC staff were pleased to read in the NEOCC inmate handbook of June 7, 2005 the following:

### **PRISONER CONTROL OVER OTHER INMATES**

The responsibility of prisoner supervision belongs solely to CCA/NEOCC employees. No prisoner or group of inmates will be given control or authority over another inmate. Staff will not designate a prisoner supervisor over a prisoner work detail, give preferential treatment to an inmate, or show favoritism toward a prisoner at any time.

The use of inmate tutors, nonetheless, seems to be well-entrenched and a successful dynamic in the delivery of educational instruction at NEOCC. Tutors at NEOCC are required to have completed the GED or to have earned a high school diploma. Not just one or two, but numerous examples of inmate tutors were observed during the inspection. In one classroom, an inmate/instructor was teaching electronics technology. In one of the computer courses, an inmate tutor described by staff as very educated and intellectually gifted, was providing individualized instruction and assistance as he moved about the classroom working with each inmate and computer station one-to-one. In one of the residential programming units (INEA), a tutor was teaching Basic English with the assistance of a translator, while in another residential program (COBACH), an inmate was teaching advanced calculus-based mathematics. Staff relayed that the INEA program engages ten inmate tutors.

***General Education - Computer.*** Among the general education courses at NEOCC, the inspection team observed two computer courses: a keyboarding course with Microsoft Windows applications, and a writing course that engages Microsoft's Word, Excel, and PowerPoint programs. The writing course is instructionally designed so that basic writing and related skills are taught. Although there is no Microsoft Office Certification available to inmates, staff relayed that each of the twelve-week courses are popular and each course has a wait list of six to eight months. Educational staff further relayed that two inmates who served as instructors of the Personal Computer (PC) I course and the Excel component of the PC II course, essentially wrote the 'textbooks' or instructional materials in both an English version and a Spanish version. The

computer classroom was equipped with approximately 20 computers at individual workstations, so that inmates did not have to share a computer.

***General Education - Residential Academic Programs.*** Separate from the educational programs held in the school's actual classrooms at NEOCC, some specific educational programming is made available as part of residential unit life; and these programs are delivered to participating inmates directly on their units. The inspection included observations of three of the institution's residential educational programs. To reiterate, the presence and 'leadership' role taken by inmate tutors was an unexpected and positive observation of the inspection.

The first residential group, engaged in the Colegio de Bachilleres (COBACH) program, was truly an academically advanced cluster of inmates, who were working on a variety of subjects, as if they were engaging in independent studies. The COBACH program was formed by the Mexican government for atypical students, and was designed to be a high school college-preparatory program that includes subjects like chemistry. During the inspection, one cluster of inmates was receiving instruction from an inmate tutor in mathematics, appearing to be calculus.

Inmates may begin the COBACH program upon completion of primary and secondary academic achievements, which are provided through two semesters of studies in basic subjects like math, history, civics, and reading, to assure inmates are prepared for a college preparatory curriculum. Inmates take their course examinations using the personal computers in the NEOCC library, and their scores are recorded and sent by flash drive to the Mexican Secretariat of Education. A cart with reference books, grease-erase boards, and tables and chairs typically found in a public library were arranged in one part of the large dayroom. Staff supervision of the instructional period was provided by a single staff member, who also 'floated' across the hall to an adjacent pod, where the INEA literacy residential program was simultaneously in progress.

The second residential program observed in Unit B, Pod 1, was the Instituto Nacional de Educacion Adulto or the National Institution of Adult Education (INEA), which is a literacy program sponsored by the Mexican government for individuals to reach ninth-grade educational levels and the equivalent of the GED, which is the American program designed for undereducated adults in the United States. The INEA program serves inmates in a double pod. Inmates in the dayroom of the INEA unit were actively engaged in academic exercises to help them learn basic language and literacy skills in Spanish to increase their ability to obtain and maintain employment upon return to their homeland in Mexico. The inmates were working in three or four groups, with 10-12 inmates per group. One group was led by an inmate tutor working on a large grease board on what appeared to be a lesson on root words. The atmosphere within the dayroom was quiet and all inmates appeared to be attentive to the instruction within their group.

***Vocational Programs.*** Vocational programs are conducted in workshop/classrooms within the education department and include horticulture, carpentry and building maintenance, masonry,

residential electrical wiring, and a prerequisite course, known as CORE. The horticulture and CORE programs were not observed. Instructional staff relayed that the CORE course teaches a cluster of 'core skills' such as safety and tool maintenance, which are needed for vocational classes. Tools within the vocational classrooms were observed to be stored in typical prison fashion in locked tool cages using the chit shadow method.

Staff reported the 16-week *masonry* class to be very popular because inmates believe they can use the trade to gain employment upon eventual release. The masonry class includes basic brick and mortar construction techniques and mortar mixing. Masonry students were working on several different projects at different levels of difficulty. The class had collaboratively completed construction of an arch, which was described as a complicated and advanced project. Completion of the arch prompted great satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment among the inmates.

The *residential electrical wiring* class was described to include both academic and lab components, so that all theory and text facts are converted to hands-on skills, which is essential in an application-driven course. An Advanced Electronics course is reportedly under development, and staff indicated that 25 inmates have pre-enrolled in the advanced course. Inmates in the electronics program have reportedly relayed an interest in solar energy concepts.

Inmates in the *carpentry* class were building a variety of wood projects during the inspection. The woodworking shop has reportedly explored community service projects, but to date there has been no community commitment to having inmates provide carpentry services associated with community service projects. However, the inmates do provide labor associated with institutional carpentry projects.

