

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE

EVALUATION AND INSPECTION REPORT

ON THE

TOLEDO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

Prepared and Submitted by

CIIC Staff

December 12, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction.....	6
Inspection Profile	
CIIC Members and Staff Present	
Institution Staff Present	
Areas/Activities Included in the Inspection.....	7
Statutory Requirement to Attend Rehabilitative or	
Educational Program	
Statutory Requirement to Attend General Meal Period	
Findings Summary	
Institution Overview.....	8
Mission Statement	
Opening.....	9
Accreditation	
Acreage and Design	
Capacity, Population, Classification.....	10
Number of Inmates at TOCI by Classification Level on	
September 9, 2005	
Population on October 1, 2005 by Institution.....	12
Inmate Population in Ohio Prisons Reported in the	
DRC Chief Inspector’s 2004 Annual Report with	
Breakdown by Institution.....	13
Racial Breakdown.....	14
Number of TOCI Inmates by Race as of September 9, 2005	
Escapes/Walkaways	
Costs	
Staff.....	15
TOCI Staff Breakdown by Gender and Race as of	
July 1, 2004.....	16
Inmate Housing.....	17
Housing Units at TOCI with Number of Beds Per Unit	
Drug Sanction Unit.....	19
Honor Housing	
Protective Control	
Segregation.....	20
Key Programs.....	22
Unit Programs	
Recovery Services Programs.....	24

	PAGE
Mental Health Services.....	24
Programs	
Staffing	
Residential Treatment Units System-Wide with Beds	
and Caseload in September 2005.....	26
Number of Mentally Ill Inmates in Segregation with	
Percentage of Segregation Population that are Mentally Ill	
in September 2005.....	27
Mental Health Caseload System-Wide as of June 2005.....	29
Attempted Suicides.....	30
Number of Suicide Attempts from January through	
September 2005 by Institution	
Educational/Vocational Programs and Services.....	31
Educational Programs	
Enrollment Data Reported on TOCI Monthly Report for	
June 2005	
Extended Educational Programming.....	32
Library	
Ohio Penal Industries Plastic Bag Shop.....	33
Vocational Programs	
Religious Services Program	
Community Services Projects.....	35
Planned Projects.....	36
Unique Programs	
Recreation Program	
Entry Building.....	37
Institutional Grounds.....	38
Visiting Room	
Food Services	
Medical and Dental Services.....	40
Medical Institutional Statistical Summary	
Civil Service Staff Summary	
Pharmacy.....	41
Prescriptions Filled	
Contractual Staff Utilization	
Primary Health Care.....	42
Intake Screenings	
Sick Call	
Emergency Triage	
Infirmary	
Dental Care	
Specialty Care	
Infectious Disease Data.....	43
Laundry/Quartermaster	
Commissary	

	PAGE
Use of Force.....	44
Use of Force Incidents Per Month at TOCI from January through September 2005 with Racial Breakdown	
Conduct Reports.....	45
Conduct Reports at TOCI from January through September 2005 by Race	
CIIC Database.....	46
Contacts	
Number of Contacts Received by CIIC from January 1, 2005 through October 17, 2005 by Institution.....	47
Concerns.....	48
Number of Reported Concerns Received by the CIIC from January 1, 2005 through October 17, 2005 by Institution.....	49
Category of Concerns.....	50
Number and Category of Concerns Reported to CIIC from January 1, 2005 through October 17, 2005 from or regarding the TOCI.....	51
Comparison of Number of Logged Concerns from TOCI Received by CIIC from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005, and from January 1, 2005 to October 17, 2005.....	52
Inmate Grievance Procedure.....	53
Informal Complaints	
2004 Informal Complaints Filed by Institution.....	54
Untimely Responses.....	55
Number of Informal Complaints with Untimely Responses in 2004 by Institution.....	56
Filers.....	57
Number of Inmates Who Filed One or More Grievances in 2004 by Institution	
Grievances.....	58
Number of Grievances Filed in 2004 by Institution	
Grievance Appeals.....	59
Number of Appeals in 2004 by Institution	
Original Grievances.....	60
Number of Grievances Filed With Chief Inspector Regarding Inspector or Warden in 2004 With Breakdown by Institution	
August 2005 Inspector's Report.....	61
Reasons for Unresolved Grievance Dispositions by the Inspector of the TOCI in August 2005	
Grievance Review: October 2003 – November 2004.....	62
Number of Grievances Filed at the TOCI by Subject from October 2003 through November 2004.....	63

	PAGE
Resolved/Unresolved.....	64
Investigator's Caseload	
Number of Investigations Initiated by Investigator in 2004 by Institution.....	65
Staff Misconduct Investigations.....	66
Staff Misconduct Investigations in 2003 and 2004 by Institution.....	67
Staff/Inmate Relationship Investigations.....	68
Number of Staff/Inmate Relationship Investigations in 2003 and in 2004 by Institution.....	69
Positive Drug Urinalysis Investigations.....	70
Number of Drug Tests at TOCI from 2000 to July 1, 2004 with Number and Percentage Positive Number of Positive Drug Tests in 2003 and 2004 by Institution.....	71
Inmate/Visitor Drug Investigations	
Number of Inmate/Visitor Drug Investigations in 2003 and in 2004 by Institution.....	72
Staff/Inmate Drug Investigations	
Number of Staff/Inmate Drug Investigations in 2003 and 2004 by Institution.....	73
Drug Investigations Involving Staff.....	74
Drug Investigations Involving Mail	
"Other" Drug Investigations	
Searches, Shakedown: Illicit Pills Confiscated	
Crack/Cocaine Confiscated.....	75
Heroin Confiscated	
Marijuana Confiscated	
"Hooch" Confiscated.....	76
Major Shakedowns	
Canine Searches	
Employee Strip Search/Pat Downs.....	77
Visitor Strip Search/Pat Downs	
Assaults	
Assault Investigations.....	78
Inmate on Inmate	
Inmate on Staff	
Sexual Assault.....	79
Other Investigations	

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION INSPECTION COMMITTEE

EVALUATION AND INSPECTION REPORT

ON THE

TOLEDO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

INTRODUCTION

This report provides data and information regarding the Toledo Correctional Institution gathered from the time of the initial inspection on July 8, 2004 through December 7, 2005. While the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee is charged with inspecting each Ohio prison biennially, the CIIC is also required to evaluate operations, conditions and the grievance procedure. Monitoring and evaluation involve an ongoing, continuous process that begins long before an inspection, and continues long after an inspection is completed. This report presents information specific to the Toledo Correctional Institution, as well as comparison data from all Ohio prisons. It includes information and observations from the one-day inspection, as well as information gathered subsequently from the monthly reports for evaluative purposes.

INSPECTION PROFILE

INSPECTION DATE	July 8, 2004
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Unannounced
CIIC MEMBERS AND STAFF PRESENT	Representative Robert Latta Shirley Pope, CIIC Director Elizabeth Curtis, Inspector Gregory Geisler, Inspector Adam Jackson, Inspector Carol Robison, Inspector

INSTITUTION STAFF PRESENT

Communication with institution staff on site included but was not limited to the following: Kelleh Konteh, Warden; Rob Jeffreys, Deputy Warden of Operations; Hugh Daley, Deputy Warden of Special Services; Caroline Haack, Administrative Assistant; Phillip Kerns, Investigator; Keith Fullencamp, Captain; Loreene Pettaway, Food Services Manager; Carl Cox, Food Service Coordinator; Dr. Bonaventure Okoro, CMS Physician; Tom Sovacool, Health Care Administrator; Richard Kollie, Corrections Officer; Pam Miller, Administrative Assistant to the Deputy Warden of Special Services; Jim Tabler,

Vocational Teacher; Marty Kerns, Mental Health Unit Secretary; Bernie Fegan, CMS Licensed Social Worker; Anthony Long, Corrections Officers; Larry Brown, Recovery Services Supervisor; Roger Fetterman, Vocational Teacher; Thomas Williams, Activities Therapist; Gayle Rehman, Laundry Coordinator; Kevin Pannel, Case Manager; Mark Gilbert, Lieutenant; Meredith Rinna, ACA Coordinator.

AREAS/ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN THE INSPECTION

Entryway	Kitchen	Laundry Facility
Entry/Exit Interview with Warden	Inmate Dining Hall	Segregation
Visitation Room	Mental Health Services	Commissary
Medical/Dental Services Area	Education Unit	Library
Recreation Yard and Gymnasium	Officer's Roll Call Room	Chapel
OPI Plastic Bag Shop	Camp Canine Dog Training	Protective Control
Housing Units		

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT TO ATTEND REHABILITATIVE OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The OPI Plastic Bag Shop was observed, although it was not in operation on the day of the inspection. The inspection also included a visit to the educational area and classrooms for GED and Automated Office Technology.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT TO ATTEND GENERAL MEAL PERIOD

The CIIC ate lunch in the Inmate Dining Room. The lunch meal consisted of a pork chop, potatoes, carrots, three slices of bread, butter and beverage.

FINDINGS SUMMARY

The Warden and his staff were most cooperative and at all times professional. It was reported that the Warden personally makes daily or twice daily rounds to critical areas of the institution including food services and recreation. The Warden's knowledge of and positive interaction with staff and inmates were apparent.

The design and construction of the Toledo Correctional Institution was impressive. One of the unique aspects of the institution is that it is the only Level Three (close) security prison that is exclusively single-celled. Reportedly, TOCI was purposely designed to remain single-celled. Single cells are extremely beneficial to staff, inmates and the overall operation and condition of the institution. TOCI is free of the problems that inherently exist in double-celled institutions. TOCI is also unique because of its urban location, a factor that is always advantageous in staff recruitment.

Although all Ohio prisons have become smoke free per ODRC policy effective November 1, 2005, from the time that the Toledo Correctional Institution opened, it has been smoke free indoors, with smoking limited to outdoors.

The facility was very clean, quiet, orderly and controlled, yet with no sign of tension. Inmate communication was good. A critically important aspect of any prison environment, particularly among high security prisoners, is the extent to which the inmates feel safe. From all indications, including observation and interaction, they felt safe.

The Protective Control (PC) Unit at TOCI houses inmates who face a verified risk of serious physical harm in general population or at other prisons, to the extent that protection is needed. Based on the comments of PC inmates, they sought more out of cell time and mixing among those in the unit. Some complained of the restricted movement due to range separations enforced in the PC Unit. Such separations have proven to be effective in another PC Unit in preventing physical confrontations and conflicts between PC inmates. PC inmates appeared to feel safe, based on their comments about wanting more freedom of movement in the PC Unit, and the absence of reports of fear or expressed concerns regarding safety issues.

There was a lack of program activity taking place at the time of the inspection. However, as detailed in the Program Section of this report, many programs exist at TOCI. Further, some programs previously reported as “pending” have since become operational. Although the TOCI websites of July and August 2004 cited Industries and Vocational Programs as both “pending,” the September 9, 2005 TOCI website listed the Plastic Bag Factory as an Industry and listed Administrative Office Technology as a Vocational Program.

During the inspection, some inmates were introduced to the CIIC who had long ago communicated extensively when they were at the Level Four (Maximum Security) Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Level Five (High Maximum Security) Ohio State Penitentiary, and/or the former Administrative Control status previously in existence at other institutions. With their long histories of misconduct and maladjustment, expectations may be that they will never make it at a Level Three (Close Security) prison. Although there is no known formal statement regarding TOCI having a special mission to aid the adjustment of such inmates, TOCI seems to provide an environment to make their adjustment more likely, and as importantly, the Warden seemed to welcome the challenge and opportunity.

INSTITUTION OVERVIEW

MISSION STATEMENT

As described in its website, the Toledo Correctional Institution (TOCI) seeks to provide a safe, efficient, humane and appropriately secure correctional institution, while maintaining dedication to the protection of citizens and the community. The institution also strives to provide its employees with opportunities for professional growth and development through education, mentorship and training. Mindful of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (ODRC) initiatives of re-entry, community service and

victim reparation, TOCI further seeks to instill in offenders an improved sense of responsibility and the capacity to become law-abiding members of society.

According to the mission statement cited in the TOCI information provided on site, the institution's mission is to protect Ohio citizens by effective supervision of adult offenders in safe, humane, and appropriately security environments. It further states that in cooperation with communities, the institution promotes citizen safety, victim reparation, restorative justice, and community service. The mission statement also cites rehabilitative programming as the means used to instill in offenders an improved sense of responsibility.

OPENING

Per information from the Toledo Correctional Institution website and additional information provided on site, groundbreaking on the facility began in April 1997. The first inmates were received at the Toledo Correctional Camp in July 2000. The Main Compound received its first inmates in October 2000.

ACREDITATION

The Toledo Correctional Institution was awarded accreditation by the American Correctional Association (ACA) in 2002.

ACREAGE AND DESIGN

TOCI is located on more than 45 acres. The Main Compound occupies more than 16 acres and the Minimum Camp occupies over four acres. The original design is a "high security", multi-story "podular" design with centralized core services and an attached administration building. Four buildings are located inside the fence, and one building is outside of the fence.

