



Southern Ohio Correctional Facility Follow-Up

July 9, 2012

Joanna E. Saul,
Report Coordinator

**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE REPORT
ON THE FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION OF
SOUTHERN OHIO CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

Date of Inspection:	July 9, 2012
Type of Inspection:	Announced
CIIC Staff Present:	Joanna E. Saul, Director Darin Furderer, Inspector Gregory Geisler, Inspector
Facility Staff Present:	Warden Donald Morgan Deputy Warden Mick Oppy Deputy Warden Anthony Cadogan Admin. Asst. Larry Greene Health Care Admin. Roseanna Clagg Case Manager Brian Nolan

Follow-Up Inspection Overview:

Overall, CIIC found that SOCF continues to demonstrate improvement and particularly commends the Warden and his staff. As the state's maximum security facility, SOCF houses a difficult inmate population; furthermore, the facility has recently experienced high turnover in its inmate population due to the DRC's current three tier reorganization plan. However, since Warden Morgan was appointed to his current position at SOCF, he has demonstrated critical self-reflection and continuous improvement for the institution, identifying issues and then taking the extra step to address them. While SOCF will always be challenging due to its mission and population, the positive effects of his attitude and leadership appear to be demonstrated through objective measurements.

The April 2011 CIIC inspection of SOCF raised five primary concerns in the following areas: (1) use of force; (2) inmate grievance procedure; (3) healthcare; (4) access/lack of programming; and (5) the need for cultural competency training for both inmates and staff. The follow-up inspection addressed these five issues only and did not attempt a full facility inspection. CIIC identified objective measures by which to evaluate the concerns noted in the 2011 inspection report. Each concern is broken down into the following areas:

- description of the concern identified during the 2011 inspection,
- the DRC's action plan in response to the 2011 inspection report, as provided by institutional staff,
- CIIC's action plan as part of its 2012 follow-up inspection, and
- the CIIC findings from the 2012 follow-up inspection.

2011 CIIC Concern: Use of Force

Numerous inmates alleged that line staff, particularly staff on second shift, are quick to use force and do not attempt to utilize verbal methods to deescalate situations.

2011 DRC Action Plan

- Increase supervision during mass movement in high profile areas such as Metal Detector, Recreation and Inmate Dining Room.
- Develop and utilize “hands on approach” Use of Force training during In-service training surrounding scenario/coaching methods to train staff providing a clear understanding of policy.
- Upon review of all Use of Force packets; the Deputy Warden of Operations will determine that all (4) elements of a use of force is present with emphasis on Preclusion and conclude whether a “coaching” session or disciplinary action is appropriate.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Review ten completed use of force packets, selected at random, including five that were sent to a use of force committee investigation and five that were not.
- Review data breakdown of use of force incidents by shift.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found through its review of the use of force packets that all DRC policies and procedures in regard to uses of force appeared to be followed.
- CIIC found that incident reports from the use of force packets indicated that staff gave direct verbal orders to inmates prior to the application of force, when possible.
- CIIC found that two of the packets lacked the required documentation for an extension beyond the 30 day timeframe for completion of the use of force investigation; this was addressed on-site with staff.
- CIIC found that from January – June 2012, a total of 258 use of force incidents were reported at the institution; of those, 155 (60.1 percent) occurred on first shift and 91 (35.3 percent) occurred on second shift. Of the total use of force incidents for the time period, 58 were referred to a committee for investigation, of which 38 (65.5 percent) occurred on first shift. Thus, CIIC does not find that second shift staff are more likely to use force than staff on other shifts.

2011 CIIC Concern: Grievance Procedure

Many inmates relayed concerns that they would be retaliated against if they used the inmate grievance procedure. Others stated that informal complaints are never made available to them upon request from staff. Inmates also questioned the impartiality of the Institutional Inspector and supervisors in responding to informal complaints and grievances.

2011 DRC Action Plan

- Place forms in an easy access areas, i.e. kites and Informal Complaints.
- Post flyers throughout the facility, as well as utilize the Inmate Character Generator as resources in educating and communicating the informal complaint and grievance process to the inmate population.
- All offenders are informed of the inmate grievance process and information regarding appropriate supervision at reception. Offenders will then be afforded a review of this information by the receiving institution upon transfer to another facility. All offenders will receive the same manner of review for the duration of incarceration as outlined in policy 52-RCP-10 (Inmate Orientation). All reviews are documented on DRC4141.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Review twenty informal complaints and responses, filed within the past quarter
- Review ten grievances and dispositions, filed within the past quarter

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that there were 531 informal complaints and 112 grievances filed by inmates at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility from April 1 – June 30, 2012, indicating access to both.
- CIIC found that the responses to both informal complaints and grievances were professional and in several cases went beyond the requirements of DRC Administrative Rule 5120-9-31.
- CIIC found that the Inspector documented appropriate interviews, record reviews, and policy reviews in response to inmate grievances.
- As an additional note, CIIC found that it received 177 contacts from or regarding inmates at SOCF from January 1 – June 30, 2011; for the same time period in 2012, the total number of contacts from or regarding SOCF dropped to 98, which may be a positive indication.
- The only potential issue identified by CIIC was the untimely response rate to informal complaints; in 2011, 13.8 percent of informal complaints received an untimely response, a rate that can be improved.

