

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

**Prepared and Submitted by
CIIC Staff**

January 13, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INSPECTION PROFILE.....	6
INSPECTION SUMMARY	
STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS.....	7
Attendance at a General Meal Period	
Attendance at a Rehabilitation Program	
INMATE PROGRAMS.....	8
EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS.....	13
Enrollment and Waiting Lists	
Table 1. Number of TOCI inmates enrolled in an educational or vocational program with breakdown by category for November 2008.....	14
Table 2. Number of TOCI inmates on educational or vocational program waiting list with Breakdown by Category for November 2008	
COMMUNITY SERVICE	
Inside Projects.....	15
Outside Projects	
FACILITY DESCRIPTION.....	16
Overview	
Mission	
Budget.....	17
Table 3.. ToCI budget comparison from 2005 to 2008	
Table 4. Daily cost per inmate comparison from 2005 to 2008	
Table 5. Annual cost per inmate comparison from 2005 to 2008	
EMPLOYEE DATA	
Table 6. Number of ToCI staff with breakdown by gender on November 1, 2008.....	18
Table 7. Number of ToCI staff with breakdown by race on November 1, 2008	
Table 8. Number of ToCI Staff with breakdown by gender and race on November 1, 2008	
Table 9. Number of ToCI male staff by race on November 1, 2008	
Table 10. Number of ToCI female staff by race on November 1, 2008	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INMATE DATA.....	19
Table 11. Number of inmates at ToCI with breakdown by race on November 2008	
Table 12. Security level of inmates at ToCI with breakdown of number and percent, November 2008	
Inmate Deaths.....	20
Table 13. The number of inmate suicides in 2008 by institution	
Suicide Attempts	
Table 14. Inmate suicide attempts from January 1, 2008 through September 30, 2008 by institution	21
Mental Health Caseload.....	22
Table 15. Mental health caseload by institution with number and percent with Serious Mental Illness as of August 31, 2008	
Table 16. Inmate population by institution and percentage of population on mental health caseload as of August 31, 2008.....	23
Security Threat Groups: Gangs.....,	24
Table 17. Number of Toledo Correctional Institution inmates profiled as a security threat group member with breakdown by participation level, number and percent.....	25
Table 18. Number and percentage of profiled security threat group inmates by Institution	
Assault Data.....	26
Use of Force	
Table 19. Use of force incidents from June to November 2008 with breakdown by race and monthly average	
Investigator Data.....	27
Table 20. Toledo Correctional Institution Investigations for October 2008, with category and case status	
Inmate Grievance Procedure.....	28
Table 21. TOCI grievances by subject in November 2008 with number granted and denied	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CIIC CONTACTS AND CONCERNS.....	29
Table 22. Number of contacts received by CIIC regarding the prisons with breakdown by institution from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008	
Table 23. Number of reported concerns received by CIIC regarding the prisons with breakdown by institution from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008.....	31
Table 24. Number of reported concerns received by CIIC regarding the prisons from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008 by category of concern.....	32
Table 25. Number of reported concerns received by CIIC from 96 contacts regarding Toledo Correctional Institution from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008 by category of concern.....	33
THE INSPECTION.....	34
Entry/Exit Building	
Art	
Initial meeting	
DVD Suicide Prevention Security Rounds.....	35
Food Services	
Meal Period.....	36
A Block.....	39
A One East	
B Block.....	40
B One North	
B One and Two South – Protective Control Unit.....	41
Table 26. Breakdown by security level of inmates in protective control at Toledo Correctional Institution as of November 24, 2008	
C Block.....	42
C One West.....	43
C One South	
C One East	
C Three West.....	44
D Block	
D One East	
D One North.....	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
D Three and Four – Segregation.....	45
Medical Department.....	48
Library.....	49
Exit Meeting	
INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES.....	50
ADULT EXPECTATIONS	
Questions and Responses to Expectations.....	52
ENVIRONMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS	
Residential Units	
Clothing and Possessions.....	54
Hygiene.....	55
Staff-Prisoner Relationships	
DUTY OF CARE.....	57
Bullying and Violence Reduction.....	60
Self-Harm and Suicide.....	63
ACTIVITIES.....	66
Learning Skills and Work Activities	
Library.....	69
GOOD ORDER.....	70
Security and Rules	
Rules.....	71
SERVICES	
Food Services	
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO CORRECTIONAL FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
Infrastructure	
Alternatives to Incarceration.....	77
Institutional Programming.....	79
Reentry Programming.....	81

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

INSPECTION PROFILE

Date of Inspection:	November 24, 2008
Type of Inspection:	Unannounced
CIIC Member and Staff in attendance:	Representative Matt Huffman Shirley Pope, CIIC Director Toni Del Matto, Inspector Darin Furderer, Inspector
Facility Staff Present:	Robert Welch, Warden Susan Brown, Deputy Warden Meredith Rinna, Warden's Assistant

Areas and Activities included during the Inspection:

Entry Building	Library
Protective Control Unit	Segregation Unit
Inmate Dining Facility	Infirmary
Housing Units A, B, C, D	Meeting with Medical/Mental Health Staff
Viewing of Suicide Prevention Video	

INSPECTION SUMMARY

The CIIC Director provides a brief, immediate summary of each prison inspection to the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) Assistant Director on the day following each inspection. Excerpts are provided below from the November 25, 2008 communication regarding the inspection of the Toledo Correctional Institution.

- *TOCI staff relayed that the institution was "inspection ready," and the facility certainly was.*
- *The entire facility was clean, including the segregation unit and safe cells.*
- *CIIC watched a new suicide prevention video made by TOCI staff for security staff arriving on duty at their post.*
- *The entrance area was quite impressive, not only in cleanliness and orderliness, but the staff were most kind and professional. The environment throughout the institution, including housing units and dining room, was mutually respectful yet relaxed.*

- *There was significant communication from the inmates, and it was predominantly positive. Certainly, the inmates who have been to other prisons truly appreciate TOCI.*
- *Inmates in the Protective Control (PC) unit expressed appreciation for their placement and safety. Their morale was good, which was attributed to the staff.*
- *Numerous inmates in general population who have been at other prisons, expressed that TOCI is “the best” in the system. The most positive aspect of TOCI in their eyes is that it is single celled. Inmates stressed how important it is that they can go to their cell, close the door, and just be alone when they need to get away from other inmates.*
- *Inmates spoke very highly of their new Warden. The positive relationship between administrative staff and the inmates was evident.*
- *Observations and discussion with security staff was impressive, beginning with the Major who happened to be at the entrance on arrival, and went out of his way to help a new officer on duty with the CIIC processing and entry.*
- *Staff relayed that TOCI now has an officer who is running a program. With the unfortunate reduction in unit staff, increasing involvement of officers in programming is regarded as an excellent way to keep programs running.*
- *Officers and their supervisors in segregation and elsewhere were extraordinary in their relaxed, respectful demeanor, which seemed to set the tone for the overall environment in the institution.*
- *Segregation staff discussed their lack of use of four way restraints, and demonstrated a working knowledgeable of the policy and administrative rules on the subject. They noted that a pilot program is being planned in which segregation officers will carry mace. Staff relayed that they are receiving training from Lebanon Correctional Institution.*

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Attendance at a General Meal Period

Per statutory requirement, each inspection must include attendance at a general meal period. On the date of the inspection, the *lunch meal period was attended, consisting of one hamburger patty, two slices of bread, cottage potatoes, peas and carrots, and fruit cocktail.* Additional information about the meal and concerns heard from inmates is described in more detail later in the report.

Attendance at an Educational or Rehabilitative Program

The statute also requires each inspection to include attendance at an educational or rehabilitative program. The inspection of the Protective Control Unit included the *Community Service Project room.* The area of segregation used for inmates assigned to the *Mandatory Substance Abuse Program* was included in the inspection. Information is provided below on the wide variety of programming available at Toledo Correctional Institution.

INMATE PROGRAMS

Numerous programs at the Toledo Correctional Institution are available to the inmates. Staff members teach the programs, and outside agencies are involved with some of the inmate programming. Based on the information provided, the programs are as follows:

Reasoning and Rehabilitation

This 30-week, cognitive skills based course, covers problem solving, values, reasoning, social skills, management of emotions, assessing consequences, assertive expression, negotiation skills, creative thinking, critical reasoning, and skills in review. These skills are delivered through techniques by staff and inmates role-playing and simulations, use of pictorial and video presentation, cognitive exercises and games aimed at examining particular issues.

The RIDGE Project

This is a faith-based non-profit organization that offers a marriage and family-strengthening project developed specifically to address the unique obstacles families face when one partner is incarcerated for more than six months. The program works with both parents not only to ensure healthy marriages and strong families, but also to ensure successful reentry of the inmate, stop incarceration within family of inmates, reduce recidivism for ex-offenders, and reduce negative behaviors among children of inmates.

Operation Re-Seed Fatherhood

This program addresses real life issues and offers understanding to a variety of situations affecting men, including child rearing, family history, values and beliefs, the role of the father in parenting, mental health, disciplining and nurturing children, violence and the family and substance abuse.

Understanding Your Crime

The program is designed to help perpetrators of crime develop insight and awareness and accept responsibility for the crimes for which they have been convicted. The program also promotes offender accountability and making restitution to society.

Cage Your Rage and Beyond Anger

These programs serve as an inmate's guide to anger control, by learning ways of managing anger and identifying the consequences of mismanaged anger.

Key Initiative Focus

This re-entry program is designed to assist Lucas County offenders in their transition back into the community. Agencies such as Family Council, APA, FOCUS, Legal Aid of NOW, TASC, TOCI, Urbane Knights, United

Way, EOPA, University of Toledo, and Fresh Attitudes work together to develop ways of assisting offenders to be successful upon release. EOPA meets with offenders who have been accepted into the program prior to their release and provides an orientation to explain what services they can receive or what type of assistance is available to them. Appointments are set up for the offender before his release date for such services as Employment, Family Matters, Housing, Drug Treatment, Job Training, Legal Services, Mental Health, Mentoring, and other necessary social services.

Family Stabilization Project

This program is designed to help inmates and their families learn to work together to make the re-entry process successful for the offender, their significant others, and their children. The program, offered through Lucas County T.A.S.C. follows the offender and their families to provide services even after release.

Safe People

This is a faith-based program that deals with pro-social choices. It challenges the inmate to explore alternative coping skills, especially in the area of maintaining friendships.

Criminal Thinking Errors

This 12-week program focuses on helping the inmate identify and begin to correct criminal thinking. The program places emphasis on negative attitudes and beliefs that contribute to offending behavior.

Criminality and Substance Abuse

Open to inmates in protective control, this program is a cognitive based program. Inmates learn to identify their own criminal thoughts and beliefs. They also gain an understanding of the relationship between their criminality and substance abuse.

Responsible Family Life Skills

This parenting program helps inmates to develop insight and understanding of their responsibilities as a parent.

Managing Money

This program is for inmates in need of assistance to develop income budgeting skills and to provide for day-to-day living. It enables participants to maintain a checking account, including writing checks and keeping a correct balance of their checking register. The program also addresses opening and maintaining a savings register, and prepares them for unexpected expenses.

Taking Charge

This semi-confidential cognitive behavioral-based course involves reading, writing, honesty, and self-exploration. The course is designed primarily for offenders to assist them in re-evaluating and rehabilitating their lives.

Goals and Aspirations

This is an eight-week program that focuses on budgeting, problem solving, and obtaining and achieving goals. This program focuses on keeping a job, and the holistic man.

Self Expression Poetry

An ongoing program, Self Expression through poetry is a program designed to give the men the proper forum to learn how to express themselves and gain the ability to effectively communicate.

Stress Management I

This program focuses on understanding the positive and negative aspects of stress and management tools, including: nutrition, exercise, relaxation, meditation, rational emotive therapy, and self-responsibility.

Stress Management II

This open program is for those who have completed Stress Management I. Focus is specifically on using the tool of mediation in order to identify basic goodness and one's responsibility for managing his or her own thoughts and feelings. Focus is on self-control and mastery through practice.

Beyond Anger

This advanced training is only for those who have completed Cage Your Rage. Focus is specifically on using the tool of forgiveness in order to free one's self from past injuries and losses from others.

Voluntary Drug Education

This education group focuses on how drugs affect the human body and mind.

Victim Awareness

The victim awareness program focuses on the effect various crimes have on victims. The class uses written exercises and victim impact panels to bring the offender face-to-face with not just a crime, but a person directly affected by the crime. The class does not focus on the victimization of the offender, but instead, on persons victimized by crimes committed by the offender. Facilitators of the program are required to attend one-week of Victim Awareness Training offered by the Office of Victim Services.

Toastmasters International

As a branch of the Toastmasters International Club, this program is aimed at building one's communication and presentations skills. Members learn by speaking to groups and working with others in a supportive environment.

Institutional Housekeeping

This basic skill-building program improves one's daily living habits within the institution.

Dual Diagnosis

This program addresses a co-existing mental health and substance abuse diagnosis. The ten-week program is co-facilitated by mental health and recovery services.

Sleep Management

This six-week educational program teaches improved sleep hygiene habits.

Current Events

This weekly program consists of ongoing discussion of current events, including city, nationwide, or worldwide.

Aunt Mary's Story Book

This ongoing program maintains and promotes family by helping inmates to bond with their children in the community by reading children's books to them on tape and sending both tape and book to their children.

Inside Out

In this 12-week program, inmates learn to take responsibility for the relationships in their lives.

Arts and Crafts

This program provides inmates with time, space, and opportunity to develop and broaden their interest and skills in art. They learn craft building and other forms of artistic creativity.

Music Appreciation

This program provides inmates with time, space, and materials to develop and broaden their interest and skills in music. There are three components to the program: music theory, instrument lessons, and a chance to perform as a band member or a rapper in front of an audience.

Choices Group

This is a moral reasoning development group for offenders. It increases awareness of the reasoning process and improves the self-concept of the group members.