From information provided on site, the Toledo Correctional Camp houses 186 minimum-security adult male offenders in a combination of single and double bunked open dormitories. The minimum camp is self-sufficient. That is, it has its own kitchen, dining hall, commissary, library, Satellite Medical Officer, laundry facilities, education classrooms, and recreational activities. The minimum camp comprises over 37,000 square feet of space. It is completely separated from the close-security side by a fence.

The ODRC website of July 6, 2004 cited the total construction cost as \$90 million, which included construction of the following facilities: Administration Building, Inmate Housing Unit, Minimum Security Camp, Warehouse, Entrance Building and Guardhouse. The Administration Building houses the central plant and support functions including: Heating Plant (hot water boilers), Chiller Plant (electrical centrifugal chillers), Power Plant (emergency generators), Laundry, Food Service and Medical Facility. The Warehouse houses central plant and support functions including: Food Storage, Central Shop, Vehicle Maintenance and Central Storage.

According to information provided on site, site buildings include 1,090 toilets, 1,126 lavatories/sinks, 133 showers, 50 drinking fountains and 32 mop sinks.

CAPACITY, POPULATION, CLASSIFICATION

The capacity of the single celled Main Compound is 1,000 beds. The Minimum Camp's capacity is 125 (single) beds. The population as of July 4, 2004 was 789. The population as of September 9, 2005 was 801. As of November 9, 2005, the total population was 779.

Of the 801 inmates at TOCI on September 9, 2005, Level One (Minimum Security) inmates totaled 179. Four were classified as Level Two. A total of 607 were classified as Level Three (Close Security). Eleven inmates were classified as Level Four (Maximum).

Number of Inmates at TOCI by Classification Level on September 9, 2005

CLASSIFICATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
In Order of Level:		
Level One (Minimum)	179	22.3%
Level Two (Medium)	4	.5
Level Three (Close)	607	75.8
Level Four (Maximum)	11	1.4
TOTAL	801	100%
In Order of Number/Percentage:		
Level Three (Close)	607	75.8%
Level One (Minimum)	179	22.3
Level Four (Maximum)	11	1.4
Level Two (Medium)	4	.5
TOTAL	801	100%

Since TOCI was built to be a "high security" facility, it has the advantage of flexibility in terms of the classification of the inmate population assigned to TOCI. For example, after the institution was constructed but prior to its opening, the then ODRC North Regional Director relayed that due to TOCI's construction as a "high security" facility, it has the potential to house Death Row, Protective Control, a Residential Treatment Unit, or Administrative Control (now called Level four B). This flexibility in use enables the facility to adapt to changing future needs within the ODRC. It is definitely a positive factor.

Level Three (Close Security) and Level Four (Maximum Security) are housed in the Main Compound, while Level One (Minimum Security) inmates are housed in the adjacent Minimum Security Camp. Although the Main Compound of TOCI is used for Level Three (close) security inmates, the Protective Control Unit at TOCI (for inmates who face a verified risk of serious physical harm in general population or at other institutions) may house inmates who are in higher security levels. The 11 inmates cited

above as classified as Level Four (maximum) were likely assigned to the Protective Control Unit. However, an inmate formerly classified as Level Three (close security) who has committed one or more rule violations may be placed in segregation and while in segregation, the inmate may subsequently be recommended and approved for increase to Level Four. One or more of the 11 Level Four inmates could have been in segregation pending such disciplinary transfer.

Based on the breakdown of classification of their population on November 9, 2005, there are still 11 inmates classified as Level Four at TOCI. Level One inmates increased from 179 in September 2005 to 190. Level Three inmates totaled 573 in November 2005, a slight decrease from September 2005 when the total was 607. There were five inmates classified as Level Two (Medium Security) in November, similar to the four inmates reported to be in that classification in September 2005.

Level Three (Close Security) inmates may earn a reduction to Level Two (Medium Security) due to positive behavior and adjustment assessed in annual reviews. Level One (Minimum Security) inmates may be increased to Level Two (Medium Security) due to negative behavior and adjustment. The presence of Level Two inmates at TOCI pending transfer after a classification change is believed to be due to such movement due to positive or negative adjustment on the part of a Level Three or Level One inmate, respectively.

Population on October 1, 2005 by Institution

INSTITUTION	POPULATION
Chillicothe CI	2,700
Mansfield CI	2,362
Richland CI	2,287
Noble CI	2,254
North Central CI	2,246
Ross CI	2,191
Belmont CI	2,151
Lebanon CI	2,126
London CI	2,087
Pickaway CI	1,985
Madison CI	1,936
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1,862
Correctional Reception Center	1,841
Lorain CI	1,768
Marion CI	1,717
Southeastern CI	1,541
Lake Erie CI	1,451
Grafton CI	1,399
Allen CI	1,297
Trumbull CI	1,246
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1,057
Warren CI	1,004
Toledo CI	781
North Coast CTF	588
Northeast Pre-Release Center	583
Franklin Pre-Release Center	491
Hocking Correctional Facility	466
Ohio State Penitentiary	404
Dayton CI	402
Montgomery Education Pre-Release C	337
Oakwood Correctional Facility	116
Corrections Medical Center	107
TOTAL	44,783

The DRC Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report completed in June 2005 lists the inmate population for each institution, with a total ODRC inmate population of 43,982. The population of TOCI is reported to be 791. Only eight institutions have smaller populations than TOCI. There are 22 prisons with larger populations. The population of the Chillicothe Correctional Institution is nearly 3.5 times the population of the Toledo Correctional Institution.

**Inmate Population in Ohio Prisons Reported in the DRC Chief Inspector's 2004
Annual Report, with Breakdown by Institution**

INSTITUTION	INMATE POPULATION
Chillicothe CI	2,690
Mansfield CI	2,371
Richland CI	2,319
North Central CI	2,272
Ross CI	2,253
Belmont CI	2,153
Noble CI	2,084
London CI	2,071
Pickaway CI	2,038
Ohio Ref for Women	1,955
Lebanon CI	1,937
Madison CI	1,901
Marion CI	1,847
Correctional Reception C	1,649
Southeastern CI	1,560
Lorain CI	1,463
Grafton CI	1,409
Lake Erie CI	1,380
Allen CI	1,302
Trumbull CI	1,097
Warren CI	1,034
Southern Ohio CF	958
Toledo CI	791
North Coast CTF	546
Northeast PRC	530
Hocking CF	464
Franklin PRC	455
Ohio State Penitentiary	455
Dayton CI	424
Montgomery EPRC	327
Oakwood CF	125
TOTAL	43,982

RACIAL BREAKDOWN

The TOCI population on September 9, 2005 consisted of 434 African American (54.2%); 327 White (40.9%); 35 Hispanic (4.4%); and five "Other" (0.6%) as presented below:

Number of TOCI Inmates by Race as of September 9, 2005

RACE	NUMBER	PERCENT
African American	434	54.2%
White	327	40.9
Hispanic	35	4.4
Other	5	.6
TOTAL	801	100%

On July 1, 2004, the TOCI population totaled 789. The African American population totaled 420, comprising 53.2 percent of the population. There were 349 White inmates comprising 44.2 percent of the total. The racial breakdown also included two Asian inmates, and 18 Hispanic inmates, with 17 White Hispanic and one Black Hispanic.

Compared with the September 2005 data, the total population has only increased slightly by 12 from 789 in July 2004 to 801 in September 2005. The number of African American inmates increased slightly by 14, from 420 in July 2004 to 434 in September 2005. The number of Hispanic inmates increased by 17 from 18 in July 2004 to 35 in September 2005, but the number of White inmates decreased by 22, from 349 in July 2004 to 327 in September 2005.

ESCAPES/WALKAWAYS

According to written information provided on site, there have been no escapes or walkaways at TOCI from its opening in 2000 to July 2004. Updated website information of November 2005 confirms that no such incidents have occurred in the interim.

COSTS

According to the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction FY 2005 Direct Institution Budget/Inmate Costs, the Toledo Correctional Institution had an annual operating budget of \$25,975,405.00, which is a slight decrease from the 2004 operating budget of \$26,098,502. The annual budget for TOCI in FY 2005 as reported in the written information provided on site was \$25,970,405.

Based on the above referenced ODRC data, 22 Ohio prisons had budgets larger than the Toledo Correctional Institution, ranging from \$28,249,395 at the Warren Correctional Institution to \$54,667,405 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Ten Ohio prisons had budgets less than that of the Toledo Correctional Institution, ranging from \$10,313,989 at the Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center, to \$24,443,771 at the Allen Correctional Institution.

Per the ODRC budget data, in FY 2005, the TOCI annual cost per inmate was \$30,841.83 with a daily average cost per inmate of \$84.50. According to the written information provided on site, the daily cost per inmate at TOCI was reported to be \$90.18. Per the ODRC data, the Toledo Correctional Institution has the sixth highest annual cost per inmate, with only five Ohio prisons having higher costs, ranging from \$34,604.38 at the Dayton Correctional Institution, to \$303,366.87 at the Corrections Medical Center. Twenty-six Ohio prisons had lower annual inmate costs than TOCI ranging from a low of \$13,501.23 at the Richland Correctional Institution, to a high of \$28,395.09 at the Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center.

According to the TOCI website of November 2005, the annual operating budget for FY 2006 is \$25,426,194.00 with an annual cost per inmate of \$32,244.71. This is a decrease in the annual operating budget of \$26,098,502 in FY 2005 and the same amount cited for FY 2004. The annual cost per inmate increased from \$31,096.32 in FY 2004 and FY 2005 to \$32,244.71 in FY 2006. The average daily inmate cost increased from \$85.20 in FY 2004 and FY 2005 to \$88.34 in FY 2006. The ODRC FY 2005 data cites the Daily Inmate Cost at TOCI as \$84.50.

In the review of FY 2006 costs per institution, the budget for the Toledo Correctional Institution ranks 24th, with 23 prisons having larger budgets than Toledo Correctional Institution, and eight prisons with smaller budgets.

STAFF

According to the institution's written information of July 2004, the institution operated with a staff of 329, including 226 security staff. According to updated figures of September 2005, TOCI staff total 332, with 213 security staff. November 9, 2005 data shows a total of 330 staff with 213 security staff.

The executive staff table of organization as of July 2004 shows that the Warden has two Correctional Warden Assistants and a Personnel Officer. A Correctional Grievance Officer, Labor Relations Officer (vacant at the time) and Executive Secretary also report to the Warden. Of the three Deputy Wardens who report to the Warden, the Major reports to the Deputy Warden of Operations, the Business Administrator reports to the Deputy Warden of Administration, and the Healthcare Administrator reports to the Deputy Warden of Special Services.

Of the 329 total staff as of July 1, 2004, 205 or 62.3 percent of the employees were male, and 124 were female.

TOCI Staff Breakdown by Gender and Race as of July 1, 2004

RACE/GENDER	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
WHITE	140 (68.3%)	65 (52.4%)	205 (62.3%)
BLACK	52 (25.4%)	47 (37.9%)	99 (30.1%)
OTHER	13	12	25 (7.6%)
TOTAL	205	124	329 (100%)

Of the 205 male staff, 140 or 68.3 percent were White, and 52 or 25.4 percent were Black. "Other" staff totaled 13. Of the 124 female staff, 65 or 52.4 percent were White, and 47 or 37.9 percent were Black. An additional 12 females were classified as "Other" in the racial breakdown.

White staff totaled 205 comprising 62.3 percent of the employees. African American employees totaled 99 comprising 30.1 percent of the TOCI staff. The "Other" category totaled 25 comprising 7.6 percent of the total employees.

At the time of the inspection, it was relayed that the Toledo Correctional Institution had all Correctional Officer positions filled with approximately 235 Officers. As of November 2005 according to the TOCI website, there were 330 total staff, with 213 security staff. It was reported during the inspection that a majority of the staff (approximately 60 percent) came to Toledo with prior experience from other correctional facilities. It was relayed that during a period of staff acquisition, 28 employees joined the ToCI staff after the Lima Correctional Institution closed. Subsequently, six employees with less seniority at ToCI were laid off, but were given "call back rights".

It was noted that volunteers also provide services at TOCI.

There are approximately 38 Correctional Medical Services (CMS) employees and four Substance Abuse Services, Inc. (SASI) recovery services employees. The medical staff at TOCI is comprised entirely of contract workers via contract with CMS.

It was relayed that while TOCI staff work to cover all posts by distributing staff where they are needed, the staff to inmate ratio was cited by at least one staff member as a concern. Relevant to the recreation yard, TOCI staff relayed that the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (ODRC) ratios are in place. Two Officers are reportedly assigned to approximately 380 inmates, ranging from 350 to 400, while on the yard, with one of the two Officers stationed inside the building. During recreation, one Unit Staff member is reportedly assigned to the area as well. During dining and recreation, the number of employees is reportedly doubled. The staffing level reportedly follows the table of organization issued by the DRC Central Office. To aid in the staffing situation, it was relayed that the Warden and Deputy Wardens routinely visit the "hot spots" within the institution, such as the inmate dining hall and the recreation area. Also, Sergeants (Correctional Counselors) reportedly attend recreation and dining periods with their assigned units. The Quartermaster reportedly operates without the assistance of security

staff, only inmate workers. From what was observed during the inspection, TOCI staff were generally not walking alone.