2011 CIIC Concern: Healthcare

Inmates stated that they have to wait for extended periods of time to receive treatment from the institutional physician. Other inmates stated concerns about changes in medication.

2011 DRC Action Plan

- As of April 7, 2011, initiated full-time contract physician; in addition to the current full time Nurse Practitioner position.
- Continue to schedule part-time physician on an as needed basis.
- Continue to work closely with the Commissary Department in educating/notifying inmates of the new drug formulary (Directive Dated 2/4/2011) utilizing bulletin postings in common areas and posting on Inmate Character Generator.
- Continue to provide patient education regarding medication use.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Interview Health Care Administrator.
- Conduct focus group of medical staff.
- Conduct two inmate focus groups: one of inmates on the chronic care caseload and one of inmates not on the chronic care caseload.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that the institution reported zero inmates on the backlog for Nurse Sick Call, Doctor Sick Call, or chronic care clinics, which is very positive.
- CIIC found that the inmates relayed very positive comments regarding the nursing staff at SOCF, both in terms of their professionalism and in the quality of the work that they do.
- Similar to the overall decrease in inmate contacts regarding SOCF, CIIC received 93 contacts from SOCF with complaints regarding healthcare from January 1 – June 30, 2011; for that same time period in 2012, the total number of healthcare related contacts from SOCF dropped to 21, which may indicate inmates' greater satisfaction with healthcare services at SOCF.
- The only issue that CIIC found was that the inmates relayed concerns regarding the institutional doctor, particularly in regard to his "bedside manner" and his abrupt discontinuance of inmates' pain medication. For example, one inmate reported being suddenly removed from all pain medication, only to be placed back on it three months later after his persistent reports of pain. In response, executive staff relayed that they are monitoring inmates' complaints regarding healthcare and medical staff and providing close supervision for medical staff when needed.

2011 CIIC Concern: Access/Lack of Programming

Many inmates reported concerns with the lack of access to programming in general. They also relayed concerns with the number of available programs, especially for inmates serving extended sentences. Several staff stated that increasing the number of programs is the change that they would make if they were the Warden, relaying that occupying inmates' time is necessary for calm institutional operations.

2011 DRC Action Plan

- Continue to follow the 02-REN-01 policy which states, in Section E Reentry Program Enrollment and Monitoring for RAP and ORAS. (1) With the exception of statutory requirements, program providers shall ensure that inmate enrollment reentry programs is prioritized according to the Case Plan and/or RAP in the following order:
 - Inmates with 2 years or less remaining to serve who scored intensive on the RAP will be prioritized for programs that address domains with considerable need. Inmates with 2 years or less remaining to serve at their parent institution and with high or very high risk on the PIT.
 - Inmates with moderate risk levels and high level of need in ORAS or considerable need in RAP should be enrolled only when there are too few high/very high risk inmates available to participate in the program and who have a high need in the particular domain for the program.
- Expand on cognitive behavioral programming to include but not limited to After Care CBT, Adapt CBT, SAMI CBT, Depression Management, Self Injury & Addiction CBT, Anger Management, Thinking for a Change, Turning Point, Victim Awareness, etc.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Review of data related to educational program enrollment.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that from January 2011 to June 2012, inmate enrollment in academic programs increased and there was no loss in career-technical program enrollment. From January – June 2011, an average of 88 inmates were enrolled in academic programs each month at SOCF; for the same time period in 2012, the average number of inmates enrolled per month increased to 113.5, a 29 percent increase.

2011 CIIC Concern: Cultural Competency Training

Many inmates stated that the lack of minority staff negatively affected inmate-staff interactions. Inmates relayed that they would like staff to participate in training to improve communication across the cultural divide. Similarly, several staff relayed that learning how to communicate with the inmate population was the biggest struggle that new recruits face.

2011 DRC Action Plan

- More emphasis on Inter-Personal Communication Skills and Cultural Diversity during In-Service training.
- One on one discussion with officers assigned to those high profile posts on the importance of communication with the offenders, remaining professional at all times and the Administration's expectations.
- Encourage and/or require staff to participate in those courses offered by CTA that fall within the Communications' Module to include but not limited to, Correctional Communications, Interpersonal Relationships, and ABC's of a Multi-Generational Workplace.
- Purchase video programming relating to Cultural Diversity in a prison setting and develop an ongoing schedule to provide access to such programming by utilizing the inmate character generator.

2012 CIIC Follow-Up Inspection

- Review SOCF grievance data related to staff/inmate relations.
- SOCF staff provided information on site.

2012 CIIC Findings

- CIIC found that in 2011, SOCF staff reported receiving 93 grievances related to staff/inmate relations in the area of supervision (includes harassment, racial/ethnic slurs, and unprofessional conduct), or an average of 23 per quarter. In comparison, staff reported receiving only 14 grievances related to staff/inmate relations in the area of supervision from April 1 – June 30, 2012, which may be a positive indication.
- SOCF staff created an extensive powerpoint presentation to use during in-service training that addressed the issue of appropriate communication with inmates and also specifically informed staff regarding CIIC's 2011 inspection report findings and the issue of cultural competency. The training also linked violence reduction to the greater use of interpersonal communication skills.