Assistance Dogs of America

Puppies are received by Assistance Dogs of America, Inc. and inmates train the puppies to become assistance dogs for the disabled.

Re-Entry/Community Resources

This class is conducted monthly, and is designed to make inmates aware of the resources in their communities upon release.

Health and Wellness

Medical staff provide educational services to the inmates regarding health related issues. (i.e. HIV, Hepatitis B, hygiene, dental care, etc.)

Recovery Services

This department provides individual treatment, group therapy, motivational sessions, intensive outpatient programming, 12-step meetings, mandatory substance abuse programming, and relapse prevention services.

Mental Health Services

This department provides individual and group therapy, psychiatric evaluations, and crisis intervention services. It also facilitates groups such as anger management, stress management, medication management, 50 and over groups, and social skills development.

Religious Services

This department provides Sabbath services and religious studies for Catholic, Jehovah Witness, Jewish, and Protestant faiths. The department also facilitates Gaining Recovery at Christ's Expense Program to address issues of self-control, addictive behaviors, moral development, and personal choices. Various special activities and events are also held throughout the year.

EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Education Department currently offers *High School Equivalency (GED) basic literacy Adult Basic Education (ABE), Pre-GED courses, as well as classes through Owens Community College.*

The inmate handbook states that the Toledo Correctional Institution education staff are *committed to provide the fullest possible development of each inmate's talents and potential.* It further states that Toledo Correctional Institution makes *every effort to allow inmates to participate in meaningful educational activities that meet educational needs.* The Education Department operates on an *open enrollment system in which an inmate may enter an education program at any time during the quarter.* College course work is also available for inmates that meet the eligibility requirements. A *computer lab* is accessible to all students through education department staff.

According to the inmate handbook, the institution currently offers *vocational programs in Administrative Office Technology and Electronics/Computer Repair.* These programs are available to both inmates at the camp and main institution. Both programs are taught in *five-week modules that teach various computer skills to inmates who are one year or less away from their release.*

The inmate handbook relays that *apprenticeship programs* are available to inmates in approved areas of the institution. *Approved apprenticeships include maintenance and food service, as well as the following: Cook, Baker, HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning), Electrical, Electronics Technician, and Plumber.*

Enrollment and Waiting Lists

The Ohio Central School System Monthly Enrollment Report for the Toledo Correctional Institution was reviewed. This report provides information on the number of inmates enrolled in educational programs, the number of inmates on a waiting list for a specific program, number of certificates given, number of GED tests passed for the month, number of GED tests given, and additional information.

In regard to the Toledo Correctional Institution, for the month of November 2008, there were *218 inmates active with an educational program and 815 inmates on a waiting list to be involved with an educational program.* Of the 218 inmates active in a program for the month of November, *91 inmates were in academic programs, 31 inmates were in vocational programs, 15 inmates were in an apprenticeship, 26 inmates were in career enhancement, 30 inmates were in advanced job training, five inmates were in special education, and 20 inmates were in Title One.*

In November 2008, there were 815 inmates on the waiting list including 561 waiting for career enhancement programs. There were 170 waiting for academic programs, and 84 on the waiting list for vocational programs.

From January 2008 to November 2008, a total of 11 GED tests were passed and seven GEDs were awarded. Also in this time period, 33 academic certificates and 70 career enhancement certificates were awarded.

Table 1. Number of Toledo Correctional Institution inmates enrolled in an educational or vocational program with breakdown by category in November 2008

Type of Educational/Vocational Program	Number Enrolled in November 2008
Academic	91
Vocational	31
Advanced Job Training	30
Career Enhancement	26
Title One	20
Apprenticeship	15
Special Education	5
TOTAL	218

Table 2. Number of Toledo Correctional Institution inmates on educational or vocational program waiting list with breakdown by category for November 2008

Type of Educational/Vocational Program	Number on Waiting List
Career Enhancement	561
Academic	170
Vocational	84
Apprenticeship	0
Advanced Job Training	0
Special Education	0
Title One	0
TOTAL	815

COMMUNITY SERVICE

The inmate handbook states that all inmates must attend a *four-hour Community Awareness Workshop* prior to their performance of community service work. This workshop is designed to *introduce the concepts of victim reparation through volunteer service and the impact volunteer service has on the community, DRC, and themselves*. Also included within the workshop are the steps that each individual can take to use skills they have learned in reentering the community.

Community service work by inmates often benefits 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organizations, such as government agencies, schools, churches, and charitable and non-profit organizations. When possible, an inmate's skill is properly matched with a community service assignment. *A select few level one (minimum security) inmates, housed at the camp, are able to take part in outside community service projects. Those not among the select level one (minimum) security inmates, take part in inside community service projects that are performed on the grounds of the institution.*

The DRC community service monthly report of all the institutions for October 2008, shows that there were 23 inmates at the Toledo Correctional Institution involved in community service projects. Of the 23 inmates, 14 were White (60.9%), seven were Black (30.4%), and two were categorized as Other.

In the month of October 2008, the inmates involved completed 4,190 hours of community service. It is also reported that 250 of the monthly community service hours benefited churches, and 3,940 hours benefited the community.

From January to October 2008, 48,445 total hours of community service were documented. Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 29th out of the 32 DRC institutions in regard to year-to-date community service hours completed. All 32 institutions combined from January to October 2008 completed 4,641,775 community service hours.

The institution is or has done community service projects for the following agencies:

Inside Projects

- Assistance Dogs of America
- City of Toledo
- Columbus Sleeping Bags/Back Packs
- Happy Hats for Kids
- KAIROS Outside
- Leverette Junior High School
- Nathan Hale Elementary School
- Sherman Elementary School
- Sofia Quintero Cultural Center
- St. Charles School
- United Way of Greater Toledo
- Victory Christian Church
- WGTE-TV, Channel 30

Outside Projects

- City of Toledo Highway Project
- Collingwood United Methodist Church
- St. James "the Armory" Church
- The Ohio Theatre

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Warden provided requested information to supplement the observations and interviews during the inspection of the institution. Information was also extracted from the manual prepared for American Correctional Association (ACA) audit members, the Employee Handbook and Reference Manual, the Inmate Handbook provided to new inmates, and a variety of prepared documents related to the areas included in the inspection.

Overview

As noted in the information provided, the Toledo Correctional Institution is an all male, level three (close security) facility, with a level one (minimum security) camp. The institution is located near the northeast corner of downtown Toledo, Ohio. The institution ground covers approximately 45 acres and contains five buildings, which include the Camp facility, a Front Entry Building, an Administrative Building, and the Main Institution. A Warehouse/Garage Building is located outside of the secure perimeter.

The minimum camp has two dorms for inmate housing, while the main facility offers four housing blocks (A, B, C, and D), all single cells. D Block contains a segregation unit, while B Block contains a Protective Control unit. Inmates have access to 6,900 feet of indoor recreation, as well as an outside recreation yard. Inmates also have opportunities for various programs and activities including music programs, arts and crafts, religious programs, mental health services, educational and vocational programs, substance abuse programs, release preparation, and many other programs to help prepare them to be successful members of the community.

Staff explained that ToCI's minimum camp focuses on community service as opposed to the typical DRC farm work oriented minimum camps. They commented that there is not enough acreage for farmland because of the institution's urban location.

Mission

The Toledo Correctional Institution's mission statement is as follows:

The Toledo Correctional Institution protects Ohio citizens by effective supervision of adult offenders in safe, humane, and appropriately secure environments. In cooperation with communities, the institution promotes citizen safety, victim reparation, restorative justice, and community service. Through rehabilitative programming, the institution seeks to instill in offenders an improved sense of responsibility to become law-abiding members of society.

Budget

According to the DRC website, the current estimated budget is \$27,581,178, with a daily cost per inmate of \$74.96. The cost per inmate annually is estimated to be \$27,360. As cited in the 2005 CIIC inspection report on Toledo Correctional Institution, the estimated budget in 2005 was \$25,975,205, with a daily cost per inmate of \$84.50. *While the TOCI budget has increased approximately \$1.6 million since 2005, the cost per inmate has reduced approximately \$9.54 per day, or \$3,482 annually per inmate. In follow-up communication with the Toledo Correctional Institution Business Administrator, it was clarified that the increase was likely due to the opening of C-Block in 2006, which required additional staffing and presumably increased their population and inmate-driven expenses such as food, clothing, etc.*

Table 3. ToCI budget comparison from 2005 to 2008

2008 Budget	\$27,581,178
2005 Budget	25,975,205
Amount Increased	+ \$1,605,9763

Table 4. Daily cost per inmate comparison from 2005 to 2008

2005 Daily Cost per inmate	\$84.50
2008 Daily Cost per inmate	74.96
Amount Decreased	- \$9.54

Table 5. Annual cost per inmate comparison from 2005 to 2008

2005 Annual Cost per inmate	\$30,842.50
2008 Annual Cost per inmate	27,360.40
Amount Decreased	- \$3,482.10

EMPLOYEE DATA

According to the Toledo Correctional Institution Monthly Fact Sheet, there are currently 346 staff at the institution, which includes 230 male staff (66.5%) and 116 female staff (33.5%). Of the 346 employees of the institution, 253 are security staff (73.1%). Of the 253 security staff, 178 are male (70.3%) and 75 are female (29.6%).

The 230 total male staff includes 162 Caucasians (70.4%), 55 African Americans (23.9%), and 13 of another race (5.6%). The 116 total female staff includes 64 Caucasians (44.8%), 43 African Americans (37.1%), and nine of another race (7.8%).

Of the 178 total male security staff, there are 132 Caucasians (74.2%), 36 African Americans (20.2%), and 10 others (5.6%). Of the 75 total female security staff, there are 39 Caucasians (52%), 32 African Americans (42.7%), and four others (5.3%).

According to the institution's vacancy report, as of November 8, 2008, there were 25 vacant positions, of which 16 were Correctional Officers. Other vacancies included Deputy Warden of Operations, two Account Clerks, two Maintenance positions, one Correctional Program Coordinator, one Recreation Supervisor, and one Secretary. Staff indicated that the Recreation Supervisor position is missed the most.

Table 6. Number of TOCI staff with breakdown by gender on November 1, 2008

Employee Gender	Number	Percent
Male	230	66.5%
Female	116	33.5
Total	346	100%

Table 7. Number of TOCI staff with breakdown by race on November 1, 2008

Employee Race	Number	Percent
Caucasian	226	65.3%
African American	98	28.3
Other	22	6.4
Total	346	100%

Table 8. Number of TOCI staff with breakdown of gender and race on November 1, 2008.

Gender	Caucasian	African American	Other	Total	Percent by Gender
Males	162	55	13	230	66.5%
Females	64	43	9	116	33.5
Total	226	98	22	346	100%
Percent by Race	65.3%	28.3%	6.4%		100%

Table 9. Number of TOCI male staff by race on November 1, 2008.

Race	Number	Percent
Caucasian	162	70%
African American	55	24
Other	13	6
Subtotal	230 Males	100%
346 Total Staff	230 Males	66%

Table 10. Number of TOCI female staff by race on November 1, 2008.

Race	Number	Percent
Caucasian	64	55%
African American	43	37
Other	9	8
Subtotal	116 Females	100%
346 Total Staff	116 Females	34%

INMATE DATA

According to the DRC website, the inmate population at TOCI as of November 2008, was 1,078. *Of the 1,078 inmates, 579 were African American (54 percent), 486 were Caucasian (45 percent), and 13 were considered other (one percent).* With the rated capacity of 1,192, the institution was *90.4 percent capacity. The population as of January 8, 2009 is 1,088, comprising 91.3 percent of its capacity.*

Table 11. Number of inmates at TOCI with breakdown by race, November 2008

Race	Number of Inmates	Percent
African American	579	53.7%
Caucasian	486	45.0
Other	13	1.2
Total	1,078	100%

According to the DRC website, out of a total of *1,060 inmates at the Toledo Correctional Institution, 869 were classified as level three (close security), comprising 82 percent of the population. They also had 185 inmates classified as level one (minimum security), comprising 17.5 percent of the population.* They only had four inmates classified as level four (maximum), and only two classified as level two (medium). It is unclear why the total population is reported to be 1,078, but the security level is only provided for 1,060 inmates.

In checking the same data for January 8, 2009, the population is reported as 1,088 and the security level breakdown totals the inmate population, showing *891 level three (close) inmates (81.9%), 180 level one (minimum) inmates (16.5%), 10 level two (medium) inmates (.9%), and seven level four (maximum) security inmates (.6%).*

Table 12. Security level of inmates at TOCI with breakdown of number and percent, November 2008

Security Level	Number of Inmates	Percent
Level Three (close)	869	82.0%
Level One (minimum)	185	17.5
Level Four (maximum)	4	0.4
Level Two (medium)	2	0.2
Total	1,060	100%

According to data provided during the inspection, the *age range of the population at TOCI is 18 to 78 years of age.*

Inmate Deaths

According to the special incident reports on inmate deaths, there were *three inmate deaths at TOCI from January 1, 2008 to the date of the inspection. Two of the inmates died of natural causes.*

One death was a suicide. In regard to the suicide, on November 3, 2008, an officer was conducting morning count in the officer's assigned general population unit. An inmate was observed sitting on the floor by his bed with a sheet tied around the shelf above him with a laundry bag rope around his neck. A medical alert was called, and CPR was administered on transport to meet the ambulance. A suicide note was later found in his cell. The inmate was on the mental health caseload and classified as C1 with a diagnosis of Serious Mental Illness. The inmate had no history of any past suicide attempts. He had been incarcerated since September 1999, serving an eight-year definite sentence and a ten-year to life indefinite sentence.

Following the suicide, *TOCI staff initiated the project of creating a training video for their officers, which reminds them how to properly check on each inmate when the Officer first arrives at their post. On one level, the video was about security duties, but the officer in the video also communicated verbal skills and a positive attitude in his interaction with the inmates. Such mannerisms on the part of an Officer can also serve to prevent suicides by increasing the likelihood that the inmate may share his suicidal thoughts with the Officer, enabling mental health staff to be alerted to the need for their services.* More information about the video can be found later in the report.