One staff person relayed that when the institution first opened, budget issues and the lack of staff at preferred levels emerged as initial concerns. It was also noted that the timing of the closure of the Lima Correctional Institution prevented TOCI from hiring new staff. Reportedly, limitations on the number of Officers at TOCI by the ODRC result in corresponding limitations on allocating a larger number of Officers to the outside recreation yard, for example. According to staff on site, the number of Officers established for the institution is based on the number and type of “hot spots” in the institution. The two “hot spots” identified at TOCI are the recreation area and food services/dining hall area. As mentioned above, on the date of the inspection, ToCI was fully staffed in Corrections Officers, with no Officer vacancies, but there was one vacancy for a Unit Manager position.

The TOCI Administrative staff identified the staff as one of the strengths of TOCI. According to TOCI staff, while the majority of the staff has four or less years of experience, they were reported to have taken much responsibility and to have adjusted well to working at the new institution. Most of the TOCI employees have never worked in a Level Three (close security) facility prior to working at TOCI. The majority of the individuals on staff are reportedly from Toledo and the surrounding areas. All new staff members are given two weeks of training to learn every post and the layout of the institution.

INMATE HOUSING

Based on the written information provided on site, TOCI has the following Housing Units:

Housing Units at TOCI with Number of Beds per Unit

HOUSING UNITS	NUMBER OF BEDS IN EACH
CORRECTIONAL CAMP	186
MAIN COMPOUND:	
A-West	96
A-North	96
A-East	96
	288
B-North	96
B-East	96
B-South	96
	288
C-East	96
C-South	96
C-West	96
	288
D-Block (1-2)	40
Infirmary	6
Segregation Unit: D-Block (3-4)	95*

*According to the written information on site, D-Block 3 and 4 (upper level) “can hold up to 95 inmates in two man cells.” It further states that D-Block 3 and 4 was specifically “designed as the segregation, or disciplinary housing unit.” Based on the fact that the prison was reportedly designed to be a high security single-celled prison, it is not understood why two-man cells in the segregation/disciplinary unit were reportedly included in the design. Single celling in segregation is as important and critical to safety and security, as single celling in general population, perhaps even more so. It is hoped that the trend toward single celling implemented at the Level Two Dayton Correctional Institution, Level Five Ohio State Penitentiary, Level Four Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, the Level Three Lebanon Correctional Institution’s Segregation Unit, and Toledo Correctional Institution’s general population, will continue in order to assist the remaining Level Three Segregation Units, and eventually all Level Three general population housing.

The inmate housing units at TOCI are designed as high-security, multi-story podular units. Each housing block (A, B and C) was designed to hold 288 inmates (single-celled) on two separate floors with two ranges of cells per floor. Each block is divided into three separate wings, with each wing holding 96 inmates, or 48 per floor. Movement within each housing block is monitored by its own control center. Unit Management officers are located within short hallways leading to each housing block.

Staff relayed on site that C Block was empty, but 288 inmates were in A Block and 288 inmates were in B Block. Staff relayed that the units are staffed with two Officers, one Control Room Officer, one Correctional Officer and one Sergeant (Correctional Counselor) for each of the two levels. General population blocks account for over 225,000 square feet of space. TOCI staff commented that on arrival, it is not uncommon for inmates to say that they do not like the constant observation of Officers at TOCI. However, staff indicated that most inmates appreciate the supervision.

The single cell arrangement at TOCI is unique among Ohio’s prisons. Although the Dayton Correctional Institution is single celled, it is a Level Two (Medium Security) facility. The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, a Level Four (Maximum Security) facility, and the Ohio State Penitentiary, a Level Five (High Maximum Security) facility, are also single celled. However, Toledo Correctional Institution is the first Level Three Ohio prison to be single celled, a major benefit to the environment and operations affecting employees as well as inmates. According to TOCI staff, after inmates experience single celling at TOCI, the inmates have mixed feelings and some reluctance when they earn a reduction in security level and transfer to a Level Two prison, which either has dormitory housing or double celling.

At TOCI, each cell has a clear window to the outside and each cell door has a glass window for viewing. According to TOCI staff, the architectural design of the institution incorporated large fans that maintain air circulation, so that the cooling system functions without air conditioning in the inmate housing wings. The temperature within all parts of the facility on the day of the inspection was comfortable. An inmate expressed appreciation for single cell housing and the air movement within the institution, which he referred to as “air conditioning.”

Inmate activity observed on the day of the inspection in the general population housing units included inmates playing cards at a picnic table in the dayroom. In addition, several inmates were in the process of doing laundry, with washing machines and dryers in operation.

DRUG SANCTION UNIT

According to the written material provided on site, A-Block is a close-security general population housing unit. However, during the inspection, A-Block included a drug-sanction unit that is staffed with two Correctional Officers and one Rover between floors. On the day of the inspection, some inmates were loud, while others quietly watched their wall-mounted televisions. A-Block contained a television on the range, as well. Washing machines and two phones for inmate use via collect calls were observed. A-Block is designed with three shower stalls at the end of the cell rows. Upon inspection, the showers were generally clean. A small amount of rust along the handrail in one of the stalls was noted. The temperature in the block was comfortable and the block was well ventilated.

A-Block inmates relayed complaints about not being allowed outside of the pod. Reportedly, they are permitted outside only to smoke, with no outside recreation. Another inmate relayed that A-Block was run like “maximum security,” while another noted that “it does no good to complain” and declined to elaborate due to the close proximity of staff members. One inmate in A-Block relayed that he tested positive for drugs, but did not receive enough time or get enough water to produce a sample. The inmate was ticketed for refusing to provide a urine sample, or cooperate with drug testing. TOCI staff relayed that inmates are given the mandatory three hours and three cups of water as cited in the Administrative Rules. If the inmate will not produce a sample, he receives a conduct report for refusal to test.

HONOR HOUSING

The Honor Housing consists of a close security pod to which 40 inmates are assigned. Among the residents in the Honor Dorm are those inmates who are participating in the Canine Training Program. Cells in the Honor Pod are like those in the other pods, but the inmates with dogs reportedly have slightly larger cells to accommodate the dog’s crate.

PROTECTIVE CONTROL

B-1 & 2 South is the only exception to the general population housing blocks, for the wing is reserved for Protective Control inmates and includes space for medical, library, unit management, and programming separate from the general population inmates. On the day of the inspection, there were 33 inmates in Protective Control (PC) with 22 white inmates and 11 black inmates, according to data observed on a large inmate tracking board in the PC pod.

B-Block in which PC is housed has a fenced entry cage with fogged glass walls to prevent seeing into the pod. Two Officers and one rover are assigned to the PC Unit. The cells in PC are kept locked except for allotted out of cell time according to the schedule. Reportedly, when one PC inmate is out of the cell, the entire PC block is locked down, to maintain local separations between inmates in PC. Inmates voiced concerns about the amount of time the block is locked down due to these local separations, and felt as though

all PC inmates were being “punished” for the separations. While the order of range separations within the PC Unit is clearly regarded as a positive, maximizing individual activity and minimizing idleness within the unit can also help to achieve the same good purposes.

A mounted television, two payphones, two benches, a pull-up bar, three washing machines, ping pong table and water fountain were observed in the PC unit. The shower area of the unit had fogged privacy walls.

At the time of the inspection, the segregation unit for PC was not in use. Reportedly, PC inmates who were assigned to segregation were removed from their regular PC cell and relocated to the regular segregation unit used for general population inmates who need to be placed in segregation.

Specialized units, such as PC and even some mental health units (RTUs) in Ohio prisons have gradually moved toward having their own segregation unit, which has definite advantages for staff and inmates by eliminating unnecessary movement. Of most importance for PC inmates, having their own segregation cells prevents them from facing personal safety problems that have been experienced elsewhere in segregation units used for non-PC inmates from general population. Because PC inmates are commonly the target of ridicule and harassment by non-PC inmates, their placement in segregation that contains non-PC inmates, including those who work as porters, handling food trays, cleaning substances, etc., can cause major problems for the PC inmate as well as the Officers assigned to the Segregation Unit.

While in the PC unit, one inmate relayed a property issue in which a Correctional Officer allegedly broke a typewriter during a cell shakedown. Another inmate in the PC unit expressed that the institution is “run too tight” citing that escorts at TOCI are more strict than at other Ohio prisons. The mission of the PC unit is to ensure the safety of the inmates who have already been determined to face verified risk of serious physical harm in population. This “tight security” appeared to be good security, which is necessary to maintain a safe environment for all.

One PC inmate noted that shift changes result in operational changes within the unit, causing inconsistent practices and expectations by staff. Such differences between shifts are commonly acknowledged system wide, yet have been known to cause extremely serious problems when left unchecked. Consistent application and enforcement of the rules are important in any housing unit, but particularly important in a PC unit where their confinement and isolation from the rest of the institution, coupled with fewer programs and activity options tend to breed conflicts affecting staff and inmates.

SEGREGATION

Per the written information provided on site, D-Block differs from the other housing blocks. D-Block 1 & 2 (lower level) is general population for 40 inmates, and includes the Operations Department and Commissary. D-Block 3 & 4 (upper level) is designed as

the segregation or disciplinary housing unit. D Block upper can reportedly house up to 95 inmates in two-man cells. It is equipped with its own outside recreation cages, and also has indoor recreation areas.

There are 96 total cells in the segregation unit, divided into four wings of 24 cells each. On the day of the inspection, 42 cells were occupied. According to count information on-site, 27 inmates were in Security Control, 14 inmates were in Local Control, and one inmate was in Disciplinary Control. Inmates from the Toledo Correctional Camp (TCC) who require segregation are housed in this unit within TOCI's segregation.

The segregation unit includes two suicide cells for use when needed. The shower area was exceptionally clean. However, some toilets were stained from what appeared to be a chemical reaction with the metal. The surface looked dull and marred, giving an unclean appearance. It was reported that inmate porters clean the area daily.

The North Side segregation unit was observed. On the day of the inspection, there were 16 inmates in the unit, ten Black and six White. The unit was loud on initial entry, but quickly quieted. Each cell in the segregation unit contained a toilet and sink, both bolted to the wall, and a bed. The unit was clean.

As mentioned above, one inmate who was in Disciplinary Control on the day of the inspection, had destroyed his cell while in segregation and was being kept in a wing of segregation, separated from all other segregation inmates. The safe cell included wire over the windows, provided no mirror, and the bed was welded to the floor.

One concern about the segregation unit was related to inmate Rules Infraction Board (RIB) hearing schedules. Specifically, inmates reported that they might be held in segregation from 10 to 14 days before their ticket is heard. Although administrative staff relayed that TOCI staff are good about monitoring how long inmates are in segregation, some TOCI staff indicated that some problems had existed with the monitoring of segregation status. Administrative staff reported that a better system is being developed to ensure that inmates are not held in segregation status any longer than they are supposed to be held. TOCI staff noted that with recent changes in the Administrative Rule and Rules Infraction Board procedures, the monitoring system was expected to further improve.

The outside recreation area for the segregation unit is a unique, separate area. Inmates are placed in individual cages and permitted to spend one hour per day in the outside recreation area. The cages are reported to be 15' x 15' x 18' and are elevated off the ground approximately five to six feet, supported by posts, with a walkway in the center, and cages on either side. An inmate porter occasionally cleans the gravel area under the cages. The top and bottom of the cages are made of the same steel grid fencing material as the sides. The top surface is open to the sky, so the inmates get natural sunlight while in the cages. The cages were bare, with no exercise equipment or other apparatus and the area is under continuous observation.

ACA Standard 44270 titled, "Exercise Outside of Cell," states that, "Written policy, procedure, and practice provide that inmates in segregation receive a minimum of one hour of exercise per day outside their cells, five days per week, unless security or safety considerations dictate otherwise." The ACA further wrote:

Inmates in segregation should be provided with the opportunity to exercise in an area designated for this purpose, with opportunities to exercise outdoors, weather permitting, unless security or safety considerations dictate otherwise. A written record should be kept of each inmate's participation in the exercise program. Reasons for the imposition of constraints should be documented.

Considering the fact that inmates in Local Control (LC) are in segregation for up to six months, outdoor exercise is extremely important to their physical and mental health, affecting their behavior, attitude and the overall environment in segregation. Thus, the extent to which inmates in segregation are provided with opportunities for exercise outside of their cell, both indoors and outdoors, can ultimately have a positive affect on inmate behavior, thus aiding the Officers who supervise Segregation. Based on outdoor recreation areas for 4B and segregation inmates at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Death Row formerly at the Mansfield Correctional Institution, segregation at other Level Three (close security) prisons, and even the new outdoor recreation area for the Level Five inmates at the Ohio State Penitentiary, it is recommended that consideration be given to maximizing the potential for real physical exercise outdoors for those in segregation.

KEY PROGRAMS

UNIT PROGRAMS

Responsible Family Life Skills

Responsible Family Life Skills is a parenting program to help inmates develop insight and understanding of their responsibilities as a parent. The goal is to help inmates develop parental awareness by examining their life from birth to present, their values and beliefs, and issues facing fathers today.

Taking Charge

Taking Charge is a semi-confidential course involving reading, writing, honesty, and self-exploration. This course is designed primarily to assist offenders in re-evaluating and rehabilitating their lives.

Victim Awareness

Victim Awareness teaches inmates the impact of crime on victims in order to heighten their understanding and awareness.