***Hobby and Craft Classes.*** Inmates interested in hobby or craft classes may engage in those activities in their cells or as part of a group in the hobby and craft room. The education handbook advises inmates to submit a request form to the Education Department if they have an interest in these options. During the inspection, some inmates were engaged in painting projects in the arts and crafts area located on route to the recreation area.

### **Rehabilitative Programming**

The inspection included observations of a residential rehabilitative program, *Life Principles Community Program* (LPCP), which is a copyrighted creation of the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) and the Institute in Basic Life Principles (IBLP). The LPCP program offers an overview of parenting, self-esteem, communication skills, job application, and interview skills; and also discusses health issues and daily living issues. The LPCP program was described as a faith-based program, taught through seminars within a six-month curriculum. During the inspection, inmates in the LPCP program were gathered in the dayroom and watching a video with a Christian orientation, yet in Spanish language. One inmate was preparing to play his guitar and lead the group in some singing. Written materials, provided to the inspection team,

outline a program that encompasses Biblical principles, relationships, financial concepts, anger resolution, and character formation.

Other rehabilitative and life-skills programming is available to NEOCC inmates through a basic *substance abuse* program, a *Self Improvement Group*, and the program, *New Beginnings*. These programs were not observed during the inspection; however, brief descriptions of the programs and statistics regarding inmate participation, have been provided in this report under the section, **Programs**, within a sub-section on rehabilitative programming.

### **“Wheels of the World” Program**

A program that is unique to the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center and reportedly one other Corrections Corporation of America facility is *Wheels of the World*, which serves people in a community service fashion. The Wheels of the World program engages inmates in repairing and refurbishing wheelchairs and supplying these chairs to organizations that subsequently distribute the chairs globally where they are needed. In addition to wheelchairs, the program occasionally restores walkers, canes, and crutches.

The program is under the supervision and coordination of one paid NEOCC employee, and the labor is completed by 13 inmates. The Wheels program began operations at NEOCC approximately two years ago and within the first two years, the program processed approximately 1,900 chairs, shipping approximately 1,600 of those chairs to eight different countries. A large wall-size world map within the workshop displays the outreach of the program, using push pins and thread to illustrate the distribution of wheelchairs from NEOCC to each country that has received the wheelchairs. Numerous photographs and thank you letters are displayed under the map as evidence of the gratitude and appreciation of recipients around the world. The NEOCC coordinator indicated that the inmates working in the program have been emotionally and spiritually touched by these messages.

The Administration explained that the wheelchairs are procured and donated to the Wheels program at NEOCC through the work of a nonprofit organization, Joni and Friends (website: [joni.org](http://joni.org)), whose mission and ministry is dedicated to assist disabled people throughout the world. The Wal-Mart Corporation donates transportation to bring the chairs from the nonprofit's warehouse to NEOCC. Wheelchairs have been restored to meet special needs like a small wheelchair for a child or an extra large and strong chair for an oversized adult. The chairs leave the program with replaced fabric, vinyl, and hardware as needed to bring them back to a new or like-new condition. The program coordinator relayed that the quality of each restoration drives the rate of production rather than quantity output.

The program coordinator relayed that chairs that are not salvageable are torn down for parts and used in restoring other chairs. A large fenced and locked parts ‘room’ serves as storage space for parts as they are removed from incoming chairs and prior to the reconstruction of refurbished

chairs. Tools are kept in a locked tool cage using a chit shadow system and a log book to inventory and track tool location. One inmate has the responsibility of supervising the tool cage.

Inmate workers in the Wheels of the World program were observed to be happy in their work, and the coordinator relayed that inmates vie for these positions. The workshop environment in the Wheels' portion of a warehouse-like building was pleasant and relatively quiet, yet busy, with inmates permitted to listen to a radio station as they worked. Inmates worked at large assigned individual workbenches, taking control over restoration steps with pride. One inmate relayed during the inspection that this job has given him a new attitude and life perspective.

### **Religious Services**

The Northeast Ohio Correctional Center employs one Chaplain to serve the inmate community. Numerous volunteers from local churches and religious leaders from the community also provide religious support and connection to the inmates. Staff relayed that approximately 22 religions are represented among the NEOCC inmate population.

### **Recreation**

Inspectors noted the recreation yard to have a full basketball court, a baseball/softball field with bleachers, a soccer field, running track encircling the yard, some tabletop games, and other equipment. The recreation department also includes an indoor facility. During the inspection, most of the inmates were observed to be actively engaged in recreation, with little idleness among them. Staff relayed that the large inmate population must be divided into smaller groups that use the yard in rotation during recreation periods.

***Inmate Comments during Recreation.** Inmate concerns relayed during the inspection included the prevalence of beans and rice at every meal, the absence of fruit and natural fruit juice, a tax on phone calls, problems with receiving a special diet tray, the new reduced access to showers, inadequate library and recreation hours, conflicts between assigned recreation hours and a job schedule, limited access to a hobby shop, and restricted timeframes and access to meal periods causing inmates to 'miss out' if they are late. Other inmates insisted that complaints and grievances are not answered and are hidden. Inmates further relayed that the physical size of the three-man cells is inadequate for three men, and that inmate count takes too much time, consuming 45 minutes. Last, inmates relayed that segregation inmates experience delays in receiving medical attention, that it takes three weeks to see a Doctor, and that a segregation inmate died in 2007 allegedly due to denial of medical treatment.*

## **STAFF OPEN FORUM MEETING**

At the close of the inspection day, a representative group of staff members voluntarily met in an open forum format with one inspector to share their thoughts, general information, ideas and suggestions, concerns, or even criticisms of any facet of operations, conditions, or programs associated with the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center. The group included staff representing Correctional Officers, Case Managers, and the Business Office. An anonymous summary of the information that was relayed during the forum was subsequently provided to the NEOCC Warden in the follow-up communication from the CIIC Director; thus, providing the Warden with an opportunity to consider the thoughts of the staff. The overall tone of the forum was positive and constructive, with a pervasive attitude of commitment from staff to their employer, their positions, other staff, and to the inmates. Staff limited their comments to the following few key subjects.