System-wide, in 2007, **eleven** inmates committed suicide. **Six** suicides occurred in 2008 as follows:

Table 13. The number of inmate suicides in 2008 by institution

Institution	Suicides
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1
Noble Correctional Institution	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1
Total	6

Suicide Attempts

System-wide in 2007, there were 127 suicide attempts, including five at Toledo Correctional Institution. System-wide in all 12 months of 2008, there were 101 suicide attempts, including two at the Toledo Correctional Institution. The number of suicide attempts from January 1, 2008 to September 30, 2008 system-wide are provided by institution.

**Table 14. Inmate suicide aempts from January 1, 2008 through September 30, 2008
by institution**

Institution	Suicide Attempts
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	12
Ohio Reformatory for Women	10
Allen Correctional Institution	7
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	7
Correctional Reception Center	6
Ross Correctional Institution	6
Madison Correctional Institution	5
Mansfield Correctional Institution	5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	4
Warren Correctional Institution	4
Belmont Correctional Institution	3
Marion Correctional Institution	3
Grafton Correctional Institution	2
Toledo Correctional Institution	2
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1
Lebanon Correctional Institution	1
North Central Correctional Institution	1
Noble Correctional Institution	1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1
Corrections Medical Center	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0
Franklin Pre-Release Center	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0
London Correctional Institution	0
Lorain Correctional Institution	0
Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0
Northeast Pre-Release Center	0
Richland Correctional Institution	0
Total	84

Mental Health Caseload

At the end of August 2008, a total of 9,475 inmates were on the mental health caseload, including 4,369 diagnosed with Serious Mental Illness. *There were 221 inmates at the Toledo Correctional Institution on the mental health caseload, with 63 inmates diagnosed as Seriously Mentally Ill, comprising 29 percent of their caseload.*

Table 15. Mental health caseload by institution with number and percent with Serious Mental Illness as of August 31, 2008

Institution	Institutional Total MH Caseload	C1 (Seriously Mentally Ill)	Percent of MH Caseload as Seriously Mentally Ill
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1,037	477	46 %
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	667	382	57
Mansfield Correctional Institution	495	192	39
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	450	251	56
Belmont Correctional Institution	431	254	59
Lebanon Correctional Institution	411	192	47
North Central Correctional Institution	402	83	21
Noble Correctional Institution	389	237	61
Pickaway Correctional Institution	362	166	46
Ross Correctional Institution	356	93	26
London Correctional Institution	348	139	40
Marion Correctional Institution	344	170	49
Trumbull Correctional Institution	343	93	27
Richland Correctional Institution	333	87	26
Madison Correctional Institution	319	148	46
Allen Correctional Institution	310	172	55
Southeastern Correctional Institution	283	146	52
Northeast Pre-Release Center	272	159	58
Correctional Reception Center	270	158	59
Grafton Correctional Institution	270	182	67
Warren Correctional Institution	244	165	67
Toledo Correctional Institution	221	63	29
Franklin Pre-Release Center	213	89	42
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	182	85	47
Lorain Correctional Institution	144	46	32
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	130	18	14
Hocking Correctional Facility	102	37	36
Oakwood Correctional Facility	79	65	82
Ohio State Penitentiary	40	4	10
Corrections Medical Center	28	16	57
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0	0
Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center	0	0	0
TOTAL	9,475	4,369	46 %

Table 16. Inmate population by institution and percentage of population on the mental health caseload as of August 31, 2008

Institution	Institutional Inmate Population	Percent of Institutional Population on MH Caseload
Oakwood Correctional Facility	139	57%
Northeast Pre-Release Center	582	47
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2322	45
Franklin Pre-Release Center	509	42
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1459	31
Trumbull Correctional Institution	1349	25
Allen Correctional Institution	1246	25
Corrections Medical Center	117	24
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2893	23
Hocking Correctional Facility	476	21
Mansfield Correctional Institution	2452	20
Toledo Correctional Institution	1091	20
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	668	19
North Central Correctional Institution	2250	18
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1557	18
Grafton Correctional Institution	1509	18
Warren Correctional Institution	1378	18
Noble Correctional Institution	2405	16
Belmont Correctional Institution	2774	16
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2579	16
Pickaway Correctional Institution	2404	15
Marion Correctional Institution	2241	15
Correctional Reception Center	1750	15
London Correctional Institution	2535	14
Ross Correctional Institution	2,524	14
Madison Correctional Institution	2240	14
Richland Correctional Institution	2525	13
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	1487	12
Lorain Correctional Institution	1754	8
Ohio State Penitentiary	539	7
Dayton Correctional Facility	462	0
Montgomery Pre-Release Center	342	0
TOTAL	50,538	19%

Security Threat Groups (Gangs)

As of November 24, 2008, there were 290 inmates at Toledo Correctional Institution out of the population total of 1,089, who were profiled as a member of a security threat group, comprising 27 percent of the population.

Of the 32 correctional institutions in Ohio, Toledo ranks third for the highest percent (27 percent) of its population being classified as a member of an STG. Southern Ohio Correctional Facility ranks first, with 40 percent of its population classified as a member of an STG. Mansfield Correctional Institution ranks second, with 28 percent of its population profiled as STG members. The statewide average of profiled STG members for all 32 prisons is 15 percent. Toledo is currently 12 percent above the statewide average.

Members of 93 different security threat groups have been identified at ToCI. The ten threat groups with the largest number of members at TOCI are:

- *Aryan Brotherhood*
- *Folk/Gangster Disciple*
- *White Supremacist*
- *Crip/Gear Gangster*
- *Bloods*
- *Crip*
- *People/Latin Kings*
- *Bloods/Piru*
- *Folks*
- *Five Percenter*

Total members per group range from six to 33. When an inmate has been identified as an STG member, he is assigned a participation level ranging from one through three. All inmates who have been profiled that come into the system are automatically assigned to level one or passive. The level system is reportedly behavior based. Level two or active indicates that the inmate engages in STG activity. Level three or disruptive reportedly indicates that an inmate has hurt other inmates and/or staff. Of the 290 STG profiled inmates at TOCI, 288 have been assigned a STG participation level. As of November 24, 2008, 240 inmates were level one (passive), 13 inmates were level two (active), and 35 inmates were level three (disruptive).

Table 17. Number of Toledo Correctional Institution inmates profiled as a security threat group member with breakdown by participation level, number, and percent

STG Participation Level	Number	Percent
Level One Participation (passive)	240	83%
Level Two Participation (active)	13	5
Level Three Participation (disruptive)	35	12
TOTAL	288	100%

Table 18. Number and percentage of profiled security threat group inmates by institution

Institution	Total Population	STG Profiled Inmates	Percentage of Population STG Profiled
S. Ohio CF	1,442	583	40%
Mansfield CI	2,461	678	28
Toledo CI	1,089	290	27
Warren CI	1,374	322	23
Trumbull CI	1,357	303	22
Lebanon CI	2,663	531	20
Grafton CI	1,514	306	20
Richland CI	2,555	482	19
Ohio State Pen.	544	105	19
Belmont CI	2,776	497	18
Ross CI	2,613	480	18
Lake Erie CI	1,503	268	18
Noble CI	2,510	437	17
North Central CI	2,351	394	17
Allen CI	1,290	214	17
Marion CI	2,272	313	14
Pickaway CI	2,481	315	13
Corr. Rec. Cent	1,937	222	11
Chillicothe CI	2,931	294	10
Southeastern CI	1,682	175	10
Oakwood CI	134	14	10
London CI	2,559	239	9
Madison CI	2,251	212	9
Dayton CI	487	46	9
N.Coast Corr TF	657	54	8
Lorain CI	2,159	149	7
Hocking CF	490	8	2
Corr. Med. Cen.	131	2	2
Mont.Educ.PRC	324	8	2
O.R..for Women	2,529	28	1
NE Pre-R.Center	582	4	1
Franklin PRC	492	5	1
TOTAL	52,140	7,978	15%

Assault Data

From January 1, 2008 to November 24, 2008, there were 14 inmate- on- inmate assaults at the Toledo Correctional Institution. Twelve of the inmate-on-inmate assaults were described as physical assault. The remaining two assaults were categorized as harassment assaults.

A total of 21 inmate on staff assaults occurred during this period, with 11 physical assaults, and 10 harassment assaults.

Use of Force

The Report of Racial Breakdown and Use of Force provides the number of use of force incidents by staff with the racial breakdown of the inmates who were subjected to force. *In November 2008, there were 18 use of force incidents. Of that number, 13 of the incidents involved Black inmates (72.2%), and five involved White inmates (27.8%). Of the 18 incidents, 10 were assigned to the Use of Force Committee to be investigated. The remaining eight incidents were not referred to the Use of Force Investigating Committee.*

From June 2008 to November 2008, ToCI averaged 16 use of force incidents per month. In that six-month span, there was an average of 13 Black inmates per month (81.3%) subjected to force, while there was an average of three White inmates per month (18.8%) involved in use of force incidents. There was one incident between June 2008 to November 2008 that involved an inmate described as "other".

Table 19. Use of force incidents from June to November 2008 with breakdown by race and monthly Average

Inmate Race	June 2008	July 2008	August 2008	September 2008	October 2008	November 2008	Total	Monthly Use of Force Average
White Inmates	16	15	11	7	15	13	77	13
Black Inmates	2	5	3	3	2	5	20	3
Other Inmates				1			1	.05
TOTAL	18	20	14	11	17	18	98	16

During the inspection of Toledo Correctional Institution, staff relayed that officers do not currently carry mace. However, there is a pilot program for officers assigned to the segregation unit who are receiving training from the Lebanon Correctional Institution. Historically within DRC prisons, only security supervisors in the institutions carried mace. In response to an inquiry made to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility regarding a pattern of complaints alleging use of mace for pure harassment, it was

reported that it is now up to each Warden to choose whether or not their officers may carry mace.

Not only have the previous restrictions on access to chemical agents been removed by DRC, but the administrative rule on use of force removed reference to mace/chemical agent. Some institutional staff have interpreted this to mean that mace/chemical agent is no longer even considered use of force, thus not required to be reported or investigated. However, on October 22, 2008, DRC central office security staff relayed that use of chemical agent remains a use of force, must be reported, and the inmate must be seen by medical staff. Extremely serious problems could be emerging in practices due to the absence of guidelines in Administrative Rule or Policy specifically on the use of chemical agents. In CIIC history, one inmate death was attributed to his reaction to the chemical agent related to his documented prior medical condition.

Investigator Data

According to data on the Toledo Correctional Institution Investigator's monthly caseload, during October 2008, *23 new cases were initiated, and nine cases carried over from the previous month(s). Of the 32 active cases, 25 were completed in the month of October, and seven cases were still pending. The cases handled by the Investigator included drugs, assault, and staff misconduct. There were no cases of inmate on inmate sexual assault initiated at the start of the month or carried over into the month of November. Additionally, the Investigator completed 35 background checks in October.*

Three cases were considered major contraband confiscations, which included marijuana and homebrew. The two marijuana cases involved just under one and two grams of marijuana, and were turned over to the Ohio State Highway Patrol. The 10 ounces of homebrew were confiscated and destroyed.

Table 20. Toledo Correctional Institution investigations for October 2008 with category and case status

Investigations	Cases Active at Month's Beginning	Cases Initiated During the Month	Case Closed During Month	Cases Active at Month's End
Positive Urinalysis	0	8	8	0
Drugs – Other	0	6	4	2
Staff Misconduct	5	3	6	2
Other – Self-Mutilation	1	1	2	0
Drugs – Staff/Inmate	1	0	0	1
Drugs – Inmate/Visitor	1	0	0	1
Staff/Inmate Relationship	1	1	1	1
Assault – Inmate on Staff	0	1	1	0
Assault – Inmate on Inmate	0	1	1	0
Other – Extortion	0	1	1	0
Other – Homebrew	0	1	1	0
Drugs – Mail/Packages	0	0	0	0
Drugs – Staff	0	0	0	0
Sexual Assault – Inmate on Inmate	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	9	23	25	7

Inmate Grievance Procedure

In all of the units checked, informal complaint resolution forms were readily available by asking a unit staff member. Throughout the inspection, inmates did relay concerns about the grievance procedure. Some inmates alleged that they never received responses to their grievances, while others stated the grievance procedure is ineffective. Some of the inmates voiced their belief that retaliation would result from using the grievance procedure.

The Institutional Inspector at each institution assembles a monthly report documenting the number of grievances submitted for investigation. The documentation includes grievances granted, grievances denied, and pending grievances. The subject of each grievance is assigned to an appropriate category pertaining to its contents.

From January 1, 2008 to November 30, 2008, 151 inmates filed 198 grievances with the Inspector of Institutional Services. The largest number of grievances filed by one single inmate was 10.

There were 74 informal complaint resolutions received in November 2008. In November 2008, the Inspector received 13 grievances, and had an additional 17 grievances pending from the previous month(s).

A total of six grievances were completed in November, which included one grievance that was withdrawn at the inmate's request. Of the five grievances that received dispositions, two were granted about personal property that was lost, damaged, or confiscated by staff. Two of the grievance that were denied concerned access/delay in receiving medical care, and one denied grievance was about transfer or denial of institution assignment.

Table 21. Toledo Correctional Institution grievances by subject in November 2008, with number granted and denied

Category of Complaint	Granted	Denied	Total
Health Care – Access/Delay in Receiving Medical care	0	2	2
Personal Property – Lost, Damage, Confiscated by Staff	2	0	2
Institution Assignment – Transfer or Denial	0	1	1
TOTAL	2	3	5

CIIC CONTACTS AND CONCERNS

From January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008, a total of 4,601 contacts were received by CIIC regarding the prisons, mostly in the form of letters. *CIIC received 96 contacts about Toledo Correctional Institution during this period, which ranked 19th in the number of contacts, comprising 2.3 percent of the total contacts received.*

Toledo Correctional Institution ranked last in total number of contacts received compared to all level three institutions. Mansfield Correctional Institution ranked first with 213 contacts, followed by: Warren Correctional Institution with 211 contacts, Ross Correctional Institution with 178 contacts, Lebanon Correctional Institution with 152 contacts, Trumbull Correctional Institution with 116 contacts, and Toledo Correctional Institution with 96 contacts.