Camp K-9 Training Program

Camp K-9 is a program in which dogs from the Toledo Humane Society are housebroken and trained in basic obedience in hopes that the animals will be adopted.

Both inmates and dogs participating in the Camp K-9 Program were observed. The goal of the program is to teach basic association and obedience skills to dogs from the Lucas County Humane society so that they may be adopted into homes. Inmates must meet specific criteria to qualify for consideration in the program, including no sex offenses and no domestic violence offenses. Reportedly, inmates at ToCI, as well as other Ohio prisons, feel honored to be enrolled for participation in the highly selective program. Staff identified that one of the benefits of the K-9 program is the bonding and emotional development between inmates and their dogs. The program is provided with dogs from the Lucas County Humane Society and at the time of the inspection, six inmates were assigned a dog.

The Camp K-9 program is under the administration of a Case Manager. After inmates are selected and assigned a dog, they must maintain a daily schedule of training activities and progression with their dogs. An exercise unit is used for training purposes. An outdoor obstacle course in one of the prison's recreation yards is used to train dogs in field trial exercises and obedience. On the day of the inspection, an inmate trainer was working with his dog maneuvering through the obstacle course.

Dogs in the program reside in the assigned inmates' cell, which include a steel grid crate for kenneling the dogs. The inmate is responsible for feeding, training, grooming and all other basic needs for the dog. On the day of the inspection, several dogs were observed with their trainers.

Toastmasters International

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

Institutional Housekeeping

Institutional Housekeeping is a basic skill-building program to improve an individual's daily living habits within the institution.

Re-Entry/Community Resources

The Re-Entry/Community Resources class is conducted monthly, and is designed to make inmates aware of resources available in their community upon release from prison.

RECOVERY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Based on the information provided on site, a Recovery Services Supervisor (SASI) and three Recovery Services Counselors (SASI) are among the filled positions at TOCI. Recovery Service programs are offered through contract services with SASI, Inc., a local substance abuse programming provider.

Recovery Service Programming consists of individualized treatment, group therapy, individual counseling, motivational sessions, intensive outpatient programming, Twelve Steps meetings, Extended Care and a Relapse Prevention refresher course

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

PROGRAMS

Mental Health Services includes individual and group therapy, psychiatric evaluations, and crisis intervention. Topics include Anger Management, Stress Management, Medication Compliance, 50 and Over Offenders, and Social Skills Development

STAFFING

In addition to medical services, mental health services are also provided on contract with Correctional Medical Services (CMS). Based on the information provided on site, the following mental health positions were filled by CMS:

2 Psychiatrists
Psychologist
LSW
MH Nurse Supervisor
2 MH Secretaries
MH Records Clerk

As noted in the medical services section, 17 Registered Nurses were listed as CMS employees. Since a MH Nurse Supervisor is employed, some of the nursing positions are presumably assigned to mental health services.

It was relayed on site that a Mental Health Therapist provides counseling services for inmates at ToCI. Staff indicated that approximately 104 inmates were receiving mental health services at the time of the inspection and that typically, a majority of the inmates receive treatment for mood disorders. Staff estimated that approximately 90 percent of the inmates with mood disorders in the institution are receiving some form of mental health treatment. Approximately one-half of the mood disorder cases are reportedly related to substance abuse. Staff relayed that, while some inmates who receive mental health services may recover, and eventually do not require services, the seriously

mentally ill inmates usually receive sustained mental health treatment for the duration of their incarceration.

Staff relayed that training for new and current mental health staff includes 40 hours of mandatory training in self-defense, firearms, mental health issues and unit orientation. No staff training was in session on the day of the inspection.

Mental health statistics from all prisons are collected monthly by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Data from the September 2005 report cites the TOCI population as 776. Of that number, 680 inmates (87.6 percent) reportedly have no need for mental health services. The total Psychiatric Caseload was reported as 80, consisting of 54 inmates classified as C2 and 26 classified as C1. Those classified as C1 are determined to have Serious Mental Illness. The total mental health caseload was reported as 96, which includes the 80 on the Psychiatric Caseload, and 16 inmates classified as C3. The 96 inmates on the caseload comprise 12.4 percent of the TOCI population. According to the monthly statistical report, 18 inmates on the mental health caseload were in Segregation.

According to the Residential Treatment Unit, Segregation, and In-Patient Caseload Report for September 2005, Toledo and Allen Correctional Institutions are in the same "cluster." Since Dunn, the prisons were divided into 11 clusters, with each cluster providing the necessary levels of mental health services, including but not limited to a Residential Treatment Unit and Crisis Stabilization Unit. According to the original concept, if an inmate at one institution is determined to need placement in one of the two units cited above, but no such unit exists at his current institution, arrangements would be made for his temporary transfer to the institution within his cluster that has such a unit. Under the concept, each inmate within a cluster would have access to all levels of mental health services, without having to provide all levels at every prison.

According to the September 2005 data, the combined population of the Toledo and Allen Correctional Institutions is reported to be 2,081, which is the second smallest cluster in the prison system. The smallest is at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, which serves as its own cluster and reports a population of 1,058. The largest cluster in the prison system has a combined population of 6,899, and includes the Chillicothe Correctional Institution, Hocking Correctional Facility, Ross Correctional Institution, and Southeastern Correctional Institution.

As noted on the monthly report, the Toledo Correctional Institution has no Residential Treatment Unit for the mentally ill. Although the Allen Correctional Institution has an 80 bed Residential Treatment Unit (RTU) and is within TOCI's cluster, Allen Correctional Institution is a Level Two (Medium Security) facility, while Toledo Correctional Institution is a Level Three (Close Security) facility. According to Central Office Mental Health staff, when an inmate needs to be transferred to access an RTU, the transfer request is processed through the Bureau of Classification. It was further relayed that the Bureau assigns the inmate to a particular institution based on security level, and also takes into account any separations from other inmates, as well as RTU bed availability.

Based on communication from RTU inmates in the past, there was a previous mixing of the security levels within RTU's, which reportedly created serious difficulties for the RTU inmate patients. In most of the cases brought to the CIIC's attention, the inmates were Level Two (Medium Security) inmates who were transferred to Level Three (Close Security) Residential Treatment Units for mental health purposes. It is therefore regarded as a positive factor that the security level of the RTU is reportedly matched to the security level of the inmate RTU patient.

Based on the data provided in the monthly report for September 2005 from all institutions, there are three Level Three (Close Security) prisons with a Residential Treatment Unit, providing a total of 266 RTU beds.

**Residential Treatment Units System-wide with Beds and
Caseload in September 2005**

INSTITUTIONS WITH AN RTU	SECURITY LEVEL	RTU BEDS	RTU CASELOAD
Chillicothe CI	Two	150(136)*	0(123)*
Allen CI		80	77
Grafton CI		73	70
LEVEL TWO (MEDIUM SECURITY) SUBTOTAL		303(289)*	270
Corr Reception C	Three	106	70
Trumbull CI	Three	77	69
Warren CI	Three	83	65
LEVEL THREE (CLOSE SECURITY) SUBTOTAL		266	204
Southern Ohio CF LEVEL FOUR (MAXIMUM SECURITY)	Four	80	74
Ohio Reformatory for Women	All	74	40

*In regard to the Chillicothe Correctional Institution, zero RTU caseload was reported on the Bureau of Mental Health Services monthly report. However, CCI staff were contacted and their report data submitted to the Bureau of Mental Health Services reportedly shows an RTU caseload of 123 for September 2005. Further, although the BMH monthly report shows that CCI has 150 RTU beds, CCI staff relayed that they have 136 RTU beds. The institution staff who enter the monthly data on the computer

reportedly are not provided with a copy of the system-wide report on all institutions. If the system-wide report was in fact shared with such staff, they would be able to check the data to identify any errors, and therefore ensure that the system-wide report is totally accurate, and thus useful for monitoring, needs assessment and planning purposes.

The September 2005 mental health monthly report provides information on the number of inmates in segregation and the number in segregation that are on the mental health caseload. According to the report, there were 49 inmates in segregation at Toledo Correctional Institution, and eight of the inmates in segregation were on the caseload, comprising 16 percent of the segregation census. This is one of the lowest numbers and percentages of mentally ill in segregation among the prisons, which is an extremely positive acknowledgement. System-wide, there were 423 mentally ill in segregation on the last day of September 2005, comprising 27 percent of those in segregation. Chillicothe Correctional Institution had the largest number of mentally ill in segregation, comprising 47 percent of their inmates in segregation.

Number of Mentally Ill Inmates in Segregation with Percentage of Segregation Population that are Mentally Ill in September 2005

PRISON	NUMBER OF MENTALLY ILL INMATES IN SEGREGATION	PERCENTAGE OF INMATES IN SEGREGATION WHO ARE MENTALLY ILL
NorthEast Pre-Release	3	100%
Chillicothe CI	37	47%
Allen CI	16	46%
Ohio Ref for Women	31	46%
Warren CI	34	38%
Trumbull CI	18	37%
Richland CI	21	36%
S. Ohio Corr Facility	24	35%
S. Eastern CI	24	31%
London CI	22	29%
Grafton CI	7	28%
N. Central CI	17	27%
Marion CI	11	26%
Ross CI	31	24%
Madison CI	14	23%
Lebanon CI	32	23%
Corr Recept Center	7	23%
Mansfield CI	19	21%
Pickaway CI	12	16%
Toledo CI	8	16%
Noble CI	12	15%
Belmont CI	0/13*	0/15%*
Lake Erie CI	6	14%
North Coast CTF	1	13%
Lorain CI	2	6%
Ohio State Pen	1	5%
Hocking CF	0	0
Dayton CI	0	0
Montgomery EPRC	0	0
Corr Medical Center	0	0
Franklin PRC	0	0
TOTAL SYSTEM	410 (423)**	27%

*The system wide monthly report shows Belmont CI with zero in segregation for the month, zero on the caseload in segregation, and zero percent in segregation on the caseload. Per phone inquiry to the institution, it was relayed that their reports show that there were 86 inmates in segregation at the end of the month, and 13 inmates on the mental health caseload in segregation at the end of the month. Clearly there is a need for careful monitoring of the accuracy of the BMH data. Only the errors that were immediately apparent are noted in this section, after contacting the BMH and the pertinent institutions.

** The total in the report is cited as 410, but the new total with the 13 added from Belmont CI is 423.

System wide mental health data from June 2005 was also reviewed. With a population of 776 in June 2005, there were 91 inmates at TOCI on the mental health caseload, comprising 11.7 percent of the total population. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported having 28 inmates classified as C1, or "Seriously Mentally Ill." They had 48 inmates classified as C2, or on the Psychiatric Caseload, but not "Seriously Mentally Ill" and 15 inmates classified as C3, or on the general Mental Health Caseload, with a mental health diagnosis and treatment plan. The Psychiatric Caseload is comprised of inmates classified as C1 and C2, thus the total Psychiatric Caseload at TOCI in June 2005 was 76. The Total Mental Health Caseload contains all three classifications, making the Total Caseload 91.

For comparative purposes, the Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW) had the highest total Psychiatric Caseload (C1+C2) with 643 inmates. With an institution population of 1,875, the mentally comprised 34.9 percent of the ORW population. The Chillicothe Correctional Institution ranked second highest of the Ohio prisons, and first among the prisons for men, with a total Psychiatric Caseload of 448. With CCI's population of 2,734, the mentally ill comprise 16.4 percent of their population. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 26th in total Psychiatric Caseloads of all Ohio prisons.

Mental Health Caseload System-wide as of June 2005.

Institution	Total Psych Caseload	Total Caseload	C1	C2	C3	Institution Population	RTU Population
Ohio Ref for Women	643	734	349	294	91	1,875	0
Chillicothe CI	448	466	261	187	18	2,734	0*
Mansfield CI	422	478	166	256	56	2,365	0
Belmont CI	344	427	215	129	83	2,184	0
Noble CI	335	394	256	79	59	2,139	0
Pickaway CI	334	343	204	130	9	1,874	0
Richland CI	312	341	170	142	29	2,294	0
Madison CI	308	343	184	124	35	1,958	0
N. Central CI	307	350	92	215	43	2,295	0
Southeastern CI	300	310	119	181	10	1,589	0
Corr Recept C	292	300	189	103	8	1,795	78
Allen CI	273	316	191	82	43	1,309	69
S. Ohio Corr	256	273	129	127	17	982	54
Trumbull CI	246	285	110	136	39	1,204	0
London CI	240	206	110	130	66	2,015	0
Warren CI	235	244	175	60	9	1,042	57
NE Pre Release	230	252	118	112	22	514	0
Ross CI	224	290	114	110	66	2,255	0
Lebanon CI	222	285	110	112	63	1,980	0
Marion CI	212	240	65	147	28	1,765	0
Franklin PR	208	216	143	65	8	467	0
Grafton CI	190	206	141	49	16	1,391	63
Lake Erie CI	152	175	89	63	23	1,384	0
Hocking CF	95	96	47	48	1	469	0
Lorain CI	93	110	63	30	17	1,510	0
Toledo CI	76	91	28	48	15	776	0
Oakwood CF	63	63	63	0	0	121	0
N. Coast CTF	33	71	16	22	33	542	0
Corr Medical C	25	25	18	7	0	109	0
Ohio State Pen	8	10	1	7	2	468	0
Dayton CI	0	2	0	0	2	420	0
Montg.Educ/PR	0	3	0	0	3	349	0
TOTAL	7,126	8,045	3,936	3,195	914	44,174	321*

*Zero population was reported for Chillicothe Correctional Institution's Residential Treatment Unit population, which is definitely inaccurate. The BMH staff communication relayed that they compile the data based on data entered by the institutions on DOTS (Departmental Offender Tracking System). In the previous errors noted above, the institutions insist that their data is accurate as entered on DOTS.