### **Inmate Laundry**

With the interest of the inmates in mind, staff relayed some frustration with a budget that reportedly does not allow the quartermaster to provide adequate towels and whites to inmates and a laundry system that too frequently misplaces inmate clothing. Further, the time that elapses between inmates' requests and their receipt of basic items from the quartermaster is lengthy, which promotes the practice of inmates donating items to other inmates. The staff offered the suggestion of placing a washer and dryer on each unit, so that the laundry system may be undertaken and managed directly on the unit. Staff relayed that better unit management of laundry services might reduce the volume and costs of lost property claims.

### **Communication among Administration, Management, and Staff**

A previous communication model was identified as one of poor quality and was described as being fragmented and sparse in connecting and communicating among administration, middle management, and staff. Staff relayed hope that a newly formed 'Round Table' model, created under the institution's new Warden, could likely bring improvements to the previous communication model. Staff communicated a sincere spirit of hope and positive anticipation associated with the new communication model under the new Warden.

### **Cross-training**

Representative staff members were somewhat less enthusiastic about current cross-training among employees that reportedly has created occasional situations where it has been difficult for an employee to complete the expected duties of their own position as well as the duties of the secondary job.

Staff indicated a theoretical appreciation and acceptance of cross-training, but in addition, relayed frustration in the apparent manner that it has occasionally been implemented. Further

development of the implementation process, including a set of realistic expectations for productive output when an employee is covering the requirements of two positions, could foster a sense for mutually understood priorities, productive flexibility, and could contribute toward a unified and cooperative mindset from both staff and management in that specific situation.

### **Sick Leave and Mandatory Hours Related to the Management of Overtime Hours**

Staff also relayed some dismay regarding a somewhat new system for addressing sick time hours, when an employee may request sick leave. Staff indicated that if a call for sick leave is made, the employee might be *mandated* or *required* to work at a time or shift that is uncommon to that employee's regularly scheduled hours and without consideration to the employee's availability. It was suggested that the practice is used as one way that overtime hours are reduced. Staff readily acknowledged the need to reduce budget and minimize overtime hours and pay, but generally, relayed some dissatisfaction with the manner in which the system has been implemented in certain situations. Comments seemed to indicate that staff had been asked to compromise their personal schedules and lives without adequate preparation or a sense of appreciation for making required or necessary schedule adjustments.

Staff members comprehend the challenges that management faces in reaching budgetary goals. However, staff also shared a perception of inadequate respect shown for their personal lives, obligations, and time restrictions. Subsequently, a concern has evolved about how staff inability to work mandated hours that fall outside their regularly scheduled hours might affect their employment reviews. Simply, staff implied a feeling of discomfort and negative concern that if they are sick, must miss a regularly scheduled day, and are unable to work during a consequently mandated substitute shift or set of hours, that they may be perceived as being in violation of the mandated assignment and could suffer unknown penalties.

Based only on the minimal information that was shared on this subject, it may be advantageous for this subject to be placed among the new "Round Table" discussions for further development to assure that staff, management, and administration arrive at a mutually agreed upon and collaborated system that will effectively deliver human resources at the specific times needed, yet not appear to render or actually cause penalties to employees who have bona fide inflexibility to meeting mandated hours of work scheduled during times they have other obligations.

### **Increased Staff Input toward Formation of Solutions to Operational Problems**

During the inspection, staff members were willing to share their suggestions for improvements and their ideas to eliminate some of the concerns that they raised. During the staff open forum, representative staff members relayed an apparent genuine desire to actively participate and contribute toward solutions to problems, and thereby establish a greater sense of ownership in the success of daily operations. However, staff also indicated that management must see staff as credible participants and partners in the process, and be willing to hear and consider qualified suggestions that staff have to offer. Staff acknowledged that qualified suggestions would be

those that have been researched and have some form of documentation to show the value of the suggestion.

The sincerity of staff comments prevailed as staff shared their desire to resume a previously abandoned “committee” effort to be included in discussions regarding solutions to operational problems and possibly the formation of policies at the institutional level. Staff communicated with great respect toward management in voicing their desire for some representation in this manner; yet indicated that under a previous administration, a group of committed staff formed a committee and completed some extensive in-depth and collaborative work toward offering solutions to problems, but their efforts were reportedly dismissed without regard for their efforts, experiential knowledge, or the time they had donated to participate in the process. It would appear that with a new administration in place, a natural opportunity to create reconnections to all levels and areas of staff has emerged, and specific channels and sustained efforts should be made in that direction.

### **Challenges of Working with the Inmate Population**

Representative staff relayed that one of their ongoing challenges is working with the current and evolving NEOCC inmate population, described as outspoken, often younger individuals, who come into the institution straight from the streets, and embody anger and disrespect. Staff noted that such individuals typically are found among those under the authority of the U.S. Marshals Office, as the Federal Bureau of Prisons inmates are often more quiet. Nonetheless, staff noted that a small percentage of difficult inmates can effectively command a majority of the available time that staff may spend with the overall inmate population.