The 4,601 contacts system-wide relayed 16,137 concerns to the CIIC. *Toledo Correctional Institution again ranked 19th in number of reported concerns, with 305 concerns relayed by the 96 contacts, comprising 1.8 percent of the total concerns. The top five categories of concerns statewide were:*

- Staff Accountability with 2,483 concerns
- Use of Force/Inappropriate Supervision with 2,083
- Health Care with 1,602
- Inmate Grievance Procedure with 1,341
- Non-Grievable Matters with 1,073

Concerns received about Toledo Correctional Institution were similar to the top statewide categories with:

- 45 concerns about Staff Accountability,
- 42 concerns about the Inmate Grievance Procedure,
- 28 concerns about Use of Force/Inappropriate Supervision, and
- 21 concerns about Non-Grievable Matters.
- 19 concerns each regarding Protective Control and Health Care.

Table 22. Number of contacts received by CIIC regarding the prisons with breakdown by institution from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF CONTACTS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	703
North Central Correctional Institution	230
Marion Correctional Institution	226
Mansfield Correctional Institution	213
Warren Correctional Institution	211
Grafton Correctional Institution	185
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	181
Ross Correctional Institution	178
Allen Correctional Institution	166
Madison Correctional Institution	162
Ohio State Penitentiary	154
Lebanon Correctional Institution	152
London Correctional Institution	143
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	122
Trumbull Correctional Institution	116
Pickaway Correctional Institution	114
Ohio Reformatory for Women	101
Other (Jails/Prisons)	97
Toledo Correctional Institution	96
Richland Correctional Institution	83
Noble Correctional Institution	71
Belmont Correctional Institution	60
Correctional Reception Center	38
Hocking Correctional Facility	38
Lorain Correctional Institution	36
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center	35
Oakwood Correctional Facility	33
Other (Not Categorized)	33
Southeastern Correctional Institution	25
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	20
Corrections Medical Center	16
Franklin Pre Release Center	10
Northeast Pre Release Center	8
Dayton Correctional Institution	3
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	2
TOTAL	4,061

Table 23. Number of reported concerns received by CIIC regarding the prisons with breakdown by institution from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF CONCERNS
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	3,167
North Central Correctional Institution	971
Marion Correctional Institution	924
Warren Correctional Institution	811
Mansfield Correctional Institution	777
Allen Correctional Institution	741
Ross Correctional Institution	703
Grafton Correctional Institution	699
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	653
Ohio State Penitentiary	610
Madison Correctional Institution	570
Trumbull Correctional Institution	592
Lebanon Correctional Institution	559
London Correctional Institution	536
Ohio Reformatory for Women	479
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	434
Pickaway Correctional Institution	430
Noble Correctional Institution	306
Toledo Correctional Institution	305
Other	299
Richland Correctional Institution	254
Belmont Correctional Institution	232
Northeast Ohio Correctional Center	162
Lorain Correctional Institution	159
Correctional Reception Center	150
Oakwood Correctional Facility	140
Hocking Correctional Facility	135
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	92
Southeastern Correctional Institution	80
Corrections Medical Center	78
Franklin Pre Release Center	44
Northeast Pre Release Center	32
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	7
Dayton Correctional Institution	5
TOTAL	16,137

Table 24. Number of reported concerns received by CIIC regarding the prisons from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008 by category of concern

CATEGORY OF CONCERN	NUMBER of CONCERNS
Staff Accountability	2,483
Use of Force/Inappropriate Supervision	2,083
Health Care	1,602
Inmate Grievance Procedure	1,341
Non-Grievable Matters	1,073
Institution Assignment	674
Other	650
Special Management Housing	546
Protective Control	511
Safety and Sanitation	492
Personal Property	467
Food Services	445
Facilities Maintenance	393
Discrimination	301
Housing Assignment	298
Security Classification	297
Mail/Packages	284
Psychological/Psychiatric	276
Inmate Account	237
Commissary	227
Visiting	224
Legal Services	186
Job Assignment	182
Recreation	135
Laundry/Quartermaster	122
Education/Vocational Training	121
Dental Care	95
Recovery Services	90
Records	80
Library	65
Religious Services	60
Telephone	58
Inmate Groups	32
TOTAL	16,137

Table 25. Number of reported concerns received by CIIC from 96 contacts regarding Toledo Correctional Institution from January 1, 2007 to November 25, 2008 by category of concern

CATEGORY OF CONCERN	NUMBER OF REPORTED CONCERNS
Staff Accountability	45
Inmate Grievance Procedure	42
Use of Force/Inappropriate Supervision	28
Non-Grievable Matters	21
Protective Control	19
Health Care	19
Special Management Housing	16
Institution Assignment	15
Personal Property	12
Other	12
Legal Services	9
Education/Vocational Training	7
Inmate Account	7
Mail/Package	7
Visiting	7
Jobs	6
Security Classification	6
Recovery Services	6
Discrimination	5
Commissary	3
Records	3
Housing Assignment	2
Library	2
Telephone	2
Recreation	2
Psychological/Psychiatric	1
Food	1
Dental Care	0
Safety & Sanitation	0
Facilities Maintenance	0
Laundry/Quartermaster	0
Inmate Groups	0
Religious Services	0
Total	305

THE INSPECTION

Entry/Exit Building

CIIC arrived at Toledo Correctional Institution (ToCI) at 10:50 A.M. *The grounds outside of the processing building remain well landscaped.* The entrance to the processing building from the parking lot is equipped with a sally port for secure vehicle access to the main compound. *The processing building appeared extremely clean and well maintained. The building has adequate seating and facilities for visitors. Staff sustained a professional and courteous attitude.*

The visitor screening and processing was thorough. The entry Officer and Major were very pleasant and professional. The metal detector was sensitive enough to pick up shoe reinforcements, yet not so sensitive as to be triggered by an ID badge. In addition to a metal detector, the institution has an x-ray machine to further examine clothing and other items. Per request, the entry Officer notified the Warden of CIIC's arrival. The Warden was attending in-service training, but made time to meet with the CIIC. *The Major of the facility kindly provided escort to the Warden's office.*

Art

Beautiful wall murals decorate many areas of the facility, all painted by inmates. Staff noted that they have an inmate art program, and that their talent is amazing. One inmate in the Protective Control Unit showed the CIIC Director a beautiful, inspirational poem that he and another inmate composed that could be included in a greeting card.

Initial Meeting

The Warden promptly joined the CIIC in his office for a brief initial meeting. He relayed that he recently became the Warden at Toledo Correctional Institution in September 2008, after transferring from the Lebanon Correctional Institution where he was Deputy Warden. The Toledo Correctional Institution's Deputy Warden of Special Services, also was present during the initial meeting. Staff noted that the *Toledo Correctional Institution is always inspection ready.* Their last American Correctional Association (ACA) accreditation audit was in March 2008.

The major challenge for staff at the time was reported to be getting ready for the total smoking ban effective March 1, 2009. In an effort to balance their loss of a major privilege, new privileges are being authorized, such as allowing the inmates to have braided hair during visits, being able to purchase ice cream in the commissary, allowing inmates to play football, and in January 2009, allowing inmates to play musical instruments in their cell.

The meeting with the Warden and administrative staff was brief. A list of requested written information was provided for review after the inspection. Two questionnaires for completion by a variety of staff were provided to the Warden. Response was requested in

10 days to two weeks. An introduction to the surveys and the questions and responses can be found at the end of this report.

DVD Suicide Prevention Security Rounds

Following the Warden's discussion of the suicide prevention video recently made by Toledo Correctional Institution staff for their staff, the opportunity was provided to view the video. *The video visually demonstrated the proper way to perform security checks and rounds at the beginning of the shift, pointing out the differences from a cell shakedown. The officer in the video maintained a professional manner and stressed the importance of frequent security rounds. The video appeared to be a good representation of proactive safety. (See also the section on Suicide)*

Food Services

Upon entering the kitchen area, CIIC and facility staff put on hairnets, a positive indication of attention to sanitation. The Correctional Food Service Manager relayed that there are approximately 125 inmate workers in food service split up into two shifts. It was also relayed that they were only down one food service staff person, but the position has been posted.

The kitchen area was clean, orderly, and organized without exception. The floor was dry and in good condition. The equipment was functional and it appeared that no appliances needed replacement or maintenance. It was relayed by staff that all of the kitchen equipment was in good working order. Inmates in the kitchen area prepared the food in a sanitary fashion, as they wore hairnets and gloves. Several staff members supervised the preparation of food during the meal preparation.

Two food storage areas were entered within the kitchen. The cooler had a separate door to the freezer, which remained locked at the time of the inspection. *The thermometer in the cooler read 52 degrees and was clearly not accurate, as it was plenty cold inside the cooler.* There was also another cooler, which contained milk and bread. *The temperature on the thermometer read 32 degrees Fahrenheit. Both coolers seemed well ventilated. The food was properly organized and stored. The coolers were very clean with an equally clean scent. Staff relayed that inmates manage the stocking of all food.*

The Correctional Food Service Manager was proud of the quality of the food, and spoke favorably about the heart healthy menu. The new menu is reportedly healthy, provides more fruits and vegetables to the inmates, eliminates bologna and reduces salt. It was also relayed that budget cuts have not affected the food or the portion sizes. Staff mentioned that the only change in the menu was a plan for a Thanksgiving meal. The Food Service Manager relayed that weekly reports are provided to Central Office, noting any variations from the standardized menu.

The kitchen contains a separate office room for administrative work, which has large observation windows. *The office was appropriately locked while not in staff use.*

Meal Period

During the meal period, the serving lines proceeded in an orderly fashion and the inmates appeared calm, orderly, and relaxed. The noise level was moderately low. A glass divider split the dining area into two sections. On the date of the inspection, the meal consisted of a hamburger patty, cottage potatoes, two pieces of sliced bread, mixed fruit (grapes, peaches, pineapple), peas and carrots, and a beverage. The food was adequately prepared and overall satisfactory.

While attending the general meal period, inmates had an opportunity to communicate any concerns.

- *According to one inmate, resources are limited and movement is more restricted than what it was under the old administration. Reportedly, security sometimes oversteps their boundaries by controlling operations, which sometimes does not provide enough time to eat, grab academic books, and get to class. He commented that the programs are halfway decent, but there are many inmates on the waiting list and not enough programs available. However, the inmate stated that the electronics, computer repair, and fiber optics training were good programs. In addition, he mentioned that because of the program deficiency, he fears regression after completing the programs and remaining idle until his release. The inmate would like to see more programming and interaction. He further explained that he is a college student and does not have appropriate library access. The inmate said that simply going to the library with the block does not allow for adequate access to needed resources, which inevitably hinders college students. He also relayed that the food portions are small. Lastly, he commented that Michigan provides inmates six good days per month, but Ohio only permits one good day per month.*
- Another inmate relayed that from November 11, 2008 to November 21, 2008, he was in segregation. The inmate stated that he received a conduct report for a rule 26 (disrespect) violation for laughing at an officer. *He further relayed that he was released from segregation without seeing the Rules Infraction Board (RIB), and that this is a method of harassment and a reported pattern experienced by inmates at Toledo Correctional Institution.*

After the inmate left, an officer described the inmate as “one of the biggest liars” she has ever known. Further inquiry was made in regard to the inmate’s allegations. His conduct report is dated November 11, 2008, citing violation of rule 26, Disrespect to an officer at medical pill call. The officer assigned to the pill call window wrote that another medical officer was enforcing a memo from the Major on the procedure of pill call leaving after the whole block is complete. The inmate reportedly did not like the way it was being done. The inmate allegedly made disrespectful statements for 15 minutes and would not quit. The officer wrote that he was told, “That was enough,” but he still would not quit. The inmate reportedly referred to a staff member as “old,” and stated, “We don’t have to listen to her.” The officer reportedly told the inmate to turn around and face the wall, that

she did not want to hear anymore. The inmate reportedly “just laughed and said I don’t have to listen to you.” He was reportedly told to turn around, responded “I don’t have to” then “finally turned around laughing all the while.” The officer wrote, “This is disobedience of a direct order in violation of rule 26.” Actually disobedience of a direct order is a violation of rule 21. He was charged with disrespect, rule 26.

On November 12th the Hearing Officer’s Report was completed, relaying that the conduct report was accurately completed, that *the inmate currently is on the mental health caseload or shows signs of serious mental illness*, that the inmate was informed of the rule violation and facts alleged in support of the violation, that the inmate was *informed of his right to be heard in his own defense, that the inmate’s plea is not guilty of Rule 26, that the inmate stated he did not do it*, but that evidence shows the inmate committed the rule violation. The Hearing Officer referred the matter to the Rules Infraction Board. Upon review by the Chairman of the Rules Infraction Board on November 21, 2008, the Hearing Officer’s decision was *modified and reversed, giving the inmate “SC time served.”*

Therefore, he spent 11 days in segregation in security control status, never received an RIB hearing where he may have been able to call witnesses consisting of staff and inmates present to verify the facts regarding his words, repeated laughing and behavior. It is noted that even though the Hearing Officer reported that the inmate is on the mental health caseload or shows signs of serious mental illness, nothing was said by the staff or included in the paperwork that indicated that contact was made with the mental health staff. The Officer who wrote the conduct report wrote that, “His mouth ran for 10-15 minutes because he wants to downgrade a female authority. I wanted him to face the wall so he can’t make his comments to me about my physical appearance, which he include in his statements because I was wearing a long sleeve shirt. This is disobedience of a direct order in violation of rule 26.” As noted above, disobedience of a direct order is a violation of rule 21, not 26, something that the Hearing Officer and RIB Chairman should have addressed to ensure that he was charged with the proper rule violations indicated in the text of the conduct report.