ATTEMPTED SUICIDES:

As of September 2005, the Toledo Correctional Institution has logged six suicide attempts in 2005. Two of the attempts occurred in January. One attempt was made in June. Two attempts occurred in July, and one attempt was made in September 2005. System-wide, there were 115 suicide attempts in 2005, from a low of seven attempts in May to 20 attempts in August. The number of suicide attempts at TOCI rank sixth in system wide, the same as the number of attempts at the Oakwood Correctional Facility. The largest number of attempts occurred at the Correctional Reception Center, with 20. Six institutions reported no suicide attempts thus far in 2005, including the Warren Correctional Institution, which is a Level Three (Close Security) prison.

Number of Suicide Attempts from January through September 2005 by Institution

INSTITUTION	NUMBER
Correctional Reception C	20
Chillicothe CI	14
Ohio Ref for Women	12
Southern Ohio CF	8
Southeastern CI	7
Toledo CI	6
Oakwood CF	6
Madison CI	5
Ohio State Penitentiary	4
Lebanon CI	4
Mansfield CI	3
Trumbull CI	3
Richland CI	3
Ross CI	3
London CI	2
North Central CI	2
Grafton CI	2
Pickaway CI	2
Lorain CI	2
Allen CI	1
Belmont CI	1
Dayton CI	1
Franklin PRC	1
Lake Erie CI	1
Noble CI	1
Northeast PRC	1
Corrections Medical Cntr	0
Hocking CF	0
Marion CI	0
Montgomery Ed PRC	0
North Coast Corr TF	0
Warren CI	0
TOTAL	115

EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

According to the written material provided on site, the following positions were among those employed at the Toledo Correctional Institution:

Teacher – ABE
 Teacher – ABE
 Teacher – GED
 Vocational Teacher
 Vocational Teacher

Additional staff positions related to the apprenticeships and vocational programs cited below, are also among the list of filled positions. However, the positions could well be unrelated to any vocational program due to the need for their services in the institution's daily operation and maintenance needs.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Educational Programs include Adult Basic Education (ABE), Pre-GED, and GED (High School) level courses, as well as Advanced Job Training through Owens Community College. Apprenticeships are available for the following positions: Cook, Baker, HVAC, Electrician, Electronics Technician, and Plumber. Vocational Programs reported as pending at the time of the inspection included Automated Office Technology, Cabling and Resilient. According to the Ohio Central School System Monthly Enrollment Report for October 2005, seven apprenticeships were reported for the year to date. It is further reported that 23 participated in Advanced Job Training in the month. The following data was reported for June 2005.

Enrollment Data Reported on TOCI Monthly Report for June 2005

Academic	June 2005	Under Age 22	Year To Date Enrollment	Waiting List*	Completers Year To Date**
GED	48	8	114	27	8
Pre-GED	17	1	64	25	31
Literacy	0	0	0	0	0
ABLE	10	0	57	27	17
GED Evening	0	0	0	0	0
HS OR HS Options	0	0	0	0	0
Total	75	9	235	79	56

*Waiting List refers to requests for enrollment, not yet participating.

**Year To Date is the cumulative total from the fiscal start on July 1. Data was extracted from the Year to Date totals for the June 2005 reports.

The education unit at the Toledo Correctional Institution operates in an area that includes several classrooms accessible from several main hallways. Words of positive encouragement and sayings to affirm the value of learning and education were observed over the doorways of most classrooms and on selected walls in the education area.

It was reported that three teachers are employed at the Toledo Correctional Institution, and one teacher at the adjacent Toledo Correctional Camp. On the day of the inspection, there were no classes being held in the education unit. When class is in session, inmates attend from 8 am to 10:15 am, and from 1:15 pm to 3:15 pm.

Staff indicated that the core education programming at TOCI consists of provisions for the completion of the General Education Development (GED) requirements, with both Adult Basic Education and Literacy Education (ABLE) and GED programs offered. To recognize the achievement of inmates who completed their GED, a diploma is painted on the wall, with the name of the recipient. A minimum camp inmate completed the paintings. At the time of the inspection, there was no waiting list to enter the GED course of study. Per institution staff, new and up-to-date educational materials and textbooks were being utilized and were available to the students. The primary GED classroom also contained computers for inmate use, as well.

Extended Education Programming

According to TOCI staff, extended education programming at ToCI includes Toastmasters, Parenthood, Anger Management, Drug Recovery Services and African Affairs. Some of these programs qualify as rehabilitative education. The African Affairs program is taught by the Warden and consists of ten weeks of classes on the history, culture, government and international relations of African civilization. According to the Warden, the class has been successful. In the future, he hopes to include staff members. A Case Manager aids the class by serving as a facilitator.

Administrative staff indicated that inmate attitude is the biggest hurdle faced in the education unit at the Toledo Correctional Institution. Reportedly, the older inmates seem to be the most reluctant to engage in educational endeavors. Staff communicated some hope that by changing inmates' attitudes through the availability of additional and varied vocational programs, inmates' motivation to learn and desire to acquire new skills will increase. Historical problems of inmate idleness and inmate preference for recreation over education were cited as ongoing challenges at TOCI.

LIBRARY

Based on the information provided on site, one Librarian is among the list of filled positions at TOCI.

The library was bright with numerous tables and chairs. The CIIC Memo regarding the reopening of the CIIC office was posted in the library. According to the library staff,

TOCI subscribes to most major Ohio newspapers and the majority of the stock is fiction. The library was equipped with Administrative Rules and ODRC Policies.

Inmates are assigned to attend optional library schedules. On the day of the inspection, approximately six inmates were in the library. It was relayed that there are “regulars” that frequent the library, while some inmates show no interest. TOCI staff relayed that no materials are available for illiterate inmates. However, TOCI cited a goal to start a book-on-tape project for non-readers and to involve more volunteers in inmate literacy programs.

The law library is connected to the main library area by a doorway. On the day of the inspection, several inmates were looking at legal materials. One inmate relayed issues related to the policy for copying legal work, the length of time taken to copy documents, and postage for legal mail.

One inmate relayed that the ACA Standards are not available to inmates at TOCI. Knowledge of the ACA Standards via access to the written Standards by TOCI staff and inmates should be encouraged. Placement of the Standards in the library along with the DRC policies and Administrative Rules could serve good purposes, consistent with the ACA accreditation commitment. The Standards should be equally accessible to TOCI employees.

OHIO PENAL INDUSTRIES (OPI) PLASTIC BAG SHOP

According to the OPI Correctional Industries website, Ohio Penal Industries (“OPI”) is a division of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, dedicated to preparing prisoners for life after incarceration by providing industrial training and instilling positive work habits. It is further reported that OPI works with institution staff to ensure that inmates learn the importance of employee accountability, pride in job performance, and the ability to work with peers, and to work productively under strict supervision.

The OPI shop at the Toledo Correctional Institution consists of a 5,500 square foot Plastic Bag Factory for the manufacture of trashcan liners for use in Ohio’s state parks and other state-used property, such as facilities that house state agencies.

On the day of the inspection no operations were in progress in the plastic bag shop. Reportedly, when in operation, 17 inmate workers manufacture the bags using one machine. TOCI has a goal of doubling the number of inmates in the program and adding a second machine, but no timeframe was provided for the proposed expansion of the program.

The bag shop had only recently received a permit to operate, but operations were not in progress as of the day of the inspections.

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Through a cooperative arrangement with Owens Community College, vocational Associate Degrees are offered at the Toledo Correctional Institution. Among the educational programs offered through Owens Community College is an Associate Degree in Business Management. This program had approximately 15 students enrolled at the time of the inspection.

Vocational programs in formation at the time of the inspection were Automated Office Technology (AOT) program, and industrial training associated with the Ohio Penal Industries (OPI) Plastic Bag Shop operations. A new classroom was being outfitted with workstations and computers for the AOT course of study. The TOCI staff expressed a desire to expand the vocational offerings to include culinary arts, computer wiring and drywall vocations.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES PROGRAMS

According to the list of filled positions at TOCI, one Chaplain is on the staff. The Religious Services Department provides Sabbath services and religious studies for Catholic, Islamic, Jehovah Witness, Jewish and Protestants. Religious services programs consist of the following:

- **Gaining Recovery at Christ's Expense (G.R.A.C.E.):** The Program addresses self-control, addictive behaviors, moral development and personal choices.
- **The Prison Evangelism Explosion Program:** The Program uses Scripture to help individuals to gain confidence in their relationship with God.
- **Kairos Prayer and Share Program:** The program is a follow-up program to Kairos.

The chapel is under the direction of the institution's Chaplain. Staff relayed that the Chaplain has been an active agent in recruiting local volunteers in programs such as KAIROS and re-entry programming. According to TOCI staff, the KAIROS program is a successful program in initiating or supporting life changes in inmates.

A group of five Muslim inmates were observed sitting in a circle on the chapel floor in religious discussion. An Imam, under contract at the Toledo Correctional Institution was leading the group.

During the inspection, a calendar of activities for the month in the TOCI Religious Services Department showed the following:

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Protestant Worship Solid Rock Church	Music Preparation	Bible Study AA Meeting	Jehovah Witness Study Catholic Mass PC Service	Taleem Kairos P/S NA Meeting	Jummah	
Protestant Worship		Bible Study AA Meeting	Jehovah Witness Study Catholic Mass PC Service	Taleem Kairos P/S NA Meeting	Jummah Prayer	Islamic Study
Protestant Worship Kairos ReUnion	Music Preparation	Bible Study AA Meeting	Jehovah Witness Study Catholic Mass PC Service	Taleem Kairos P/S NA Meeting	Jummah	
Protestant Worship St. James COGIC	Music Preparation	FB ReEntry AA Meeting	Jehovah Witness Study Catholic Mass PC Service	Taleem Kairos P/S NA Meeting	Jummah Prayer	Islamic Study
Protestant Worship Abundant Pardon Ministry		AA Meeting	Jehovah Witness Study Catholic Mass	Taleem Kairos P/S NA Meeting	Jummah	

COMMUNITY SERVICES PROJECTS

The following community services projects were reported in the written material provided on site:

- Chair Refurbishing- Little Sisters of the Poor
- Reading in Visiting Room- Ohio Reads
- Workbook Collating and Flashcard Making- Sherman Elementary
- Dog Rescue/Obedience Program- Toledo/Lucas County Humane Society
- Bulk Mailing- City of Toledo
- Ridgewood Church of Christ

- Adopt-a-Highway
- Habitat for Humanity

PLANNED PROJECTS

At the time of the inspection, the following community services projects were in the planning stage:

Books on Tape for schools and/or Vision Center	Local senior centers- clean up
Renovation for Toledo Area Humane Society	Litter Control- ODOT
Repair agility equipment for TAHS	Making dog leads for TAHS
Lucas County Metroparks clean up	Crayons to Computers
Cleaning football equipment for local boosters	

UNIQUE PROGRAMS

According to the TOCI website, Toastmasters International and Hope for Youth are cited as unique programs. Toastmasters International is also listed above as one of the Unit Programs.

HOPE FOR YOUTH

Hope for Youth is an inmate-produced magazine aimed at helping struggling youth to stay out of prison through words of wisdom, support and advice.

TOASTMASTERS INTERNATIONAL

As a branch of the Toastmasters International Club, this program is aimed at building one's communication and presentation skills. Members learn by speaking and working with others in a supportive environment. The program is also listed above under unit programming.

RECREATION PROGRAM

Based on the information provided on site on filled positions, TOCI has one Activity Therapy Administrator and one Activity Therapist. Such positions are typically assigned to the Recreation Department. The Recreation Department is located at the north end of the first floor of the Administration Building. The area comprises over 6,900 square feet of indoor space, and includes access to a large outdoor recreational yard that includes one softball diamond, one handball court, two half-size basketball courts and one full basketball court. Recreation services include basketball, volleyball, ping-pong, board games, isometric exercise equipment, a music program, and arts and crafts.

On the day of the inspection, more than a dozen inmates, some operating heavy machinery, were in the process of constructing three sets of bleachers for viewing the

softball diamond, additional sidewalks and some water fountains. All inmates were working with staff supervision. The yard was very clean.

The outside recreation programming includes inmate softball leagues that are played using regulation aluminum bats and softballs. A unique feature in the outdoor recreation area is a wall with four cigarette lighters installed, so that inmates may smoke while in the yard without the use of hand-held lighters. Visible from the yard are many of the long narrow cell windows, which do not open, a feature that eliminates the possibility of trash being thrown into the recreation yard.

Administrative staff relayed that inmates are given at least two one-hour recreation periods (AM or PM) throughout the day. Recreation is provided one block at a time, according to a rotating schedule. Each block of inmates take turns on an assigned basis to spend time in the yard.