### **Systems to Track Inmate Accounts**

With the inmates’ interest in mind, staff relayed that a better system needs to be created for the distribution and tracking of inmate monies that remain in their personal account upon release, to minimize the possibility of inmates left vulnerable to financial losses. Under the current system, inmates may not receive money from their NEOCC account if they transfer to a county jail or county facility, or if they provide no forwarding address to receive their unspent and unencumbered money. While a small percentage of inmates may be affected in this manner, the inability to forward money creates a dilemma for the institution. It was explained that an inmate may go to his court hearing under the assumption that he will be returning to NEOCC, but instead, is given a transfer and taken directly from court to a different facility. In some cases, an inmate may be released without a forwarding address or contact information.

This concern, specific to a small segment of the inmate population, appears to be one that might be addressed effectively through input from staff, management, and perhaps a review of the practices found in other Corrections Corporation of America facilities. Perhaps a solution lies in the creation of a system that includes each inmate’s signature on a form designating instructions for funds unable to be forwarded and the creation of an account to hold those monies for a

specified period of time, with options for the inmate to select if no accurate forwarding information is provided.

### **EXIT MEETING WITH ADMINISTRATION**

During the exit meeting with NEOCC Administrators, CIIC inspectors relayed a range of inmate comments that were voiced during the inspection and the administration responded to bring clarification or explanation regarding the statements that inmates made. The following three subjects were brought to the administration's attention: operations within the D7 transition or 'step down' pod, meals, and dental services.

Regarding the D7 transition/step-down pod, administrators responded that the system is effective as a management tool in re-integrating troublesome inmates back to general population and that the inmate's length of stay is gauged by his offense that initially brought him into segregation. The system employs a graduated scale of sanctions, and each case is considered individually.

On the subject of reportedly inadequate meals due to a reduced caloric content, administrators responded that meals contain an average of 3,200 calories, a dietician approves the nutritional values, and a Rabbi approves the kosher diet.

On the third subject of dental and denture services reportedly being slow and inadequate, administrators responded that many inmates know when they will be released and seek dental services prior to departure. It was further indicated that dental services legitimately require a lengthy wait due to the volume of demand placed on available resources, and that a certain number of sick call appointments are reserved and held open for dental services.

During the Exit Meeting, the administration responded to the opportunity to share additional information on a range of subjects that had emerged throughout the day, in order that the inspection team would have a full understanding and appreciation of administrative insight as well as the efforts, successes, and challenges of staff in managing the inmate population on a daily basis.

Administration and management indicated that they were comfortable taking inspectors to the 'worst' pods in the institution. While the Administration's expectation was that inmates would comment negatively about certain issues to the inspectors, the institutional representatives did not want to limit the inspection team's presence or appear to hide any part of the institution's operations from the inspection process.

Given the opportunity to share remaining thoughts to the inspection team, the institutional representatives offered the following examples of how their problem-solving strategies illustrate their management of the institution's operational details.

On the subject of managing such a diverse inmate population and keeping track of all individuals, administrators reported that the racial distribution of inmates throughout the

institution is balanced to prevent racial clustering in any one area; and further, there have been only a few inmate racially-based incidents. It was relayed that there have essentially been no inmate tracking problems experienced within the institution.

Regarding inmate visitation privileges, the administration relayed that inmates are provided with opportunities for unlimited visits during visitation hours, as long as the visitor is an approved visitor. The 'open' visitation privileges are however, provided with consideration for the required no-contact between inmates under the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service and inmates under authority of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The prompt delivery of medical services as an indicator of accountability was acknowledged during the exit conference and some specific details of the institution's medical operations were shared by administrators. Reportedly, medical needs are triaged based on severity, and everyone requesting sick call is seen within 72 hours. Inmates must be on antibiotics for two weeks for certain conditions. Medical sick calls are held Monday through Friday and walk-in appointments are permitted. Administrators relayed their insight of a tendency among inmates who are to be deported to seek an appointment with the medical Doctor, rather than a Nurse, prior to release because they are aware that they will not receive medical care after deportation.

Administrators explained that they must be compliant with the need to conserve water resources, and a requirement to manage expenses; thus, reductions in the shower schedule have been implemented. While the limits placed on the number of showers has prompted some inmates to react negatively and register complaints, administrators indicated that these reductions will remain as a permanent change in unit operations. Staff added, however, that there will be one shower open all day, particularly for food service workers who can shower in the middle of the day after their work shift; but the other four showers on the pod will only be accessible on the schedule. Staff explained that inmates previously had no limits on showers and some inmates were taking three showers each day.

With consideration to inmate complaints about the dingy appearance of clothing returned to inmates from the laundry, staff acknowledged there has been a previous problem as described, but the administration added that new hot water tanks are being installed to correct this problem.

In response to inmate porter concerns about their need for protective gloves and goggles, and their desire for stronger cleaning chemicals, the administrators relayed that the cleaning supplies are non-caustic; thus, inmate porters are not issued gloves or goggles. Reportedly, inmates are currently provided with five gallon buckets twice a week to accomplish their cleaning duties, but some inmates have relayed a desire for additional quantities.