- Other concerns relayed to CIIC during the meal period related to the grievance procedure. Inmates expressed that the grievance procedure is ineffective. Two inmates alleged that they did not receive responses to grievances.
- Another inmate questioned the CIIC about what was going to be done with regard to prison overcrowding. He relayed that he is back in prison on a technical parole violation and was nearly in tears when he spoke about an order to have no contact with his girlfriend, who is the mother of his children, making it impossible for him to see his children.
- One inmate spoke about his problems with medical, and stated that the CIIC wrote an inquiry and received a reply. He further stated that the doctor exaggerated the truth in the information that was provided to the CIIC. The inmate relayed that when he was housed at the Southern Ohio Correctional

Facility, he was *stabbed in the head and now has severe headaches. Reportedly, the doctor says that he “looks healthy,” but the inmate relayed that he cannot sleep. He voiced concerns about having to keep paying the three-dollar medical co-pay to be seen by the doctor.* This concern was later discussed with the Health Care Administrator in general. In such instances, CIIC recommends that the inmate continue to get on sick call to report unresolved symptoms. *The Health Care Administrator relayed that if the inmate returns over and over on the same unresolved problem without a big gap in time, he would not have to pay the co-pay every time.*

- One inmate that was in a wheelchair said he has a vitamin deficiency, and is told that he must buy supplements in the commissary. *He feels that the medical department should supply any needed supplement or that food services should make sure that inmates are getting any needed vitamins in the foods.* He further relayed he came to Toledo Correctional Institution directly from reception, and would like a transfer to another institution. *Additionally, when he initially came to Toledo, security reportedly objected to his wheelchair, but medical staff worked it out with security, according to a staff person who spoke to CIIC on site. Many inmates were told by CIIC that one of the positives regarding ToCI is the security, which keeps inmates safe. The fact that medical staff worked out the problem with security regarding the wheelchair is another positive.*
- An inmate shared one of his unsatisfactory experiences with the medical department. He relayed an incident in which he broke his leg, and it reportedly took them a *long time for follow up to verify his leg was broken.*
- One inmate relayed concerns about visitation at ToCI. He stated that *in order for a visitor to make a reservation for the visit, they must live at least 120 miles away. The inmate relayed that his family lives 102 miles away, and are not permitted to make a visiting reservation. He stated that one time they were unable to visit at all and other times have had to wait for the second visiting session due to lack of space. He also relayed that there have been fights in the entry building between visitors.*
- One inmate relayed that he and other inmates, are *suppose to get two cups of milk per day. He stated that as of a few months ago, both cups are now being served at the breakfast meal.* Since he does not attend morning breakfast, he has no access to milk.
- Many inmates relayed that the *cells in the institution are extremely cold, and also relayed concerns that they are unable to block vents to help keep their cell warmer. One inmate urged a visit to A1 West, cells one through 12, which are reportedly particularly cold.*
- Another inmate stated his family sent *him two food boxes and he only received one. Concerns about mailroom operations* were also relayed.

- Additionally, an inmate said he is required to *cut his hair, even though he is Indian.*
- *A mentally ill inmate* relayed that he has been in prison since 1983 and insists that he is being held illegally because he reportedly has never committed a felony.
- On a positive note, an inmate relayed that Toledo Correctional Institution is the *best place to do time, because of the single cells. He relayed that you can close your door, and just be by yourself when needed.*
- Other inmates *praised the new Warden, appreciating some of the changes he has made in the short time he has been there.*
- Other inmates commented on the food, relaying that the *food is not bad, that the meal served on the day of the inspection was one of the better meals, and that there is little noticeable difference with the new heart healthy diet.*

A Block

A Block is designed to hold 288 inmates in single cells, on two separate floors with two ranges of cells per floor. A Block is divided into three separate wings, with each wing holding 96 inmates, or 48 inmates per floor. Movement within this unit is monitored by its own control center and the Unit Management offices are located within the short hallways leading to each block.

A One East

A one East is one of the wings that make up A Block. On the day of the inspection, inmates in the unit that were sitting at picnic tables in a common living area communicated with the CIIC. The inmates did not relay any major concerns, and seemed content with their placement at TOCI. *Some inmates relayed concerns about food service, and said that the food is not cooked completely at times and inmates have gotten sick with food poisoning. Another inmate relayed that they are only given a few hours a day outside, and that is much worse than other institutions.*

Inmates also relayed concerns in A1 East about the allotted time they are given to use the law library. Inmates relayed that they are not given the 28 hours they are suppose to have, and the law library is not always open when the regular library is open. Again inmates relayed that they do not have enough time to research and address legal issues, and noted that many appeals have strict deadlines. It was also relayed that the law library has no access to federal jurisprudence.

B Block

B Block is designed to hold 288 inmates in single cells, on two separate floors with two ranges of cells per floor. B Block is divided into three separate wings, with each wing holding 96 inmates, or 48 inmates per floor. Movement within this unit is monitored by its own control center and the Unit Management offices are located within the short hallways leading to each block.

B 1 and 2 South are the only exception to the general population housing blocks. This wing is reserved for the Protective Control (PC) inmates. This area includes space for medical, library, unit management, and programming separate from the general population inmates.

B One North

The unit had the CIIC memo posted along with other important information. The unit was clean and orderly. A few inmates were cutting hair in one of the cells.

- *A blind inmate reported lack of accommodations for his disability. He explained that he wants to receive assistance in learning Braille and other programs for the blind. In addition, he reported that staff recommended someone to train him, but he has not received any assistance because the institution cannot provide the training. Furthermore, the inmate relayed that DRC (Department of Rehabilitation and Correction) said he could get assistance in the street. Finally, he relayed that DRC (Department of Rehabilitation and Correction) stated an agency that could train him would not assist the situation because he is a convicted felon.*
- *Another inmate expressed issues with food contamination. He stated that he is a vegetarian and food services reportedly frequently uses materials for preparing meat to prepare other foods.*
- *Another inmate mentioned that he has problems with the grievance procedure and the mailroom. Mailroom staff reportedly have been found in the past to have held packages and mail.*
- *Other concerns included security classification.*
- *One inmate stated this is the safest institution to do his time because of a failure to address nexus reports at other facilities.*
- *Another inmate stated he received a reduction in his security classification five months ago, but has not transferred to a level two institution, due to lack of bed space.*

B One and Two South- Protective Control Unit

On the day of the inspection, *there were 28 inmates housed in the protective control unit at Toledo Correctional Institution. The Administrative Rule on PC states: "...protective control areas shall be used to house inmates that, due to personal physical safety concerns, need to be separated from the general inmate population."* In order for an inmate to be placed in protective custody, it must be substantiated that their safety is at risk.

There are two PC units for male inmates in Ohio. The larger PC unit is found at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. *The PC unit at Toledo Correctional Institution is used for protective control inmates that cannot be housed at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility PC unit for some reason.*

The PC unit at TOCI potentially houses all security levels, as needed. On the day of the inspection there was one level 1B (minimum) inmate, seven level two (medium) inmates, 17 level three (close) inmates, and three level 4B (maximum) inmates. They are all currently housed in single cells, in a unit that is separated from the general population inmates at TOCI. PC inmates spend time alone in their cell, and are let out by ranges in order to not mix the security levels and to honor any inmate separations that may be in place.

Table 26. Breakdown by security level of inmates in protective control at Toledo Correctional Institution as of November 24, 2008

Security Level	Number of Inmates	Percent
Level 3 (close)	17	60%
Level 2 (medium)	7	25
Level 4B (maximum)	3	11
Level 1B (minimum)	1	4
TOTAL	28	100%

A community service room is in the block, equipped with material and a sewing machine. Staff relayed that the inmates make blankets and sleeping bags, which are later donated back to the community.

A library in the unit is available for the PC inmates to use. Staff relayed that one of the PC inmates is assigned as a Library Aide for the PC library, and they are able to contact the main library at the institution for assistance, as needed. Upon review of some of the library materials, there was no indication that the library included DRC Policies and Administrative Rules.

A row of cells enclosed with Plexiglas in the PC unit could be used as a segregation unit for the PC inmates. However, staff relayed that they reserve an area of the main segregation unit just for PC inmates and have had no problems. Staff relayed that originally, the PC unit was intended to be a Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally

ill, and the Plexiglas would have been perfect for those whose behavior warranted such a shield, such as urine/feces throwing. Staff also mentioned that the row of empty cells with a Plexiglas enclosure has no electricity.

The PC unit also has a small washer and dryer in the unit for the inmates to use. On the day of the inspection, one inmate was doing laundry.

- *Some inmates relayed that no one comes to the PC unit for school. Five of the PC inmates are reportedly able to take their GED, but they have *not been able to get anyone to come to their unit to administer the test.**
- *Another inmate relayed that he needs sex offender treatment, but he is unable to get such treatment since he is in PC.*
- *One inmate relayed that he has been in PC for a very long time, and stated that they are only out of their cells for three hours a day. A PC daily unit calendar was provided to the CIIC, so out of cell time may be reviewed. *Most of the inmates are permitted to be out of their cell for three and a half hours a day. The only inmates that are not able to be out for three and a half hours are the level 4B inmates, as they are permitted to have one and a half hours outside of their cell.* The inmates are let out of their cells one range at a time, and inmate separations are always taken into account. A rotating schedule has been put in place that changes weekly in terms of the time period each range can be released from his cell. The time periods are: 7:00 A.M. to 10:30 A.M., 12:00 P.M. to 3:30 P.M., and 5:30 P.M. to 9:00 A.M. Due to separations, one of the level 4B inmates is allowed out of his cell alone from 3:30 P.M. to 5:00 P.M. daily.*

All of the inmates in the PC unit are assigned to a job, and are expected to complete that job during their out of cell time. Some of the jobs include: staff restroom cleaner, art room porter, upper shower cleaner, barber, material handler, and library aide.

C Block

C block is comprised of six pods altogether with three on the lower level and three pods on the upper level. The lower and upper levels both have a security control center, which allows officers to control the doors from the common area to the individual pods. All units within C block have a similar layout and much of the same features. The stated maximum capacity is 100.

The overall cleanliness of the block was most impressive. All pods appeared to be in excellent condition with spotless floors, appropriate recreation equipment, adequate lighting, proper ventilation, and well-maintained appliances. Some inmates appeared idle while others slept, exercised, or played chess, cards, or dominoes. Informal Complaint Forms (ICF) remained readily available at the officer's desk.

C One West

The unit contains three washer/dryers, two water fountains, a microwave, and a shower room with three showerheads. The unit also has a television, two picnic tables, and three benches. Throughout the inspection, there were consistent observations of neatly made beds and organized cells.

- *Inmates voiced concerns about not having enough space in the personal storage bins.*
- *Inmates also stated that there is a lack of heat and they have to sleep in thermals because of poor insulation.*
- *Furthermore, inmates expressed issues with lack of good time and programming.*
- *They also mentioned the inmate grievance procedure is too internalized and never rules in favor of the inmate. One inmate communicated that he has never spoken with the Inspector of Institutional Services (IIS) face to face.*
- *The unit had a corkboard with displayed important papers, but did not have the recent CIIC memo posted. The CIIC memo explains statutory duties and responsibilities.*

C One South

Unit C South had similar features, which included two picnic tables, three benches, two washer/dryers, three showerheads, two phones, one microwave, and one television. *The shower area appeared clean and in good condition. CIIC's memo was not posted on the corkboard. The informal complaints were available at the officer's desk. The cells appeared cleaned and organized.*

- *One inmate stated that he exhausted the grievance procedure, but did not receive responses and believes the administration was not forwarding appeals to the Chief Inspector. He also stated concerns about restricted access to the library.*
- *Other complaints included not being able to take shirts off at recreation, the institution being run like a maximum security facility, and the institution not providing state supplies such as soap and detergent.*

C One East

The condition of the cells in C1 East seemed consistent with the other cells in C block. The unit did not have CIIC's memo posted.

- *One inmate relayed concerns of disease spreading because of a cut in cleaning supplies. The inmate commented that they only receive the full supply some of the time. However, the common area was orderly, the cells appeared clean, and most beds remained neatly made. According to the inmate, Toledo CI is one of the best institutions and referred to it as a "Holiday Inn." The inmate stated that*

the attitude of staff is excellent, but voiced criticisms regarding inability to take college courses because of his crime.

- Another inmate reported issues with the *emergency call buttons in the infirmary cells. He stated that the call buttons remain improperly wired and they use a baby monitor instead.*
- Other complaints included *excessive use of force, small food proportions, lack of confidentiality for informal complaints, and the lack of jobs and programs.*

C Three West

The Officer in C3 West reported that *informal complaints remain on hand at the desk. The unit's shower area appeared moderately clean with minor traces of soap scum, orange residue, and chipped paint. The cells were neat and clean.*

- One inmate noted issues with *food service regarding occurrences where he did not receive special diet meals. He also commented on inability to receiving programming or schooling.*

A Corrections Officer asked an inmate about his blue shirt and the inmate replied in a negative way. Some inmates in C3 West appeared idle while others played dominoes, cards, and chess. Administrative staff interacted with inmates and seemed to note their problems on site.

D Block

D Block differs from the other housing blocks. D Block one and two (lower level) is general population for 40 inmates total, as well as home to the Operations Department and Commissary. *D Block three and four (upper level) is designed as the segregation, or disciplinary housing unit.* D Block upper can hold up to 95 inmates in two-man cells. It is equipped with its own outside recreation cages, as well as indoor recreation areas.

D One East

D One East, also known as the Merit Block, has single cells up and down and a large dayroom on the first level. The unit had picnic style tables for inmates to sit at, a pull-up bar for exercise, and washer and dryer in unit. An inmate in the unit relayed that they are able to do laundry when they please. The showers were observed to be in excellent condition, as was the entire unit. Memos and information was posted on a well-kept bulletin board for the inmates, but it was noted that no CIIC memo was posted.