Two Officers per shift (6 AM to 2 PM and 2 PM to 10 pm) are assigned to the yard during recreation periods. Normally, one Officer is in the yard with the inmates and one Officer is at the entrance of the yard. Staff relayed that while there have been fights and these incidents have not involved any weapons, nor have they produced serious injuries, additional security staff may be justified for this area. This is due to the fact that the recreation yard could potentially have as many as 350-400 inmates at any given time. Administrative staff relayed that to offset the ratio of staff to inmates, the administrative staff commonly visit the yard during recreation periods.

In addition to the large yard, the institution has two smaller yards with chairs and tables. One of the two smaller yards is equipped with hurdles and other obstacle equipment for use with the canine field trial training that some inmates engage in with their dogs.

Inmates may also take part in recreational activities through the use of the large gym. Spectator stands were observed on one side of the gym, with two exercise bicycles, a pull-up bar, weight equipment and a leg lift machine on the other side. Adjacent to the gym were multiple shower stalls, a storage room for recreation equipment, and a musical instrument room that was organized and well maintained. Inmates may access the gym during multiple periods throughout the day, primarily from 8:00 to 9:00 AM and 9:00 to 10 AM. Staff relayed that inmates conduct musical concerts once each quarter. The air in the gym was somewhat stuffy on the day of the inspection.

ENTRY BUILDING

On arrival at TOCI, all staff and visitors must enter through the Front Entry Building. The facility is approximately 3,900 square feet and houses the institutional mail and package room, separate visitor and staff check-in stations, and visitor restroom facilities.

Two Correctional Officers were assigned to the Front Entry Building. They were friendly, courteous and organized. Proper screening procedures were followed. A supervised inmate worker was observed buffing the floors in the entry building.

INSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS

The front yard and institutional grounds of the Toledo Correctional Institution were observed. The landscape was attractive and well maintained. The outside entrance area included flowers, and the yard was free of debris. Level One (Minimum Security) inmate workers were busy with assigned duties, including tending to the landscaping.

VISITING ROOM

The visiting room, available for visits that are scheduled by appointment two days in advance, was visible through a glass pane. The room was observable to Officers from an elevated observation booth with tinted glass windows for one-way visibility. The visiting room consisted of folding chairs and numerous food and beverage vending machines. The visiting room area is bordered by non-contact booths, attorney rooms, and a shakedown/inmate processing room. Inmates are able to meet with visitors directly, without the separation from a wall or window, for contact visits. An area is provided with toys and books for children who visit. On the day of the inspection, several inmates and family members were observed in the visiting area.

According to the TOCI website, the Main Compound's visiting room is closed every Monday and Tuesday and reservations are required. All close security inmates are allowed visitors on Wednesday through Sunday from 8 am to 11:30 am or 12 pm to 3:15 pm. Level One (Minimum Security) inmates are allowed visitation on Friday through Monday, 8 am to 11:30 am or 12 pm to 3:15 pm. The visiting room is closed Tuesday through Thursday and reservations are required.

FOOD SERVICES

Per the list of filled positions provided on site, the Food Services Department has four Food Service Managers and 10 Food Service Coordinators.

As noted in written information provided on site, Inmate Food Services consists of two dining halls, each equipped with stainless steel security tables to seat 120 inmates each. There are separate dump stations and a fully operational kitchen. Food Services covers approximately 10,102 square feet. The Officers Dining Room (ODR) is located across the hall from the main kitchen entrance and seats 86 staff.

Food Services staff and inmates were actively involved in meal preparation duties. The kitchen was clean and appeared to be well maintained. Though a small amount of water was observed on the floor, the area exceeded expectations considering the fact that they were in the midst of meal preparation.

The layout of the kitchen included large central chop, mix and food-handling counters and several industrial-sized ovens for food preparation. Around the perimeter of the kitchen were the refrigerators and dishwashers. Except for one kettle that was labeled

“out of order,” the kitchen appeared to be fully functioning. According to institution staff, the facility has had no problems in getting kitchen equipment repaired or replaced.

Several Food Services staff were introduced including the Food Services Manager, Food Services Coordinator and Correctional Officers assigned to Food Services. It was relayed that Food Services operates with one full time Manager, one part time Manager, one Coordinator, three to four additional civilian Food Services workers and two Officers.

Historically, Ohio prisons have typically assigned large numbers of inmates to work in Food Services. It was not unusual for an institution to report having 200 or more inmate Food Service workers. However, that trend may be changing, and the change serves good purposes. The difficulties of meeting staff supervision needs for such a large number of workers are lessened with a reduced number of workers. The reduced number of Food Service workers provides less of a drain on other job assignments and opportunities.

At the Toledo Correctional Institution, there are reportedly only 20-25 inmates involved at a time in Food Services, depending on the production needed for various menu items. According to Food Services staff, cross training in food preparation and kitchen work is the normal mode of operation, so that inmates may acquire skills that are transferable to jobs upon an inmate’s release from prison.

Inmates workers assigned to Food Services appeared to be actively engaged in a production task under the supervision of Correctional Officers. No inmates in the kitchen appeared to be idle. All inmates were observed wearing hats and gloves for sanitary purposes. Two inmates commented that they like working in Food Services. Administrative staff at TOCI relayed that they attempt to assure that inmates assigned to Food Services have no objections to the assignment and do not perceive it as a form of punishment.

The inmate-dining hall was also observed. The dining hall is divided by a multi-paned glass wall, which separates the area so that two food distribution lines can flow simultaneously. All trays at TOCI are distributed to inmates via “blind” serving. This approach was also observed at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. A partition with tempered glass is located along the serving line, so that inmate Food Services workers cannot see who will be receiving the tray that is being prepared. This prevents tampering or favoritism in dishing out the food to inmates. “Blind” serving is clearly viewed as a positive feature.

Meals are served at the precise times of 6:30 am, 11:30 am, and 4:30 am. Lunch was served from the blind serving line. The menu consisted of a pork chop, potatoes, carrots, three slices of bread, butter and a beverage. The flavor and texture of the food was generally good with a satisfactory food temperature. Inmates are issued a plastic fork and spoon, which caused some difficulty in cutting the pork chop, since no knives are provided for security reasons. Some inmates resorted to picking up the item with their hands. One inmate noted that the food portions could be larger, while other inmates stated that the food is usually relatively good.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL SERVICES

Medical and Dental services at the Toledo Correctional Institution are provided on contract by an independent vendor, Correctional Medical Services (CMS). The medical area serves both medical and dental needs of inmates. Inmates may request services through five daily sick call sign-ups. At the time of the inspection there were 35 employees on the medical staff, with no vacant positions. The medical staff included five nurses. According to the Health Care Administrator, the medical unit operates with all the equipment needed.

The medical and dental services area appeared clean, sanitary and uncluttered. The area consisted of rooms with large half wall glass windows that opened into a central hallway. Doors are opened through the control center. Six holding cells serve as recovery/infirmary rooms for inmates after being seen by the physician in one of three total exam rooms. In addition, there are two crisis or safe cells that include a shower, sink, toilet and two positive airflow chambers. On the day of the inspection, three of the six holding cells were occupied.

The Dental Examination Room is complete with three dental chairs. It was reported that dental care is delivered on a scheduled basis as needed five days a week from 8 am to 5 pm. On the day of the inspection, one inmate was receiving dental care from the Dentist and a Dental Hygienist.

MEDICAL INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICAL SUMMARY

In a review of the July 2005 Medical Institution Statistical Summary for TOCI, it was noted that although other ODRC prisons report the number of hours that each staff person worked in the month, the report from TOCI provides the number of staff. Further, although TOCI medical services are in fact all provided on a contractual basis, the following "Civil Service Staff Summary" was reported for TOCI in July 2005:

Civil Service Staff Summary

RN	8
LPN	3
Physician	1.5
Health Care Administrator	1
Dentist	1
Ancillary Dental Staff	1
Pharmacy Technician	1
X-Ray Technician	0.3
Lab Technician	0
Clerical	0
Hospital Aide	0
Pharmacist	0
Total Medical Staff	16.8

Pharmacy

According to Pharmacy data for the month, the following is reported:

Prescriptions Filled

New Prescriptions	520
Prescription Refills	294
Psychotropic Prescriptions	83
Controlled Med Scripts	0
Total	1,052

Based on the staff list provided above, no Pharmacist was reported to be on staff. Further, no Pharmacist was reported to be among the contractual staff specified below. However, the monthly report provides data on the volume of prescriptions filled in the month, a total of 1,052 prescriptions. Although the above list includes one Pharmacy Technician, by Statute, a Pharmacist must be physically present to supervise any Pharmacy Technician, and such Technicians may not, according to state law, substitute for the services of a Pharmacist.

Contractual Staff Utilization

Based on the monthly institutional report, all “Contractual Staff Utilization” including RN, LPN, Physician, Dentist, Ancillary Dental Staff, Pharmacist, Pharmacy Technician, X-Ray Technician, Lab Technician, Clerical, were reported as zero. The Institutional population was also reported as zero, which of course is incorrect.

Based on the written information provided on site, the following medical positions were filled by CMS employees. Additional CMS positions are listed in the mental health section of this report.

Healthcare Administrator
 Nursing Supervisor
 17 R.N.s
 2 Physicians
 Optometrist
 Dentist
 Dental Asst.
 Dietician
 X-Ray Tech
 Pharmacy Tech
 Clerk

PRIMARY HEALTH CARE

Intake Screenings

According to the monthly report, in July 2005, intake screenings by Nurses and a Physician were provided to 34 inmates at TOCI.

Sick Call

Also per the monthly institutional report, Nurse's Screenings for General Population inmates were primarily on the First Shift, with 420 reported in July 2005. The remainder consisted of 62 on Second Shift and 25 on Third Shift. A total of 554 inmates were seen on Nurses Sick Call in the month. Of that number, 20 inmates were referred to see a Physician.

Physician appointments for Doctor's Sick Call consisted of 269 scheduled visits, with four "no shows," and five emergent add on appointments.

Segregation Screenings for Nurses Sick Call in the month totaled 1,206 on Second Shift, 1,199 on First Shift, and 34 on Third Shift. However, Nurse's Sick Call in the month only totaled 20, with 13 seen on site in segregation by a Physician.

Emergency Triage

According to Emergency Triage statistics, a Nurse screened nine inmates, and a Physician treated three inmates on site at TOCI. Five inmates were sent to the local Emergency Room, with four admitted to the local hospital. Two staff in the month received emergency treatment.

Infirmary

Regarding Infirmary Care, 30 infirmary bed days were reported in the month.

Dental Care

In July 2005, Dental Care was provided to 164 inmates who were seen by appointment. An additional seven inmates were seen on an emergent basis, with a total of 171 inmates seen.

Specialty Care

Regarding on site Specialty Care via Telemedicine, 15 inmates were provided services in July 2005 as follows:

Specialty Care on Site – Telemedicine

Other	6
Internal Medicine	3
Surgery	2
Cardiovascular	2
Pulmonary	1
Infectious Disease	1
Nutrition	0
Total	15

According to the monthly statistical report, the Optometrist saw 24 inmates in the month. It was also reported that the Podiatrist did not see any inmates in the month.

Infectious Disease Data

The July medical report data shows that five inmates and 30 staff were given a TB test in the month, with none positive. It was also reported that one inmate was on INH and that no inmates at TOCI have TB disease. According to the report, 11 inmates at TOCI are HIV positive. No inmates were newly diagnosed as HIV positive in the month. Nine inmates were reported to be on Protease Inhibitors.

LAUNDRY/QUARTERMASTER

The inmate laundry and quartermaster are located just outside of the recreation complex and comprise 4,400 square feet of space. The cleaning, repair, inventory, and distribution of inmate clothing, uniforms and bedding takes place in the laundry and quartermaster areas. The laundry/quartermaster areas were clean and quiet. Separate washing machines and dryers were observed in individual blocks.

Administrative staff relayed that approximately 40 new inmates a month are issued clothing and linens from the Quartermaster. Once issued, the sizes may be exchanged through the Quartermaster, as well. The Quartermaster had seven inmate workers from the main compound, and three inmate workers from the neighboring camp. The Quartermaster had no civilian staff.

COMMISSARY

The commissary at TOCI is a large, completely caged area that resembles a warehouse. The commissary is a “no talking” area of the institution. The silence is regarded as positive, because at some institutions, talking in the commissary lines has been so loud that inmates have complained that they could not hear to process their purchase orders. A thumbprint/inkpad security system is in place for entry at TOCI.

Administrative staff relayed that while there is no rule requiring inmates to use all acquired commissary items by a specific date, or risk it becoming contraband, there is a system of cell shakedowns at TOCI. If it is believed that an inmate is running a “store” from their cell, that inmate receives a warning that there will be a weekly shakedown of his cell. As necessary, cell shakedowns are conducted in part to stop dealing activity among inmates. If an inmate is caught “running a store” out of his cell, disciplinary action is taken. Staff indicated that the system appears to be effective, citing that in one incident, an inmate dealer was placed in the honor dorm because no other inmates in the honor dorm would risk their placement there by dealing with him and buying from his store.