Last, the administrators acknowledged there have been gnats appearing in the showers, but that the problem is treated on a frequent basis.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was developed by CIIC for use as part of institutional inspections, in order to gather additional information. The questionnaire 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 were reported to be consistent with international standards. The purpose of gathering information on the extent to which Ohio correctional institutions are similar or different from selected sections of Expectations is twofold: To identify possible areas in need of improvement, and to identify possible means of addressing reported areas of concern.

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,’ or ‘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 CIIC office within ten days of the inspection.

### Adult Expectations

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

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

<b>Environment and Relationships:</b>	Residential Units: Overview
	Residential Units: Clothing and Possessions
	Residential Units: Hygiene
	Staff – Prisoner Relationships
<b>Duty of Care:</b>	Complaint/Grievance Procedure
	Bullying and Violence Reduction
	Self-Harm and Suicide

<b>Activities:</b>	Learning and Skills and Work Activities Library
<b>Good Order:</b>	Security and Rules
<b>Services:</b>	Food Services

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO EXPECTATIONS

### SECTION 2- ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS

#### RESIDENTIAL UNITS: Overview

1. Do prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions? **YES**
  
2. Are cells and communal areas (blocks, dorms, dayrooms) light, well decorated and in a good state of repair? **YES**
3. Do all prisoners occupy accommodation that is suitable for the purpose and for their individual needs? **YES**
  - a. Are there cell sharing risk assessments? **YES**
  - b. Are cells sufficiently warm in winter and cool in summer? **YES**
  - c. Are cells ventilated and do they have sufficient daylight? **YES**
  - d. Do prisoners have their own bed, corkboard, lockable cupboard/locker box, and use of a table and chair? **YES, WITH EXCEPTION OF CORKBOARD**
  - e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks? **YES, IF ISSUED BY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT**
  - f. Do shared cells have screened toilets? **NO**
  
4. Are reasonable adjustments made to ensure that prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems can access all goods, facilities, and services? **YES**
  - a. Do prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems have ease of access to different locations and services? **YES, NEOCC IS HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE**
  - b. Are older, infirm and disabled prisoners assigned to landings, which hold most of the communal facilities? **YES**
  
5. Is there a system whereby nominated volunteer prisoners on each residential unit are trained to help less able prisoners and they are paid for this work? **NO**
  - a. How are volunteers identified, trained and assigned? **NA**
  
6. Are residential staff aware of prisoners within their care with disabilities and their location? **YES, WHEN APPLICABLE**

- a. Are safe evacuation procedures in place to assist those prisoners who may need help in an emergency? **YES**
- b. Are there visible markers on cell doors? **DOORS ARE NUMBERED**
- 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? **NA**
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?  
**CLASSIFICATION TO ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION IF APPLICABLE**
9. Do all prisoners have access to an in-cell emergency call button/bell that works and is responded to within five minutes? **YES**
10. Do observation panels in cell doors remain free from obstruction? **YES**
11. Is there a clear policy prohibiting offensive displays, and is it applied consistently? **YES**
12. Are prisoners' communal areas (activity and shower areas) clean, safe, meet the needs of the prisoner population, and effectively supervised by staff? **YES**
- a. Are there adaptations for older, infirm and disabled prisoners? **YES**
13. Do prisoners feel safe in their cells and in communal areas of the residential units? **YES, VIA SURVEY TO INMATES ANNUALLY**
- a. Is there a suitable design of residential units e.g. good sightlines, and supervision in high-risk areas? **YES**
14. Are notices displayed in a suitable way for the population? **BULLETIN BOARDS IN ALL UNITS AND PODS; MEDICAL, R AND D; INMATE MEMOS DISTRIBUTED REGULARLY; INMATE TOWNHALLS CONDUCTED AT LEAST MONTHLY; STAFF ROUNDS, ETC.**
- a. Is adequate provision made for any prisoners who cannot read notices because of literacy, language, or eyesight problems or any other disability? **YES**
15. Are residential units as calm and quiet as possible both to avoid incidents and to enable rest and sleep, especially at night? **YES**

**SECTION 2- ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS****RESIDENTIAL UNITS: Clothing and Possessions**

1. Do prisoners have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs? **YES**
  - a. Are older prisoners provided with additional clothing and bedding, if required, without the need for medical permission? **NO**
2. Do prisoners have at least weekly access to laundry facilities to wash and iron their personal clothing? **YES**
  - a. Do they have access to laundry/exchange facilities outside the weekly rotation? **YES**
3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request? **YES**
4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage **YES**
5. Is there a standard list detailing the possessions that women prisoners are allowed to keep, and used across all women's prisons? **NA**
  - a. Is there a standard list also employed for male facilities of the same security category? **YES**
6. Are suitable clothes and bags available to discharged prisoners who do not have them? **YES**
7. Are facilities available before discharge to launder clothes that have been in storage for long periods? **YES**

**SECTION 2- ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS****RESIDENTIAL UNITS: Hygiene**

1. Are prisoners encouraged, enabled and expected to keep themselves, their cells and communal areas clean? **YES**
  - a. Are older and disabled prisoners enabled to keep themselves and their cells clean? **YES**
2. Do prisoners have ready access to both communal and in-cell toilets, baths and showers in private? **YES**
  - a. Are screened toilets in shared cells? **NO**
  - b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older, less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles? **BLANK**
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? **YES**
  - b. Are older, less able or disabled prisoners helped to have a bath or shower every day? **YES**