One inmate relayed in the unit that they are not getting a balance breakfast, and inmates must get by through purchasing items from the commissary. He relayed that the institution may be following the menu being handed down from Central Office, but is still not a balanced meal.

Another inmate relayed concerns with the medical care provided at TOCI. Specifically, he relayed that he had put in four health care request slips, and had still not been seen by the medical department.

CIIC also had the chance to speak with an inmate that has been in recent contact with the CIIC office. He relayed concerns that he was reduced to level two security, and would now be transferring from TOCI. He was appealing the security level reduction, as he believes his special security review was in retaliation for voicing his concerns about his medical care. The inmate stated that his cane and wheelchair had recently been taken away from him, and as a result, he fell down stairs. He relayed that he has a spinal condition, and had to wait 33 months to see a specialist. He reportedly needs to get a second opinion before he can be approved for the surgery, and is currently waiting for his appointment. He fears that if he transfers, he will have to get on yet another waiting list to see a specialist for a second opinion. The inmate relayed that he just wants to have his surgery completed. Additionally, he stated that he was given a two month lay-in in his unit, and has not been permitted to attend religious services or attend the steering committee for a program he helped start.

D One North

D One North resembled D One East, and was just as clean and well kept. Inmates were observed playing chess at a picnic style table. Another bulletin board was observed, that also did not have a CIIC memo posted for the inmates to write. The unit also had a washer and dryer for the inmates to use and an ironing board.

Multiple inmates relayed that they have had an ongoing problem with an officer in the unit harassing them at night. They relayed that they have used the inmate grievance procedure to report the concern, have not received a response even after three months of investigation. The inmates reported that they now fear retaliation from the officer. The reported concerns were relayed to the Warden in the exit meeting or closure at the end of the inspection. Staff relayed that complaints were reported about the officer in the past, but there have been no current complaints.

One inmate relayed concerns that there are no apprenticeship programs at TOCI, even though material states that there are apprenticeships available for inmates that qualify.

One inmate relayed concerns about access to the law library. He said that the block they live in has scheduled access, and there is not enough time to get legal work done. The inmate said this problem constitutes denial of court access.

D Three and Four – Segregation

Staff relayed that there are three pods that are dedicated to segregation housing and one pod that is used for Mandatory Substance Abuse Program (MSAP), for a total of four pods in the Segregation Unit. In 2005, during the CIIC's last inspection of the institution,

the MSAP Program was in a population unit. This was one of the changes noted since the last inspection of Toledo Correctional Institution.

The segregation unit has a total of 95 beds available for use. On the day of the inspection, there were 58 inmates housed in a segregation cell.

26 of the inmates were in Security Control. The Administrative Rule on the subject states:

An inmate may be placed in security control: When needed to facilitate an investigation prior to the issuance of a conduct report or other administrative action, criminal prosecution; and/or, Pending a hearing before the rules infraction board; Pending transfer to another institution; As a temporary housing assignment for inmates to facilitate an inmate's appearance in judicial or administrative proceedings. The deputy warden of operations may authorize an inmate to be held in security control pursuant to an investigation for up to seven days. If the investigation has not concluded at the end of the initial seven-day period, the warden may authorize that the inmate be held in security control for an additional seven days.

30 of the inmates were in Disciplinary Control. Placement into disciplinary control results when:

An inmate who has been found guilty of a rule violation by the RIB, pursuant to rule 5120-9-08 of the Administrative Code, may be placed in disciplinary control. An RIB panel may impose up to fifteen days in disciplinary control for a single violation or series of violations arising out of a single even.

One of the inmates was in Local Control status. The Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Administrative Rule on Local Control provides the following:

An inmate may be placed into local control if the warden determines after a hearing that: The inmate has demonstrated a chronic inability to adjust to the general population, or the inmate's presence in the general population is likely to seriously disrupt the orderly operation of the institution. Placement in local control shall be for an indefinite period, but shall not exceed one hundred eighty days unless the prior written approval of the director or his designee has been obtained.

One of the inmates housed in the segregation unit was listed as being in orientation.

The segregation cells have a bunk bed in each cell, but inmates are single celled. Each cell also has a metal table that is secured to the wall and metal seat that can be used for eating meals or for writing. The cells are also equipped with a stainless steel sink and

toilet. Inmates leave their cell to shower, and are offered a shower five days per week. *The condition of the showers in the segregation unit was most impressive. The showers appeared to have been freshly painted, and they were immaculately clean.*

An Individual Segregation Record Sheet was hanging on a clipboard outside of each cell. This sheet keeps track of both the meal and exercise times and must be signed off by the Officer in segregation. The segregation record sheet also keeps track of when the inmate received linens, clothing, a shower, hygiene items, toilet paper, medical care, barber services, the ability to shave and clean the cell. Every seven days this record is to be reviewed by Unit Staff, to ensure that basic needs are being met. All of the record sheets checked by CIIC appeared to be up to date.

Strong cells are also found in the unit, and are used for inmates that are aggressive and/or disruptive. *Staff relayed that they never use four way restraints at TOCI. Additionally, it was relayed that four ways are not to be used after an inmate has calmed down. According to staff, segregation staff do not carry mace in the unit. However, there is a pilot program for officers in segregation The Warden relayed that they are currently receiving training from Lebanon Correctional Institution.*

- *One inmate in segregation relayed that he is blind and has been at Toledo Correctional Institution for four years, and has also been at Ross and Lebanon Correctional Institution. He expressed his desire to be at Madison Correctional Institution since he is blind, as he is currently unable to have Braille materials. An inmate roster in the entry showed his name and inmate number with "Blind" noted.*

On the day of the inspection, there were two inmates housed in the safe cells. One inmate was in the safe cell for medical reasons.

- *The second inmate was in the other safe cell because he cut his wrist. He relayed that he is a "cutter," or a person who self-injures by cutting himself. The inmate relayed that he was raped in general population, waited five days before reporting the rape to staff, and the staff allegedly told him he had no proof and he waited too long to report the rape. Before being placed in the safe cell for cutting himself, the inmate was in the Mandatory Substance Abuse Program (MSAP) in the segregation unit, for reportedly holding drugs for other inmates. The inmate relayed that he is a weak person who cannot stand up to inmates, so he is chronically used by them. In his view, his main problem was personal safety. He relayed that when he faces situations and enormous frustrations, he cannot help but cut himself. He was advised that a program is being developed at the Oakwood Correctional Facility for "cutters" that can help them.*

Based on the subsequent discussion with mental health staff familiar with the above inmate, there was concern that the mental health diagnosis or label given to him caused staff not to believe his allegations, before those allegations were investigated to determine the facts. However, in follow-up communication from the Warden, assurance

was provided that the inmate was in fact seen by medical staff, the Investigator, and the staff person who serves as the victim support person, and that the inmate's allegations could not be substantiated. It was further relayed that the Ohio State Patrol declared that no sexual assault occurred. CIIC staff were most pleased to learn from the Warden that the DRC sexual assault policy was followed. CIIC staff were also pleased to know from contact by the inmate's family, that he has been transferred to a Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally ill.

In regard to mental health services, a Psychologist relayed that he *would like to increase the number of groups available to inmates to help reduce their reliance on psychotropic medications. He relayed that more staff would be needed in order to have preparation time.*

Medical Department

The inspection included the medical department, which includes a *very clean and organized dental area. A memo was posted in the area about suicide prevention training that was scheduled.* The dental area was equipped with three dental chairs. Staff relayed that unlike some institutions, they did not have to add any dental chairs to be compliant with court stipulations outlined in the *Fussel* agreement.

The Health Care Administrator relayed that Toledo Correctional Institution currently has a *comprehensive contract for medical, dental, and mental health care from Correctional Medical Services, (CMS).* It was further relayed that the department is currently short a *full time Psychiatrist and Psychologist.*

The staff person relayed that the number one priority for the medical department is the *inmate's medical care, regardless of the inmate's ability to pay the medical co-pay. She further relayed that inmates are not charged the medical co-pay for chronic conditions.* Additionally, she relayed that whenever warranted, they will contact the Medical Director at Central Office.

Staff relayed that inmates are seen on sick call within 48 hours of filling out a Health Services Request form. Sick call is conducted five days per week. On the weekend, a nurse may check on a sick inmate that is waiting to be seen.

The new doctor was praised by the Health Care Administrator. The physician was described as being a good doctor that they were pleased to have 40 hours per week. The current doctor has reportedly identified problems that were previously undiagnosed. It was also noted that the doctor will not prescribe unnecessary medications.

Library

The library was observed near the end of the inspection. The library was closed at the time, but large glass windows looking into the area made it possible to view the area. *The library appears to have plenty of seating, and appeared to have an adequate selection of reading material.* The library resembled a community library, only on a smaller scale. Staff relayed that they *do have a Librarian on staff.*

Throughout the inspection, many inmates relayed concerns in regard to library access and hours, especially in regard to the law library. A calendar reflecting the housing units' library times was posted in all the areas visited. However, inmates relayed that the hours posted on the schedule were not accurate. Staff later relayed, that inmate's access to the library was not just a problem at Toledo Correctional Institution, for it is reportedly a problem statewide.

In July 2008, communication was received from facility staff at Toledo Correctional Institution, which relayed concerns about the inmate's access to legal assistance through the library. It was reported that, "*Some inmates need legal help that is beyond Librarian and inmate legal clerks' knowledge. I would like to suggest having legal staff for each institution so inmates can receive legal services from professional staff.*"

The staff person was referred to speak to their supervisory staff to explore the possibility of having law school students, the Ohio Public Defender Commission and/or legal aid office arrange to visit the institution or possibly respond to written requests through the mail. Each prison law library used to maintain a list of legal assistance referrals in term of agencies and addresses for the inmates to contact. If TOCI does not have such a list, it was suggested that that one should be compiled so that inmates may initiate contact for possible legal information, direction or assistance. It was further noted that facility administrators could consider making contact with possible resources noted above to see what might be able to be arranged to address the need.

In addition to responding to the staff person, the CIIC Director contacted DRC Legal Services staff following the inspection, to ensure that they are aware of the reported need for legal assistance and the staff person's suggestion to access legal services from professional staff for each institution's population.

Exit Meeting

The purpose of the exit meeting or closing is to provide immediate feedback to the Warden on any positive and negative aspects of operations, conditions, programs or grievance procedure observed or reported during the inspection. Following each inspection, notes from all CIIC staff and CIIC members present are reviewed, as well as all requested written information on the institution. Detailed findings are provided in the written inspection report.

The most positive aspects noted were the excellent attitude of the Toledo Correctional Institution staff, and the cleanliness and orderliness of the institution. Reported concerns regarding law library access, and non-response to allegations of officer harassment were noted.

In contrast to the excellent attitude cited above, the CIIC Director learned of two instances which prompt concern regarding that assessment. In one instance, a CIIC Inspector offered his business card to an administrator, who responded, "Save your money." In a second instance, an officer spoke to one of the CIIC Inspectors of the importance of signing in the logbook on entering the block, adding, "If they needed to find your dead body, they'd know where to look."

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Two questionnaires were developed by CIIC for use on 2007-2008 inspections. One of the questionnaires is based on selected sections of Expectations, which contain inspection criteria used by the British Inspectorate. These Expectations were the subject of one of the presentations at an international conference on effective prison oversight in 2006. They are reported to be consistent with international standards. The purpose of gathering information on the extent to which Ohio correctional institutions are similar or different from selected sections of Expectations is twofold: *To identify possible areas in need of improvement, and to identify possible means of addressing reported areas of concern.*

The second questionnaire is based on the 16 recommendations of the *Ohio Correctional Faith-Based Initiatives Task Force*. *The purpose of the questionnaire is merely to gather information on the extent to which progress is being made in implementing the recommendations.* Brief, handwritten responses to the questions by any staff person knowledgeable of the subject, were requested.