USE OF FORCE

In the CIIC Biennial Report of January 2005, a breakdown of use of force incidents by institution for November 2004 was provided. Although six institutions provided no data, the remainder ranged from no incidents at the Franklin Pre-Release Center, to the high of 40 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

The Toledo Correctional Institution had only five total incidents in the month, among the lowest in the system. There were 14 prisons with more use of force incidents in the month than TOCI. Three of the TOCI incidents involved Black inmates, and two involved White inmates. Four were logged as “slight use of force,” and one was assigned to a Use of Force Committee for investigation. Of the four incidents of slight force, two involved Black inmates, and two involved White inmates.

The following data was taken from monthly reports from TOCI from January 2005 through September 2005

**Use of Force Incidents Per Month at TOCI from
January through September 2005 with Racial Breakdown**

USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS INCLUDING “SLIGHT FORCE”					USE OF FORCE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS			
MONTH	Black	White	Other	Total	Black	White	Other	Total
January	9	6	0	15	4	2	0	6
February	2	1	0	3	1	1	0	2
March	7	1	1	9	1	1	1	3
April	1	3	0	4	0	1	0	1
May	1	2	0	3	0	2	0	2
June	2	1	2	5	1	0	1	2
July	2	8	1	11	0	3	0	3
August	5	4	0	9	0	3	0	3
September	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
Total	29	28	4	61	7	15	2	24
Percent	47.5%	46.0%	6.5%	100%	29.2%	62.5	8.3	100%
Average Per Month	3	3	0	7	0	1	0	2
Monthly Range	0-9	1-8	0-2	2-15	0-4	0-3	0-1	1-6

The above use of force data from January through September 2005 at TOCI shows that in all, there were 61 use of force incidents at TOCI in the nine month period, ranging from two to 15 incidents per month, with an average of seven per month. January had the largest number of incidents at 15, followed by July with 11 incidents.

Of the 61 use of force incidents, 24 incidents (39 percent) were referred to the Use of Force Investigating Committee to determine if the force was authorized and not excessive. An average of two per month, with a monthly range of from one to six such incidents were referred to the Use of Force Committee for investigation.

Considering again the November 2004 data system-wide, in which TOCI had a total of five incidents in the month, 14 other prisons had total use of force incidents ranging from seven each at the Warren Correctional Institution and Correctional Medical Center, to 40 incidents at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The Ross Correctional Institution ranked second highest, with 31 incidents in the month, followed by the Lebanon Correctional Institution with 28 incidents. The Belmont and Mansfield Correctional Institution had 14 and 13 incidents respectively. Based on the November 2004 data, Lorain, Toledo and Trumbull Correctional Institutions had the lowest number of incidents of the Level Three (Close) security institutions. The Ross, Lebanon, and Mansfield Correctional Institutions, also Level Three facilities, ranked second, third and fifth highest in the system.

CONDUCT REPORTS

The TOCI monthly use of force data includes the number of disciplinary reports with a breakdown by race of the inmate who received the conduct report. A review of data from the reports for January through September 2005 was made with the following results:

Conduct Reports at TOCI from January through September 2005 by Race

Month	Black	White	Other	Total
January	96	58	0	154
February	56	27	0	83
March	84	46	1	131
April	78	49	3	130
May	72	65	3	140
June	91	44	4	139
July	110	84	4	198
August	*	*	*	*
September	72	63	0	135
Total	659	436	15	1,110
Percent	59.4%	39.2%	1.4%	100%
Monthly Average	82	55	2	139
Monthly Range	56-110	27-84	0-4	83-198

*Data for the month of August was not reported. Monthly averages are figured for an eight-month period.

System-wide data on conduct reports by race at each institution in November 2004 was provided in the CIIC Biennial Report. During that period, with 23 prisons reporting, there were 7,935 conduct reports written, an average of 345 per prison. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported 174 conduct reports in November 2004. The specific number at each prison ranged from a low of 13 at the Hocking Correctional Facility to a high of 1,139 at the North Central Correctional Institution. Of the 23 reporting institutions, 16 prisons had more conduct reports written in the month than the Toledo Correctional Institution.

CIIC DATABASE

CONTACTS

The CIIC database for January 6, 2004 to December 31, 2004 shows that 63 contacts were received from or regarding the Toledo Correctional Institution in the period. A total of 1,789 contacts were received system-wide. Contacts regarding TOCI comprised 3.5 percent of all contacts. The largest number of contacts in the period was from or in regard to the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 285 contacts comprising 15.9 percent of the contacts.

A review was made of the number of contacts received by CIIC system-wide from January 1, 2005 to October 17, 2005. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 15th with 41 contacts. A larger number of contacts was received from 13 other Ohio prisons, ranging from 44 contacts from or regarding the Allen Correctional Institution, and 44 contacts from or regarding Other (Jails), to 207 contacts from or regarding the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Sixteen Ohio prisons had fewer contacts than the Toledo Correctional Institution, ranging from one contact from the Northeast Pre Release Center, to 40 from the Richland Correctional Institution. The CIIC received a total of 1,444 contacts system-wide, with TOCI comprising 2.8 percent of all contacts.

Number of Contacts Received by CIIC from January 1, 2005 through October 17, 2005 by Institution

Institution	Number of Contacts	Percent
Southern Ohio Corr Facility	207	14.3%
Madison Corr Institution	89	6.2
North Central Corr Institution	86	5.9
Marion Corr Institution	84	5.8
Warren Corr Institution	81	5.6
Chillicothe Corr Institution	76	5.3
Mansfield Corr Institution	68	4.7
Pickaway Corr Institution	65	4.5
Lebanon Corr Institution	59	4.1
Correctional Reception Center	56	3.9
Grafton Corr Institution	56	3.9
Northeast Ohio Corr Center	46	3.2
Allen Corr Institution	44	3.1
Other (Jails)	44	3.1
Toledo Corr Institution	41	2.8
Richland Corr Institution	40	2.8
Noble Corr Institution	37	2.6
Ohio State Penitentiary	37	2.6
Ross Corr Institution	37	2.6
Trumbull Corr Institution	34	2.4
Lake Erie Corr Institution	33	2.3
London Corr Institution	28	1.9
Ohio Reformatory for Women	25	1.7
Hocking Correctional Facility	18	1.3
Corrections Medical Center	12	.8
Belmont Corr Institution	10	.7
Southeastern Corr Institution	10	.7
North Coast Corr Treatm F	9	.6
Oakwood Corr Facility	6	.4
Lorain Corr Institution	3	.2
Dayton Corr Institution	2	.1
Northeast Pre-Release C	1	.1
TOTALS	1,444	100%

As of December 5, 2005, the CIIC has received a total of 51 contacts from or regarding TOCI since January 1, 2005, and a total of 1,667 contacts system-wide. The 51 contacts from or regarding TOCI comprise 3.1 percent of the contacts system-wide.

CONCERNS

The CIIC database for 2004 shows that the 1,789 contacts system-wide relayed 4,976 problems, issues or concerns in their communication. The 63 contacts from or regarding Toledo Correctional Institution relayed 203 logged concerns, comprising 4.07 percent of the reported concerns. The largest volume of reported concerns was from or regarding the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 826 logged concerns, comprising 16.6 percent of the concerns system-wide.

A review was made of the number of concerns logged from each institution from January 1, 2005 through October 17, 2005. System-wide, 4,694 problems, issues or concerns were reported to the CIIC. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 12th with 144 concerns, or 3.1% of all concerns. Eleven Ohio prisons had a larger volume of reported concerns than the Toledo Correctional Institution, ranging from 157 at the Grafton Correctional Institution, to 697 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. Twenty Ohio prisons had fewer reported concerns than TOCI, ranging from one concern at the Northeast Pre-Release Center, to 140 at the Correctional Reception Center.

**Number of Reported Concerns Received by the CIIC from January 1, 2005 through
October 17, 2005 by Institution**

Institution	Number of Concerns	Percent
Southern Ohio Corr Facility	697	14.8%
Warren Corr Institution	296	6.3
North Central Corr Institution	272	5.8
Mansfield Corr Institution	264	5.6
Marion Corr Institution	259	5.5
Northeast Ohio Corr Center	258	5.5
Madison Corr Institution	239	5.1
Lebanon Corr Institution	220	4.7
Chillicothe Corr Institution	216	4.6
Pickaway Corr Institution	196	4.2
Grafton Corr Institution	157	3.3
Toledo Corr Institution	144	3.1
Correctional Reception Center	140	3.0
Richland Corr Institution	136	2.9
Ross Correctional Institution	127	2.7
Allen Correctional Institution	125	2.7
Trumbull Corr Institution	122	2.6
Other (Jails)	117	2.5
Ohio State Penitentiary	99	2.1
Noble Correctional Institution	96	2.1
Lake Erie Corr Institution	86	1.8
Ohio Reformatory for Women	82	1.8
London Corr Institution	73	1.6
Corrections Medical Center	69	1.5
Hocking Correctional Facility	59	1.3
Belmont Corr Institution	51	1.1
Southeastern Corr Institution	32	.7
N Coast Corr Treatment Fac	26	.6
Lorain Correctional Institution	20	.4
Oakwood Corr Facility	13	.3
Dayton Corr Institution	2	
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	
TOTAL	4,694	100%

The most recent statistics in the CIIC database for the period of January 1, 2005 to December 5, 2005 show that a total of 51 contacts were received from or regarding TOCI relaying 178 logged problems, issues or concerns. System-wide in the same period, 1,667 contacts have been received, relaying 5,570 problems, issues or concerns. TOCI concerns comprised 3.2 percent of the system-wide total, and TOCI contacts comprised 3.1 percent of the system-wide total.

CATEGORY OF CONCERNS

The CIIC database in which communication received from or regarding the institutions, is logged by subject area, uses the same subject categories of the ODRC in their monthly reports on the inmate grievance procedure. However, the CIIC database has additional categories that are not included in the ODRC categories, such as complaints regarding the inmate grievance procedure. Under the broader category of Staff/Inmate Relations, "Force/Supervision" includes the following subcategories: use of force, use of force with no report, abusive language, racial or ethnic slurs, conduct report for no reason, intimidation/threats, retaliation for filing grievance, filing lawsuit or voicing complaints, privacy violations, harassment and other. The largest category of concerns received from the Toledo Correctional Institution from January 1, 2005 through October 17, 2005 was the "Force/Supervision" category with 25 logged concerns, comprising 17.4 percent of their reported concerns.

The two categories titled "Staff Accountability" and "Protective Control" ranked second largest among the categories of concerns, with 18 each, comprising 12.5 percent of the concerns in each of the two categories. The "Staff Accountability" category is also a subcategory of "Staff/Inmate Relations," and includes concerns pertaining to the following: Access to staff, failure to perform job duties, failure to respond to communication, failure to follow policies, and "other." The "Protective Control" category is a subcategory of the larger Custody and Housing Status category. Reported concerns in the Protective Control category include: Placement, Release, Privileges, and Other.

The Inmate Grievance Procedure ranked as the third largest category of concern, with 16 problems, issues or concerns regarding the grievance procedure. The category includes concerns pertaining to the following: Inspector, Chief Inspector, Informal Complaint, and Other.

It is significant that there were no concerns reported in the following categories: Safety/Sanitation, Facilities Maintenance, Laundry/Quartermaster, Education/Vocational Training, Inmate Groups, Recovery Services, Recreation, Visiting, Telephone and Legal Services.

**Number and Category of Concerns Reported to CIIC from January 1, 2005 through
October 17, 2005 from or regarding the Toledo Correctional Institution**

Type of Concern	Number of Concerns Logged	Percent
Force/Supervision	25	17.4%
Staff Accountability	18	12.5
Protective Control	18	12.5
Inmate Grievance Procedure	16	11.1
Non-Grievable Matters	9	6.3
Institution Assignment	9	6.3
Housing Assignment	7	4.9
Mail/Packages	6	4.2
Other	6	4.2
Health Care	5	3.5
Security Classification	5	3.5
Special Management Housing	4	2.8
Discrimination	3	2.1
Job Assignment	2	1.4
Library	2	1.4
Psychological/Psychiatric	2	1.4
Commissary	1	.7
Personal Property	1	.7
Inmate Account	1	.7
Food Services	1	.7
Dental Care	1	.7
Religious Services	1	.7
Records	1	.7
Safety and Sanitation	0	
Facilities Maintenance	0	
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	
Education/Vocational Training	0	
Inmate Groups	0	
Recovery Services	0	
Recreation	0	
Visiting	0	
Telephone	0	
Legal Services	0	
Total	144	100%

The CIIC Biennial Report of January 2005 provided data on the number of reported concerns by category at the Toledo Correctional Institution from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005. Changes between the number of reported concerns in specific categories are noted below.