4. Do prisoners have access to necessary supplies of their own personal hygiene items and sanitary products? **YES**
5. Is fresh laundered bedding provided for each new prisoner on arrival and then on at least a weekly basis? **YES**
- a. Is there a system for the replacement of mattresses in operation? **YES**
- b. Are clean pillows available for new prisoners as well as other bedding? **YES**
6. Is a prisoner's valuable property routinely security marked before it is issued? **YES, IT IS INVENTORIED UPON ARRIVAL AND LOGGED WITH EACH PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION.**

**SECTION 2 - ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS**  
**STAFF-PRISONER RELATIONSHIPS**

1. Are prisoners treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions? **YES**
2. Is there a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness? **YES**
3. Are all prisoners treated with humanity, and with respect for the inherent dignity of the person? **YES**
- a. Is staff aware that the prison has a duty of care for all prisoners, to ensure no prisoners are at risk of physical or emotional abuse by staff or prisoners, and that prisoners are to be held in decent and humane conditions? **YES**
4. Are staff aware that they should set a personal example in the way they carry out their duties at all times? **YES**
5. Are staff always fair and courteous in their day to day working with prisoners? **YES**
6. Do staff positively engage with prisoners at all times? **YES**
7. Is interaction between staff and prisoners encouraged by the senior management team?
- a. Does staff help and encourage older and less able prisoners to participate in and access all facilities offered across the prison? **YES**
8. Does staff routinely knock before entering cells, except in emergencies? **YES**
9. Are prisoners encouraged by staff to engage in all activities and routines, promoting punctuality, attendance and responsible behavior? **YES**
- a. What methods are used to encourage prisoners to get involved? **SOME EXAMPLES INCLUDE HONORS POD, EDUCATION, PROGRAMS, COMMISSARY REWARDS, GED, AND INEA GRADUATIONS, ETC.**
10. Is inappropriate conduct on the part of prisoners challenged? **YES**

a. Do staff demonstrate skill in confronting low-level disputes without using official disciplinary measures? **YES**

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

### **SECTION 3 – DUTY OF CARE COMPLAINT/GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE**

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

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

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

b. Since some prisoners, e.g. foreigners may need to be specifically told about the whole process, is there a single channel of contact or clear information on how to make a complaint? **YES**

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

d. What are the procedures for blind prisoners? **YES, VIA UNIT TEAM, MEDICAL, FGO**

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

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

a. Are forms required to access complaint forms? **YES**

b. Are there forms, and at least one kite box on each block/dorm? **NO**

c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer? **NA**

d. Are form dispensers always stocked with forms? **NA**

e. Are informal complaints and grievance files secured on a limited access basis? **YES**

6. Do prisoners make use of the procedures, and are they free of pressure to withdraw any complaints or grievances? **YES**

a. What are the procedures for prisoners with learning or other disabilities? **FGO MAKES ROUNDS, MEETS WITH INMATES; UNIT TEAM AND MEDICAL CAN REQUEST ASSISTANCE VIA INFORMAL RESOLUTION PROCESS.**

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? **POLICY ALLOWS FOR 15 DAYS FOR RESPONSE**

a. Are complaints resolved? **YES**

- b. Are complaints answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances? **WITHIN 15 DAYS FOR RESPONSE**
- c. Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure? **YES**
- d. Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner? **YES, WHEN APPICABLE**
- e. Are target return times recorded? **YES**
- f. Are letters of complaint/concern from third parties, such as legal representatives, family or voluntary organizations, logged and answered? **YES**
8. Do prisoners receive responses to their complaints/grievances that are respectful, legible, and address the issues raised? **YES**
9. Are formal grievances signed and dated by the respondent? **YES**
- a. Regarding the quality of responses, is there a quality assurance system in place? **YES**
- b. Does the staff member who dealt with the complaint clearly print their name on the response? **YES**
- c. Are staff responses to confidential complaints returned in sealed envelopes? **YES**
10. Do prisoners feel able to ask for help in completing their complaint or grievance form and in copying relevant documentation? **YES**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for help with forms? **YES**
- b. Are translation services provided for those who need them? **YES**
- c. What are the arrangements for prisoners with literacy problems, and for those who are blind? **BY APPOINTMENT THROUGH MEDICAL, UNIT TEAM, SIS OR FGO**
11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered?
- 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, BY POLICY WITHIN 24 HOURS**
- a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice? **ALL MATTERS ARE HANDLED BY SIS, REFERRED TO OIA IF SUBSTANTIATED AND INVESTIGATED CONFIDENTIALLY**
- 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**
- 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? **15 DAYS AS PER POLICY**
  - b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms? **YES**
  - c. How many have appealed in the last six months? **7**
  - d. What was the outcome, and how promptly were they answered? **WITHIN 15 DAYS, ALL UPHELD**
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? **NO, WE ARE WAITING FOR THE INFORMATION**
  - 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? **LIBRARY**
17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need to? **YES**
- a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisers or making direct applications to the courts? **YES**
  - b. In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector? **UNKNOWN**
  - c. What do they tend to be about? **NA**
  - d. What proportion are generally resolved? **NA**
18. Do prison managers analyze complaints (both granted and denied) each month, by ethnicity, disability, block/dorm/unit, prisoner type, etc., and if necessary, make any appropriate changes? **YES**
- a. Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge? **YES**