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

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 are:

- Safety
- Respect
- Purposeful activity
- Reentry

These are increasingly accepted internationally as the *cornerstones of a “healthy” custodial environment*, providing consistent criteria in a system that is increasingly under pressure and subject to conflicting demands. Expectations 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:

Environment and Relationships

- Residential Units
 - Clothing and Possessions
 - Hygiene
- Staff – Prisoner Relationships

Duty of Care

- Complaint/Grievance Procedure
- Bullying and Violence Reduction
- Self-Harm and Suicide

Activities

- Learning and Skills and Work Activities
- Library

Good Order

- Security and Rules
- Rules

Services

- Food Services

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO EXPECTATIONS

Environment and Relationships

Residential Units

1. Do prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions? **Yes**
2. Are cells and communal areas (blocks, dorms, dayrooms) light, well decorated and in a good state of repair? **Yes**
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? **N/A Single Cells**
 - b. Are cells sufficiently warm in winter and cool in summer? **For the most part if they complain about heat, we check the area and adjust as necessary**
 - 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? **No corkboard**
 - e. Are older prisoners in shared cells with bunk beds given priority for lower bunks? **At the camp they are given bottom bunks, along with medical bottom bunk restrictions.**
 - f. Do shared cells have screened toilets? **N/A**
4. Are reasonable adjustments made to ensure that prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems can access all goods, facilities, and services? **Yes**
 - a. Do prisoners with disabilities and those with mobility problems have ease of access to different locations and services? **Yes**
 - b. Are older, infirm and disabled prisoners assigned to landings, which hold most of the communal facilities? **Yes**
5. Is there a system whereby nominated volunteer prisoners on each residential unit are trained to help less able prisoners and they are paid for this work? **Yes – they are reclassified**

- a. How are volunteers identified, trained and assigned? **They volunteer and the inmate that needs assistance has to be in agreement**
6. Are residential staff aware of prisoners within their care with disabilities and their location? **Only obvious disabilities**
 - 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? **What markers? (don't understand question) The cell doors have a number on them.**
 - 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? **Nothing – officers know who on their block has a disability.**
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? **N/A**
 - b. What are procedures in any case where young adults are identified as posing a risk to others? **Screening through mental health**
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 – we even have a workout session for them and they have access to all other events and programming.**
13. Do prisoners feel safe in their cells and in communal areas of the residential units? **For the most part**

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

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

- a. Is adequate provision made for any prisoners who cannot read notices because of literacy, language, or eyesight problems or any other disability? **Yes – this is determined at the initial orientation**

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

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? **No**

3. Is prisoner property held in secure storage, and can prisoners access their property within one week of making a request? **Yes**

4. Are prisoners fairly compensated for clothing and possessions lost while in storage? **Yes**

5. Is there a standard list detailing the possessions that women prisoners are allowed to keep, and used across all women's prisons? **N/A**

- a. Is there a standard list also employed for male facilities of the same security category? **Yes**

6. Are suitable clothes and bags available to discharged prisoners who do not have them? **Yes**

7. Are facilities available before discharge to launder clothes that have been in storage for long periods? **Yes**

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? **Toilets are in their cells, no baths, and a shared shower stall on each range.**
 - a. Are screened toilets in shared cells? **N/A Single cells**
 - b. Is there a shower cubicle adapted for use by older, less able or disabled prisoners as well as baths with grab handles? **Yes**
3. Are prisoners able to shower or bathe daily, and immediately following physical activity, before court appearances and before visits? **Yes**
 - c. Is there access at any time during the day? **Yes, other than count times and 3rd shift**
 - d. Are older, less able or disabled prisoners helped to have a bath or shower every day? **If needed, assigned waiters**
4. Do prisoners have access to necessary supplies of their own personal hygiene items and sanitary products? **They are provided toilet paper. All other products are available through commissary.**
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**

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, they are**

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, there is a well ordered environment.**
3. Are all prisoners treated with humanity, and with respect for the inherent dignity of the person? **Yes they are.**
 - 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, staff are aware**
4. Are staff aware that they should set a personal example in the way they carry out their duties at all times? **Yes they are**
5. Are staff always fair and courteous in their day-to-day working with prisoners?
(BLANK)
6. Do staff positively engage with prisoners at all times? **In the overwhelming majority of the time, Yes**
7. Is interaction between staff and prisoners encouraged by the senior management team? **Yes it is**
 - a. Does staff help and encourage older and less able prisoners to participate in and access all facilities offered across the prison? **Yes they do**
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 they are**
 - a. What methods are used to encourage prisoners to get involved? **The encouragement begins when the inmates arrives at orientation throughout his incarceration at TOCI.**
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**

DUTY OF CARE

Complaint/Grievance Procedure

1. Are there effective complaint procedures in place that are easy to access, easy to use, and provide timely responses? **Yes**
2. Do prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are they aware of an appeal procedure? **Yes, as none have been reported**
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? **None**
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? **Forms on each unit, then central mailbox**
 - c. Are the boxes emptied daily by a designated officer? **Yes, except weekends and holidays**
 - d. Are form dispensers always stocked with forms? **Yes**
 - 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? **Discussions of needs with IIS, then accommodations are attempted or implemented.**

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? **No**
 - a. Are complaints resolved? **When necessary**
 - b. Are complaints answered within three working days, or within 10 days in exceptional circumstances? **No**
 - c. Are forms sent back to prisoners because of technicalities in procedure? **Occasionally**
 - d. Are such complaints referred to the relevant staff member, not back to the prisoner? **Not supposed to be**
 - e. Are target return times recorded? **Yes, tracked by IIS office**
 - 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, appeal to Chief Inspector's Office**
 - 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? **None for blind inmates and literacy issues are discussed between IIS and inmate.**
11. Is any declaration of urgency by prisoners fully assessed and answered? **Yes**
- a. Are staff responsive to requests for urgent help? **Yes**
12. Are prisoners who make complaints against staff and/or other prisoners protected from possible recrimination? **Yes**
- a. What protection measures are in place and put into practice? **Staff trained annually plus monitored and investigated by IIS office.**
 - 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? **No on timeline, but they are fair**
 - b. Are prisoners reminded of their appeal option on the relevant forms? **Yes**
 - c. How many have appealed in the last six months? **44 – 5/1/08 to 11/26/08**
 - d. What was the outcome, and how promptly were they answered? **See attached report**
14. Do all prisoners (and staff) know how to contact members of the Ohio General Assembly's Correctional Institution Inspection Committee, and can they do so in confidence? **Yes**
- a. Is CIIC contact information posted in dorms, blocks, library and other areas to ensure that staff and inmates are aware of how to contact CIIC? **Yes**
 - b. Are there any difficulties with access to the CIIC? **Not that IIS is aware of**

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? **Yes, handbook and postings**
17. Do prisoners receive help to pursue grievances with external bodies if they need to? **No**
- a. Do they also receive help in contacting legal advisers or making direct applications to the courts? **No, only required services by DRC Policy 59-LEG-01**
 - b. In the last month, how many original grievances and appeals were sent to the Chief Inspector? **3**
 - c. What do they tend to be about? **Property, Health Care, and non-grievable matters**
 - d. What proportion are generally resolved? **See report attached**
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, IIS reviews monthly report for patterns and/or trends**
- a. Is data studied and is action taken when strong patterns/trends emerge? **Yes**

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)? **Unknown**
2. Are active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation known to staff, prisoners and visitors? **Annual in-service**
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? **No**
 - a. Is the violence reduction strategy widely publicized? **No**
 - 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? **No**

- 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? **No**
 - e. Are prisoners consulted as part of the strategy development and maintenance? **No**
 - f. How effective is the strategy in promoting safer custody and violence reduction? **Not tracked and unknown**
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? **Discuss with unit Sergeants**
- a. Has there been any consultation in the last six months? **Not reported to IIS office**
 - b. Has an annual confidential survey to all prisoners about bullying been undertaken? **No**
 - c. Are there wing representatives? **No**
5. Do staff supervise and protect prisoners throughout the prison from bullying, verbal and physical abuse, racial abuse and threats of violence? **When possible**
6. Are staff consistent in challenging these behaviors? **When possible**
- a. How many incidents occurred in the last six months? **Not reported to IIS office**
 - b. Are there particular areas where prisoners feel vulnerable to bullying? **Not reported to IIS office**
 - c. What policies provide protection of vulnerable prisoners? **AR 5120-9-14 and AR 5120-9-04, plus ODRC policy 64-DCM-01**
 - 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? **Structured movement only on the half hour**
 - f. Is particular attention given to prisoners who have asked for protection from other prisoners or those who may be victimized because of the nature of their offense or other individual circumstances? **Yes, internal Protective Control Committee**
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? **Can share their input to Unit Staff**
- 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? **No**
 - d. Are there posters in visiting rooms? **No**
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? **No**
 - c. Are staff alert to potential bullying and do they confront all forms of victimization? **When reported addressed by**
 - d. Are all sources of information including security reports, accidental injuries etc. used for evidence of bullying/intimidation? **If necessary, documentation is reviewed.**
 - e. How do staff contribute to the strategy? **Reports written**
 - f. Is there a coordinated approach by all departments? **No**
9. Are allegations of bullying behavior treated consistently and fairly? **When reported**

- a. Are they investigated promptly? **When reported promptly**
 - b. Are outcomes of investigations recorded and is the prisoner who reported the bullying supported? **Usually with RIB records, when allegations are substantiated the victim is supported.**
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? **No**
 - b. What information is distributed to new arrivals? **None**
 - c. Is bullying clearly defined to prisoners? **No**
 - 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? **Report to staff, conduct and incident reports, once investigated, substantiated claims handled appropriately**
 - b. Are interventions aimed at achieving sustained and agreed changes in behavior? **No**
 - c. Do prisoner records contain comprehensive updates on how bullied and bullying prisoners have been supported and/or challenged? **No**

Self-Harm and Suicide

1. Does the prison work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach? **Yes – the Major is supportive and accessible – he is open to suggestions and directs his staff to be helpful to M.H.**
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? **Officers are trained to initial suicide watch as needed**

3. Are prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity? **Yes – we have been known to take a “gentle” approach if necessary to encourage participation**
4. Are all staff aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, appropriately trained, and have access to proper equipment and support? **Staff receive yearly “in-service” training**
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 – through initial and detailed screenings**
 - 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? **There are no women in this facility. There is a substance addiction service in place.**
 - 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? **We have four cells – typically 15 to 20 inmates go on watch a month.**
 - 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? **I would like to see a “psychiatric consultation” step be established and utilized instead of “watches”**
6. Does a multi-disciplinary committee effectively monitor the prison’s suicide prevention policy and procedures? **Yes – through spart and CQI**
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? **Committee doesn’t include prisoners or members of the local community M.H.**
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? **No**

- 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? **I don't know**
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 – we have treatment plans**
10. Are personal factors or significant events that may be a trigger to self-harm identified? **Yes**
11. Do regular reviews take place involving staff from a range of disciplines and family and friends as appropriate, which provide good support and care for all prisoners at risk? **Friends and families are not included**
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? **On as needed if necessary, yes**
 - b. What level of training have they received? **Counselors are accessible – not sure about the rest**
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? **Prisoners at risk for suicide are at safe cells**
 - a. Is a care suite available to support the work of Listeners? **We don't have "listeners"**
 - b. Is there access to counselors, the chaplaincy team, Listeners and Samaritans at all times? **Counselors are accessible – not sure about the rest**
 - 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? **This is an all male facility**
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? **Yes**

- 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? **Prisoners are encouraged to identify their own support. I don't know about the second half of the question.**
15. Are all staff, including night staff, fully trained in suicide prevention and clear on what to do in an emergency? **Yes, all staff receive yearly suicide prevention training**
- a. Is there a program of refresher training in place? **Yes - yearly**
 - b. Do staff have access to first aid kits and shears? **I don't know**
 - c. If facility does not have a first night center, do night staff know where first night prisoners and those at risk are located? **I don't know**
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? **I don't know**
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**
 - b. Have there been any reviews of recommendations from previous deaths in custody? **I don't know**
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? **Not always – “suicide notes” are not routinely placed in M.H. box for M.H. review**

ACTIVITIES

Learning 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? **95 possible in segregation cell isolation as designated by hearing officer. PC on a rotating schedule.**
 - b. How many are formally registered as unassigned? **0**
 - c. What is the rated capacity compared with current population? – **27 Main +7 Camp**
 - d. How easy is it for a prisoner to get a job? **They are classed to a job within 7 days of arrival, then may request a job change every 90 days.**
6. Are activities that 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? **All scheduled times**
 - a. Is there access for older and disabled prisoners? **Yes**
 - b. Are there any inaccessible areas because of poor mobility and insufficient help to get to them? **No**
9. Is every prisoner who wishes to able to engage fully with all prison activities offered, and is no one excluded from participation, other than as a result of a disciplinary punishment? **Education – in compliance w/ DRC policy**

- a. Is a full schedule of activities available to all prisoners? **Yes – there are 2 programs that exclude sex offenders per DRC policy: RFL’s and Ridge Project**
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 – their request is by kite and answered in writing. Applications are required for OPI, Dog Assistance and Maintenance**
- 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? **No**
 - c. How are unit-based jobs (cleaners, painters, food service workers etc.) allocated, as these often bypass formal procedures? **Food Service and unit jobs are usually classed at their initial placement after orientation**
 - 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? **Pay as determined per DRC Policy**
- a. Do unskilled jobs with no links to learning offer more pay than education and training activities? **Pay is determined per DRC Policy**
13. Do prisoners who do not work because they are exempt (Long-term sick, etc.) receive sufficient weekly pay? **Yes, per DRC Policy**
14. Do prisoners who are unemployed through no fault of their own or who are exempt from working unlocked during the day, provided with access to the library and other activities? **As scheduled per their housing unit**
15. Does the prison have an effective strategy to ensure that learners are able to regularly and punctually attend those activities that meet their needs and aspirations? **Yes, DRC Policies**
- a. What systems are in place for managing punctuality and encouraging attendance at prison activities? **DRC Policy**
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?
Education = yes
- a. Wherever possible, can vocational qualifications be obtained alongside their work? **Yes Career Tech and apprenticeship programs**
 - 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? **Career Tech and apprenticeship hours are documented per DRC Policy. Education evaluates, monitors, and records the student's time in education.**

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? **Elevator**
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**

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**
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?
 - 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? **Yes**
 - 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? **Yes**
8. Is prisoners' access to prison activities impeded by an unnecessarily restrictive approach to security? **No**
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 – strip search log in Captain’s office, visitation area, R&D area**
 - b. Are squat searches only used in exceptional circumstances? **No – Conducted in segregation, visitation, trips, just cause, death bed visit, return outside hospital, return from court**
11. Is the criteria to ban or otherwise restrict visitors visible and unambiguous, with an appeal process available? **Yes appealed to the Warden**
- a. Are the visitors subject to bans or restrictions reviewed every month? **Yes only for active restrictions**

Rules

1. Are local rules and routines publicized prominently throughout all residential and communal areas? **Rules in handbook for inmates**
 - a. Are rules and routines posted/distributed on units/blocks/dorms? **Yes**
 - b. Are they accessible to those with language and literacy needs? **Yes – handbook translated in Spanish**
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 – levels are verbal warning, conduct report, RIB**
4. When rules are breached, does staff take time to explain how and why to the prisoner concerned? **Yes – during hearing officer level**
5. When decisions are conveyed to prisoners, are appeal arrangements explained and made available? **Yes – all issues addressed in appeal decision with copy to the inmate**