**SECTION 3- DUTY OF CARE**  
**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**
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**
  - a. Is the violence reduction strategy is widely publicized? **YES**
  - b. Is monitoring part of the strategy and as a minimum, does it cover feelings of safety among prisoners, incidents of bullying (verbal and physical), number of assaults, number of racist incidents, location of incidents and action taken? **YES**
  - c. Do staff understand their duty to maintain a safe environment and what they do to promote this? **YES**
  - d. Are staff alert to threats to a safe environment, and do they confront all forms of victimization? **YES**
  - e. Are prisoners consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance? **YES**
  - f. How effective is the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction? **YES, VERY AS INMATE TEAM MEETINGS ARE CONDUCTED REGULARLY TO REVIEW WITH UNIT TEAM AND INMATES, OR AS NEEDED**
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? **YES**
  - a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months? **FOUR MEETINGS WITH INMATE COMMITTEES, TOWNHALLS AT LEAST MONTHLY WITH ALL UNITS**
  - b. Has an annual confidential survey to all prisoners about bullying been undertaken? **YES, INCLUDED IN MASTER SURVEY**
  - c. Are there wing representatives? **FOR VARIOUS COMMITTEES AND GROUPS.**
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? **NONE**

- b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying? **NO, UNKNOWN**
- c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners? **PREA, SECURITY AND CONTROL POLICIES**
- d. Do staff lead by example in the way they treat their colleagues/prisoners, and understand that their duty is to foster a safe environment, by confronting unacceptable behavior quickly and fairly? **YES**
- e. What are the arrangements for movement, exercise, mealtimes and discharge, especially for those who are considered vulnerable? **INMATE IN PROTECTED CUSTODY WILL HAVE RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES, EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES, LIBRARY MATERIAL ACCESS, ETC.**
- 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? **BLANK**
7. Are prisoners' families and friends encouraged to make suggestions about how the prison could better protect prisoners from victimization and to provide information to help identify those prisoners likely to be at risk? **YES**
- a. Are prisoners' families encouraged to come forward if they feel they are being bullied to bring drugs into prison? **YES**
- b. Is a visitors' survey distributed systematically? **NO**
- c. Do visiting families know about reporting procedures and do they think that visiting staff are approachable and sympathetic? **YES**
- d. Are there posters in visiting rooms? **YES**
8. Is an effective strategy in place to deal with bullying which is based on an analysis of the pattern of bullying in the prison and is applied consistently throughout the prison? **YES**
- a. Has a strategy been formed by systematic consultation with prisoners across the prison? **YES**
- b. Is a central log of bullying kept, and are incidents of bullying reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary committee? **YES**
- c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization? **YES**
- d. Are all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. used for evidence of bullying/intimidation? **YES**
- e. How do staff contribute to the strategy?  
**NUMBERS ARE REPORTED AND REVIEWED TO VIEW TRENDS, SIS INVESTIGATES, ETC.**
- f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments? **YES**

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, IF SUBSTANTIATED**
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**
11. Is inappropriate behavior consistently challenged? **YES**
- a. Are there bullying posters throughout the prison? **YES**
  - b. What information is distributed to new arrivals? **HANDBOOK, MEDICAL INFORMATION, PREA INFORMATION**
  - c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners? **YES**
  - d. Are staff aware of both direct and indirect forms of bullying? **YES**
12. Do anti-bullying measures support the victim and take the victim's views about their location into account? **YES**
- a. Do staff understand the link between bullying and aggressive and disruptive behavior generally? **YES**
13. Are appropriate interventions in place to deal with bullies and support victims? **YES**
- a. What interventions are available to challenge bullies and to support victims of bullying? **SIS INTERVENTION, MEDICAL INTERVENTION, SEPARATIONS, ETC.**
  - b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior? **YES**
  - c. Do prisoner records contain comprehensive updates on how bullied and bullying prisoners have been supported and/or challenged? **SOME INFORMATION WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL IF RELATING TO STG ACTIVITIES**

**SECTION 3: DUTY OF CARE****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?  
**YES**
  - 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? **OBSERVATION CELLS IN MEDICAL ARE AVAILABLE**
  - e. Does the protocol in place recognize the need for continued interaction, and avoid an over reliance on the safer cell as a preventative measure? **YES**
6. Does a multi-disciplinary committee effectively monitor the prison's suicide prevention policy and procedures? **YES AND APPROVED THROUGH THE CUSTOMER AND CORPORATE OFFICER**
7. Is the committee chaired by a manager responsible for the policy and does membership include prisoners, staff representatives from a range of disciplines, and a member of the local community mental health team? **YES**
8. Are prisoners' families, friends and external agencies encouraged, through local arrangements, to provide sources of information which may help identify and support those prisoners likely to be bullied or who have a history of self-harming behavior? **YES**

- 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? **NO**
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 which 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? **YES**
12. Are arrangements in place for following up after a care and support plan has been closed? **YES**
- a. Do unit officers have knowledge of policy and support plans? **YES**
- b. What level of training have they received? **ANNUAL AND AS NEEDED**
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? **YES**
- a. Is a care suite available to support the work of Listeners? **YES**
- b. Is there access to counselors, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times? **YES**
- 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? **YES**
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? **BLANK**
- 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? **BLANK**
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**
- 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? **NA**
16. Are incidents of self-harm closely monitored and analyzed at regular intervals to establish any trends and to implement preventive measures? **YES**
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?  
**YES**

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? **NA**

20. Is all information about prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide communicated to people who are able to offer support in the community? **YES**

## **SECTION 5: ACTIVITIES**

### **LEARNING AND SKILLS AND WORK ACTIVITIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- a. How many prisoners are locked up during the day? **ONLY SEGREGATION INMATES**

- b. How many are formally registered as unassigned? **NONE**

- c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population? **NA**

- d. How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job? **INMATES EITHER WORK OR ENROLL IN EDUCATION**