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 – when requested**

3. Do all areas where food is stored, prepared and served, conform to the relevant food safety and hygiene regulations? **Yes**
4. Are religious, cultural or other special dietary requirements relating to food procurement, storage, preparation, distribution and serving, fully observed and communicated to prisoners? **Yes**
 - a. Are Halal certificates displayed where prisoners can see them?
 - b. Are appropriate serving utensils used to avoid cross-contamination? **Yes separate piece for each item**
 - c. Do kitchen staff make special arrangements for different types of food, and special dietary requirements for e.g.
 - Pregnant inmates? **N/A**
 - Specific religions? **Yes**
 - Prisoners with disabilities? **Yes**
 - 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 all staff serve safe certified in food protection**
7. Do medical clearance forms exist on food service workers, and are training courses offered? **Have documented medical clearance forms. No training**
8. 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**
9. Do prisoners have a choice of meals including an option for vegetarian, religious, Ocultural and medical diets? **Yes**
 - a. Are all menu choices provided to the same standard? **Yes**

- b. Are options for religious or cultural groups open to all, and not just those who practice their religion officially? **Yes**
10. 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? **As often as necessary**
 - b. Is there a food comments book? **There is a kite log for favorable and non favorable comments**
11. Is the breakfast meal prepared on the morning it is eaten? **Yes**
12. Is lunch served between noon and 1:30 pm and dinner between 5 pm and 6:30 pm? **Yes**
13. Do prisoners have access to drinking water (including at night time), and the means of making a hot drink after evening lock-up? **Yes**
14. Are prisoners able to eat together (except in exceptional circumstances)? **Yes**
15. Does staff supervise the serving of food in order to prevent tampering with food and other forms of bullying? **Yes**
16. Where prisoners are required to eat their meals in their cells, are they able to sit at a table? **Yes**
17. Do pregnant prisoners and nursing mothers receive appropriate extra food? **N/A**

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

Infrastructure

1. Is DRC/DYS being encouraged, wherever practical, to use faith-based and community programs that address documented criminogenic needs? How? By whom? **DRC is encouraged whenever practical to use faith based and community program that address documented criminogenic needs. This is done by Religious Services Administrator, Reverend Gary Sims out of DRC central office.**
 - a. Is DRC/DYS in conjunction with the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, making available to the faith community, examples of evidence-based programming shown to impact offenders' lives? What examples? How are they being made available? **At the institution level, I am unaware of any Faith-Based and Community Initiative, making available to the faith community. ToCI did received information about a one year ago but to date we have not heard anything/**
 - b. Is information being used and disseminated to faith-based and community organizations so that they provide programs that are evidence based and can truly impact the lives of ex-offenders and their families? **At the institution level I am unaware is the information being used and disseminates to the faith based and community organizations.**
 - c. What is in place to ensure that the recommendation is implemented? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - d. What methods of program evaluation are being explored to further document program success? What methods are in place? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**

2. Is the DRC/DYS Director working with wardens/superintendents to develop programs that will facilitate a cultural change in institutions to encourage collaboration with faith-based and community service providers? How? What programs have been developed? **The DRC Director is working with wardens to develop program that will facilitate cultural change in the institution. An example of the cultural change is the public forum regarding the faith based community. Additionally we have community service providers that have been trained to mentor our (ToCI) that is within 6 months of release.**
 - a. Is the culture within the institution continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers? Explain. **Yes the culture within the institution is continuing to evolve to encourage community volunteers; this is evident by the new numbers of volunteers allowed to come into work with the offenders as reentry mentors.**

- b. How is the warden/superintendent supporting and encouraging a cultural shift and institutional change as a day-to-day practice to encourage community volunteers? **The Warden is supporting and encouraging a cultural shift and institution change as a day to day practice by making the institution more acceptable to the community to bring in various programs.**
 - c. How is the DRC/DYS administration working with wardens/superintendents to collaboratively develop protocols that will proactively assist with changing the culture? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - d. Have such protocols been developed? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - e. What are they? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - f. Have policies been reviewed to determine if they might inhibit use of community volunteers, and have necessary changes been made accordingly? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - g. What policies have been reviewed? By whom? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - h. What policies have been changed so that they do not inhibit use of community volunteers? **The various reentry policies have been changed so that the community volunteers are not inhibited coming inside the institution. (71-SOC-01)**
3. Has DRC/DYS developed a marketing plan to assist in recruiting volunteers from the community and faith-based institutions? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- a. Does the plan discuss educating volunteers about the justice system? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - b. Is there a need to increase programming for incarcerated offenders to improve the likelihood they will be reintegrated into the community successfully upon release from prison? **There is a need to increase programming for the incarcerated offenders to improve the likelihood they will be reintegrated into the community successfully. Citizen circles are an example of existing programming but more community involvement is needed.**

- c. Is the faith community being encouraged to volunteer to provide programs and services to assist offenders in both the institutions and the community? **At the institution level we encourage volunteers to provide programs and services to assist offender in both the institution and the community by making the institution open to new programs. At TOCI we require the Faith Based to be committed to the reentry model.**
 - d. Has a marketing plan been developed to overcome the public's misperceptions of offenders? **At ToCI we use community forums locally to educate the community.**
 - e. Has DRC developed an educational program to motivate the faith community to get involved in volunteering, including a video to educate volunteer groups about offenders and their needs in institutions? **Yes**
 - f. Is information provided on how individuals and groups can volunteer in the prisons? **Yes**
 - g. Does the marketing campaign include information on the needs of the adult/youthful offenders, information on how the justice system works, and information on the different ways to volunteer? **Yes**
4. Has DRC/DYS developed a standard training program for staff, volunteers, and the community to facilitate working in institutions together? **Yes DRC Has developed a standard training program for staff, volunteers and the community to facilitate working in the institution together on the DRC website.**
- a. Does the program include information on:
 - Ethics of working with offenders? **Yes**
 - Confidentiality issues? **Yes**
 - Ensuring safety and security of volunteers? **Yes**
 - Working with volunteers? **Yes**
 - Rules and regulations for volunteers? **Yes**
 - b. Does the program include information to volunteers on the security requirements for the institution, why the requirements are in place, and how to properly work with offenders? **Yes**
 - c. Has a standardized training program been developed for volunteers to facilitate their work in institutions? **Yes**
 - d. Has DRC/DYS established an orientation program for volunteers, held at preset intervals to allow community organizations to plan for the training as part of their program planning? **Yes**

5. Has Ohio law been revised to remove unnecessary and unreasonable collateral sanctions that inhibit offenders' successful reentry? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
6. What improvements have been made regarding communication about programs and services between:
 - Staff and volunteers?
 - Staff and the community?
 - Other parts of the criminal justice system and the community?

Staff and communities are communicating during training when offered but there are no on going conversations; limited communication between staff and communities and other parts of the criminal justice system.

- a. What improvements have been made in effectively communicating among staff within the facilities, as well as with the community? **Some improvements are multiple staff being involved in reentry attempts; I am not aware of improvements in the community.**
- b. Has an improved communication mechanism been developed in order to ensure these efforts? **Yes, technology thru access to DRC website**
- e. Has the system been developed collaboratively with staff and volunteers to address observed problems? **There is regular contact between staff and volunteers, problems are addressed as they present themselves.**

Alternatives to Incarceration

7. Has the statute been revised to increase judicial use of community options for non-violent offenders so prison space can be reserved for violent offenders? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - a. Working with faith-based and community service providers, have programs been developed in the community to effectively provide treatment while protecting public safety? **Yes reentry initiatives, such TASC, Reentry Coalition, Citizen Circles**
 - b. Has the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission reviewed additional options to encourage judges to use these community options rather than sending non-violent offenders to limited prison space? **Yes, Reentry courts have been established in Lima, Cuyahoga, Lucas and Stark counties**
 - c. Have local probation departments prepared a listing of community options currently available for judicial use? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**

- d. Have faith-based and community programs contacted local probation departments through the Juvenile Court, Common Pleas Court, and Municipal Courts to inform them of programs and services available? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
8. Are faith-based and community programs being encouraged to supplement existing community and diversionary programs for offenders and to provide services that are not currently available? How? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - a. Is DRC/DYS working with community organizations and probation departments to expand services available for offenders? How? **Yes, many organizations we work together with. (Reentry Coalition, Citizen Circles)**
 - b. Has a community model been created that will help meet the basic needs of offenders within the community? Is it being created? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
9. Has DRC/DYS taken a more active role in linking with the faith-based community to develop programs to meet the gaps in services to adult and juvenile offenders? How? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - a. Has DRC/DYS reviewed current grant or subsidy programs to determine eligibility for faith community programs, in order to increase the number of faith-based and community programs available to judges for sentencing? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - b. Following identification of funding sources, is DRC/DYS actively working with the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives to provide information to these organizations on funding availability? How? What is in place? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - c. Is the Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives providing technical assistance to the faith community to assist them in developing competitive applications for state and federal funding? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
10. Has DRC/DYS, and Job and Family Services expanded efforts in partnership to work with employment centers and the faith community to increase practical employment opportunities for offenders in the community? Explain. **Yes, one stop shops**

- a. Has a job placement program been implemented? **Yes, started SCOTT through unemployment services, continue to offer release preparation**
- b. Does it provide:
 - Information on job fairs to ex-offenders? **Yes**
 - Education of businesses/employers on the benefits of hiring ex-offenders? **Yes**
 - Incentives for employers to hire ex-offenders (i.e., tax breaks)? **Yes**
 - Increased involvement of faith-based and community groups? **Yes**
- c. Is there collaboration between the DYS, DRC and Job and Family Services who started the employment centers in Ohio? In what way? **One stop shops, SCOTT systems**
- d. Has a program been implemented with the goal to get jobs for offenders upon release, and also to match them up with jobs of interest to the offenders, specifically ones at higher wages and skill levels, if possible? Explain? **No linkage to community resources**
- e. Has the DRC Omnibus Reentry legislation been enacted to reduce unnecessary sanctions in the law and thus made training more relevant? **DRC is working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions**

Institutional Programming

11. Is DRC/DYS working with the faith community and faith volunteers to develop and expand programs within the institutions?

- a. Do current programs include the following? Are they being developed? Are they being expanded?
 - Life skills?
 - Financial management and budgeting?
 - Personal hygiene?
 - Family programs including:
 - Family and community-based orientation?
 - Family mediation?
 - Family education and orientation program?
 - Transportation and video conferencing for visitation?
 - Parenting?

Current programs do include the list items. Yearly we look at the program offered and tailor the program to fit the need of the institution

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

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

- b. Have specific life skills programs been developed in the following areas?

- Budgeting?
- Parenting?
- Job searches?
- Anger management?
- Appropriate leisure-time activities?

Current program address the list items

- d. Is emphasis centered on using a mentor-type relationship for such training? **Yes, we have a reentry mentor at ToCI**
- e. Has legislation created a new community-based reorientation program whereby non-violent offenders could be released to the community up to 30 days prior to the expiration of their sentence to arrange for suitable employment, housing, treatment services, etc.? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- f. Have video-conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders, been expanded? Are they used as an incentive program? **I am not aware of any video conferencing opportunities for the families, particularly children of offenders**
- g. Do volunteers facilitate the improvement of family relations through coaching in basic relational skills or involvement in family mediation programs? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
12. Has DRC/DYS expanded partnerships with national organizations including faith-based and community organizations to provide programming in state institutions? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**

- a. Does DRC/DYS have a stated plan for the extent of their involvement in prison programming that specifies any limitations seen as necessary? What is it? **DRC has policies in regards to reentry**
13. Does DRC/DYS involve the faith community when appropriate, in the development of release plans for the offender that flow from the institution to community reentry? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- a. Are community actors and organizations a part of reentry planning for those offenders who will shortly be returning home? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- b. The best ideas and programs will serve no purpose in helping offenders live out productive lives after their release if there is no effective community follow-through. Is there effective community follow-through? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- c. Is there a mentorship program for offenders at your facility? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- d. Are faith-based and community volunteer groups actively developing such a program for participation by offenders at your facility? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**

Reentry Programming

14. Have methods been developed to increase and encourage the involvement of the faith community in various reentry efforts, and to encourage collaboration among faith groups? What are they? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- a. What has been done to make the faith community aware of programs and training for the faith community's involvement? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- b. What has been done to create awareness among the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and the avenues to get involved? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- c. What effort has been made to inform the faith community of the needs of ex-offenders and volunteer opportunities available? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
- d. Have leaders among the faith community been identified? How? When? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**

- e. Have staff been used to accomplish this, using existing organizations, groups and established relationships? Explain. **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - f. Has this educational opportunity been extended to faith groups of all kinds? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - g. Has an easily visible section been added to the DRC (or DYS) web site for the faith community that identifies different programming opportunities for volunteers? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - h. Does the section contain volunteer opportunities linked to specific communities in Ohio, including contact information for volunteer coordination within each department or institution as needed? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
15. Are offenders informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release? How is this done? **Offenders are informed of various housing options before leaving prison or immediately upon release by their case manager.**
- a. Although the offender is no longer in prison, he/she is still subject to housing restrictions due to the crime committed (i.e. sex offenders), which creates more difficult circumstances and specialized needs. Are seminars, with free legal or consultation services provided, along with increased involvement of the faith community? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - b. Is legal advice in these situations available? Have partnerships been formed with local law schools to achieve this end? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - c. Are presentations by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development provided to ex-offenders to provide information on their options upon leaving prison, and knowing how to navigate through the many restrictions placed on them? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**
 - d. How has DRC/DYS made better use of existing federal programs that aim to address the issue of housing? **At the institution level I am not involved in this part of the process.**

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

a. What educational efforts have been made to:

- Assure the public that their best interest is at hand, that public safety is not at risk, but will improve with these efforts, and to
- Inform the public of the many needs of ex-offenders to help them transition successfully back into society?

At ToCI we have made efforts to assure the public interest is at hand through seminars workshops. Also we inform the public of the many needs of ex-offenders through the same seminars and workshops.

b. Are grassroots agencies and advocacy groups being made aware of and sold on this effort, so that they can help to market the increased public safety and reduced criminal justice costs associated with effective offender reentry? How? **We (ToCI) are trying by inviting service providers to our meetings.**