6. Are activities which fall outside the learning and skills provision purposeful and designed to enhance prisoners' self-esteem and their chances of successful reentry? **YES**

7. Are facilities and resources for learning and skills and work appropriate, sufficient and suitable for purpose? **YES**

8. Are all prisoners able to access activity areas? **YES**

- a. Is there access for older and disabled prisoners? **YES**
- b. Are there any inaccessible areas because of poor mobility and insufficient help to get to them?  
**NO**
9. Is every prisoner who wishes to be able to engage fully with all prison activities offered, and is no one excluded from participation, other than as a result of a disciplinary punishment? **YES**
10. Is allocation to activity places equitable, transparent, and based on identified reentry planning needs?  
**YES**
11. Can prisoners apply for job transfers and are they given written reasons for any decisions? **YES**
- a. Does case management link with the reentry planning process? **YES**
- b. Do prisoners with identified learning needs work in low skilled, production line work, rather than relevant classes? **WHEN APPLICABLE**
- c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures? **BASED ON NEED AND DESIRE OF INMATE, WAITING LISTS**
- d. Is there any favoritism or line jumping? **NO**
12. Do local pay schedules provide disincentives for prisoners to engage in education or training activities? **YES**
- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities? **NO**
13. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay? **NA**
14. Do prisoners who are unemployed through no fault of their own or who are exempt from working unlocked during the day, and provided with access to the library and other activities? **YES**
15. Does the prison have an effective strategy to ensure that learners are able to regularly and punctually attend those activities, which meet their needs and aspirations? **YES**
- a. What systems are in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities? **INMATES WILL BE DISCIPLINED WHEN TARDY OR DELINQUENT**
16. Are all prisoners given accurate information, advice and guidance about prison activities, which support their learning and sentence plans and link to their reintegration into the community? **YES**
17. Does the assessment and provision of individual learning and skills form an effective part of prisoners' reentry plans and are they used effectively to record and review overall progress and achievement? **YES**
18. Do work placements provide purposeful and structured training for prisoners? **YES**

- a. Wherever possible, can vocational qualifications be obtained alongside their work? **YES**
  - b. In the absence of such qualifications, are developed skills recognized and recorded? **YES**
19. Are prisoners helped to continue on their courses when transferred or to progress to further education, training or employment on release? **YES**
20. Does the prison accurately record the purposeful activity hours that prisoners engage in, excluding non-purposeful activities in their calculations? **YES**

## **SECTION 5: ACTIVITIES**

### **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? **THROUGH REQUESTS**
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**

## **SECTION 6: GOOD ORDER**

### **SECURITY AND RULES**

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

**Security**

5. Are there any obvious weaknesses or anomalies in the physical and procedural security of the facility?

**NO**

6. Are the elements of “dynamic security” in place: **YES**

- a. Are staff-prisoner relationships positive? **YES**
- b. Do prisoners receive personal attention from staff? **YES**
- c. Is there constructive activity to occupy prisoners? **YES**

1) Do staff cluster during association? **NO**

2) Are there enough staff in dorm/block areas to facilitate good officer work? **YES**

7. Does effective security intelligence safeguard prisoners’ well-being? **YES**

- a. Do staff comply with security requirements in terms of filing reports? **YES**
- b. Are there recent incidents where security reports have led to action? **NO**

8. Is prisoners’ access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessarily restrictive approach to security?

**NO, UNLESS CIRCUMSTANCES ARISE**

9. Is strip and squat searching of prisoners carried out only for sound security reasons? **YES**

10. Are prisoners strip or squat searched only in the presence of more than one member of staff, of their own gender? **YES**

- a. If squat searches are used, does their incidence and authorization need to be logged and regularly checked? **YES**
- b. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances? **NA**

11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available? **YES**

- a. Are the visitors subject to bans or restrictions reviewed every month? **YES**

**SECTION 6 – GOOD ORDER: RULES**

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas? **YES**

- a. Are rules and routines posted/distributed on units/blocks/dorms? **YES**
- b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs? **YES**

2. Are rules and routines applied openly, fairly and consistently, with no discrimination? **YES**

3. Does staff use only the level of authority necessary to ensure a prisoner's compliance with the rules? **YES**
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned? **YES**
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoners, are appeal arrangements explained and made available? **YES**

## **SECTION 7 – SERVICES: FOOD SERVICES**

1. Are prisoners offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements? **YES**
2. Is food prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations? **YES**
3. Do all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to 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? **BLANK**
  - a. Are Halal certificates displayed where prisoners can see them? **NA**
  - 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. **YES**
    - Pregnant inmates? **NA**
    - Specific religions? **YES**
    - Prisoners with disabilities? **YES**
  - d. Do prisoners who are on special diets have confidence in the preparation and content of the meals? **YES**
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? **BLANK**
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**
- b. Do prisoners on transfer miss out on their main meal? **NO**
8. Do prisoners have a choice of meals including an option for vegetarian, religious, cultural and medical diets? **YES**
- a. Are all menu choices provided to the same standard? **BLANK**
- b. Are options for religious or cultural groups open to all, and not just those who practice their religion officially? **NO**
9. Are prisoners consulted about the menu, and can they make comments about the food? **YES**
- a. If logs of comments are kept, how frequently are they consulted? **AT LEAST ANNUALLY**
- b. Is there a food comments book? **NO**
10. Is the breakfast meal served on the morning it is eaten? **YES**
11. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm? **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**
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**
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? **NA**