Comparison of the Number of Logged Concerns from TOCI Received by CIIC from January 6, 2004 to January 12, 2005, and from January 1, 2005 to October 17, 2005

Subject of Concern	1-6-04 to 1-12-05	1-1-05-10-17-05	Change
Force/Supervision	34	25	-9
Staff Accountability	30	18	-12
Inmate Grievance Procedure	20	16	-4
Health Care	15	5	-10
Non-Grievable Matters	14	9	-5
Personal Property	10	1	-9
Other	9	6	-3
Mail/Packages	8	6	-2
Discrimination	8	3	-5
Inst Assignment	7	9	+2
Spec Mgmt Housing	7	4	-3
Protective Control	7	18	+11
Visiting	6	0	-6
Psychological/Psychiatric	5	2	-3
Food Services	4	1	-3
Facility Maintenance	3	0	-3
Recreation	3	0	-3
Security Classification	3	5	+2
Commissary	2	1	-1
Educ/Voc Training	2	0	-2
Library	2	2	0
Legal Services	2	0	-2
Safety and Sanitation	1	0	-1
Inmate Account	1	1	0
Recovery Services	1	0	-1
Religious Services	1	1	0
Records	1	1	0
Dental Care	0	1	+1
Laundry/Quartermaster	0	0	0
Inmate Groups	0	0	0
Job Assignments	0	2	+2
Telephone	0	0	0
Housing Assignment	0	7	+7
TOTAL	205	144	-61

Based on the above, the largest decrease has been in the concerns regarding Staff Accountability, a decrease of 12 in the two periods. The second largest decrease occurred in Health Care concerns, a decrease of 10 in the two periods. The third largest decrease occurred in the reported concerns in the Force/Supervision category as well as the Personal Property category. Reported concerns in each category decreased by nine in the two periods. Visiting concerns decreased by six in the two periods. Both categories of concerns pertaining to Non-Grievable Matters and Discrimination decreased by five. Concerns regarding the Grievance Procedure decreased by four.

The largest increase in concerns occurred in the Protective Control category, with an increase of 11 reported concerns in the two periods. The second largest increase in concerns occurred in the Housing Assignment category, with an increase of seven in the two periods.

INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

In 2004, a total of 30,492 informal complaints were filed system wide, from 62 at Hocking Correctional Facility, to the high of 3,432 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked ninth among the institutions, with 1,153 informal complaints filed in 2004. The breakdown by institution is provided below:

2004 Informal Complaints Filed by Institution

INSTITUTION	INFORMAL COMPLAINTS IN 2004
Southern Ohio CF	3,432
Ohio Ref for Women	2,443
Ohio State Penitentiary	1,938
Mansfield CI	1,693
North Central CI	1,537
Madison CI	1,371
Chillicothe CI	1,206
Lake Erie CI	1,171
Toledo CI	1,153
Grafton CI	1,141
London CI	1,133
Marion CI	1,105
Lebanon CI	1,052
Trumbull CI	1,040
Richland CI	978
Lorain CI	892
Noble CI	888
Pickaway CI	828
North Coast CTF	745
Warren CI	679
Ross CI	614
Belmont CI	609
Southeastern CI	595
Allen CI	519
Warren CI	433
Corrections Medical	252
Correctional Reception	217
Montgomery EPRC	193
Oakwood CF	177
Dayton CI	119
Hocking CF	62
TOTAL	30,492

UNTIMELY RESPONSES

According to the 2004 Chief Inspector's Annual Report, untimely responses to informal complaints system-wide totaled 4,756. The Toledo Correctional Institution had 318, comprising 6.7 percent of the system-wide total of informal complaints with untimely responses. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked second among the institutions in the number of untimely responses to informal complaints. Untimely responses system wide ranged from only six at the Hocking Correctional Facility to as high as 1,017 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

Although the number of informal complaints system wide decreased by 1,136 from 2003 to 2004, the number of untimely responses to informal complaints increased by 149, from 4,607 in 2003 to 4,756 in 2004. At the Toledo Correctional Institution, untimely responses increased from 250 in 2003 to 318 in 2004.

An Informal Complaint is the first step in using the three-step grievance procedure. If the problem is resolved at the Informal Complaint level, it prevents the need to file a grievance and appeal, saving time and effort of the Inspector, Chief Inspector and inmate. According to Administrative Rule 512-09-31 on the Grievance Procedure, the inmate has 14 calendar days to file an informal complaint from the "date of the event giving rise to the complaint," and the Staff Supervisor to whom the Informal Complaint is addressed, "shall respond in writing within seven calendar days of receipt of the informal complaint." If no response is received, the inmate is to contact the Inspector, who "shall take prompt action to ensure that a written response is provided to the informal complaint within four calendar days." According to the Administrative Rule, if a response is not provided by the end of the fourth day, the informal complaint step is automatically waived.

The Administrative Rule specifies that informal complaint responses should reflect an understanding of the inmate's complaint, be responsive to the issue, cite any relevant rules or policies, and specify action taken if any. It further states that the Inspector must monitor staff compliance with the informal complaint process, and any pattern of non-compliance by staff must be reported to the Warden for appropriate action. Therefore, the Administrative Rule provides specific directives to the Staff Supervisors to provide thorough responses to Informal Complaints, and further directs the Inspector to monitor staff compliance with the Administrative Rule and to report patterns of non-compliance to the Warden for appropriate action. When an inmate notifies the Inspector of non-response to an Informal Complaint beyond the seven days, per the Administrative Rule, the Inspector must take action to ensure that a written response is provided to the inmate in four calendar days. If the inmate does not receive a response by the end of the fourth day, the informal complaint step is waived, and he may file a grievance. Therefore, the extent to which the responses to Informal Complaints are thorough, timely and actually resolve the reported problem, can greatly benefit the Inspector by requiring less of his

time at the informal complaint level, and by actually resolving problems quickly so the inmate has no need nor desire to proceed with a grievance.

On the other extreme, untimely responses to informal complaints can do serious damage to the inmate perception of the grievance procedure. It creates frustration at the very first step, impacts the workload of the Inspector who must monitor and intervene when staff do not respond to informal complaints within the timeline in the Administrative Rule, and involves the Warden who must be alerted by the Inspector to any patterns of non-compliance.

Number of Informal Complaints with Untimely Responses in 2004 by Institution

INSTITUTION	INFORMAL COMPLAINTS WITH UNTIMELY RESPONSES IN 2004
Ohio Ref for Women	1,017
Toledo CI	318
Ohio State Penitentiary	311
London CI	295
Lake Erie CI	256
Madison CI	235
Trumbull CI	203
Marion CI	194
Southern Ohio CF	185
Pickaway CI	185
Mansfield CI	160
Ross CI	155
North Central CI	148
Richland CI	148
Warren CI	121
Southeastern CI	100
North Coast CTF	95
Lebanon CI	91
Chillicothe CI	85
Lorain CI	59
Corrections Medical C	42
Grafton CI	38
Oakwood CI	37
Belmont CI	34
Allen CI	30
Correctional Reception C	29
Montgomery EPRC	29
Noble CI	22
Dayton CI	16
Warren CI	10
Hocking CF	6
TOTAL	4,756

FILERS

In 2004, a total of 3,211 inmates system wide used the grievance procedure, filing a total of 6,303 grievances. At the Toledo Correctional Institution, 115 inmates used the grievance procedure, filing a total of 265 grievances. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 16th among the institutions in the number of inmates who filed one or more grievances.

In 2003, a total of 3,297 inmates filed one or more grievances. The number of filers declined in 2004 by 86. However, at the Toledo Correctional Institution, the number of inmates who used the grievance procedure increased slightly from 106 in 2003 to 115 in 2004, an increase of nine.

The number of inmates who used the grievance procedure at each institution in 2004 is presented below:

Number of Inmates Who Filed One or More Grievances in 2004 by Institution

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF INMATES	PERCENT
Southern Ohio CF	249	7.8%
Mansfield CI	224	7.0
Pickaway CI	190	5.9
North Central CI	183	5.7
Lebanon CI	161	5.0
Madison CI	159	5.0
Grafton CI	152	4.7
Chillicothe CI	151	4.7
Ohio Ref for Women	148	4.6
Marion CI	145	4.5
Ohio State Penitentiary	141	4.4
Warren CI	131	4.1
Allen CI	130	4.1
Richland CI	129	4.0
Noble CI	127	4.0
Toledo CI	115	3.6
London CI	101	3.1
Ross CI	84	2.6
Trumbull CI	79	2.5
Belmont CI	72	2.2
Lorain CI	65	2.0
Lake Erie CI	63	2.0
Southeastern CI	59	1.8
Correctional Rec C	40	1.2
North Coast CTF	27	.8
Corrections Medical C	20	.6
Montgomery EPRC	15	.5
Oakwood CF	13	.4
Hocking CF	12	.4
Franklin PRC	10	.3
Northeast PRC	8	.2
Dayton CI	8	.2
TOTAL	3,211	100%

GRIEVANCES

In 2004, a total of 6,303 grievances were filed system wide, ranging from nine at the Dayton Correctional Institution, to 656 grievances at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 13th among the institutions, with 265 grievances in 2004.

The number of grievances filed system wide in 2003 totaled 6,395. System-wide, the number of grievances declined by 92 in 2004. Similarly, at the Toledo Correctional Institution, the number of grievances filed decreased by 59. The number of grievances filed in 2003 was 324 compared with 265 in 2004.

Number of Grievances Filed in 2004 by Institution

INSTITUTION	NUMBER	PERCENT
S. Ohio CF	656	10.4%
Mansfield CI	447	7.1
Ohio State Pen	443	7.0
Lebanon CI	351	5.6
N Central CI	346	5.5
Madison CI	307	4.9
Warren CI	295	4.7
ORW(Women)	293	4.6
Pickaway CI	291	4.6
Grafton CI	281	4.5
Chillicothe CI	278	4.4
Allen CI	271	4.3
Toledo CI	265	4.2
Noble CI	247	3.9
Marion CI	230	3.6
Trumbull CI	206	3.3
Richland CI	205	3.3
London CI	164	2.6
Lake Erie CI	133	2.1
Ross CI	128	2.0
Lorain CI	89	1.4
Belmont CI	88	1.4
S Eastern CI	77	1.2
N Coast CTF	46	.7
Cor Medic C	44	.7
Corr Rec Cent	43	.7
Montg EPRC	21	.3
Oakwood CF	13	.2
Hocking CF	13	.2
Franklin PRC	12	.2
Northeast PRC	11	.2
Dayton CI	9	.1
TOTAL	6,303	100%

GRIEVANCE APPEALS

If an inmate is not satisfied with the Inspector's decision on a grievance, the inmate may appeal the grievance disposition to the Chief Inspector. In calendar year 2004, the Chief Inspector's office received 3,005 grievance appeals system-wide, ranging from no appeals from the Dayton Correctional Institution and North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility, to 418 appeals from the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 16th in the number of appeals with 87.

According to the Chief Inspector's 2003 Annual Report, there were 59 appeals from the Toledo Correctional Institution in 2003. The number of appeals increased by 28 in 2004, with a total of 87 grievance appeals received from the Toledo Correctional Institution in 2004. System wide, grievances increased by 601 in the two-year period, from 2,404 in 2003 to 3,005 in 2004.

Number of Appeals in 2004 by Institution

INSTITUTION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Southern Ohio CF	418	13.9 %
Mansfield CI	203	6.8
Madison CI	198	6.6
Ohio State Penitentiary	188	6.3
Lebanon CI	181	6.0
Chillicothe CI	175	5.8
Warren CI	160	5.3
Trumbull CI	137	4.6
Allen CI	135	4.5
Noble CI	124	4.1
Grafton CI	123	4.1
North Central CI	120	4.0
Pickaway CI	99	3.3
Richland CI	99	3.3
Marion CI	93	3.1
Toledo Corr Institution	87	2.9
London CI	86	2.9
Lake Erie CI	76	2.5
Ohio Ref for Women	75	2.5
Belmont CI	65	2.2
Ross CI	52	1.7
Lorain CI	32	1.1
Corrections Medical Center	31	1.0
Southeastern CI	23	.8
Hocking CF	7	.2
Oakwood CF	7	.2
Montgomery EPRC	4	.1
Correctional Reception	3	.1
Northeast PRC	3	.1
Franklin PRC	1	.0
North Coast CTF	0	.0
Dayton CI	0	.0
TOTAL	3,005	100%

ORIGINAL GRIEVANCES

If an inmate has a problem or complaint pertaining to the Inspector or Warden, the inmate may file a grievance directly with the Chief Inspector. Such grievances are referred to in the Chief Inspector's Annual Report as "Original Grievances." In 2004, the Chief Inspector received 509 original grievances. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 11th in the number of original grievances with 18, along with the Ohio State Penitentiary and Richland Correctional Institution.

Number of Grievances Filed with Chief Inspector Regarding Inspector or Warden in 2004 with Breakdown by Institution

INSTITUTION	NUMBER	PERCENT
S Ohio CF	60	11.8%
Trumbull CI	38	7.5
Belmont CI	35	6.9
Mansfield CI	33	6.5
Noble CI	28	5.5
Chillicothe CI	27	5.3
Allen CI	25	4.9
Grafton CI	23	4.5
London CI	20	3.9
Warren CI	20	3.9
Madison CI	19	3.7
Lebanon CI	19	3.7
Ohio State Pen	18	3.5
Richland CI	18	3.5
Toledo CI	18	3.5
Marion CI	17	3.3
Corr Med Cent	14	2.8
Lake Erie CI	14	2.8
Lorain CI	13	2.6
N Central CI	13	2.6
Pickaway CI	9	1.8
Ross CI	8	1.6
ORW/Women	6	1.2
Southeastern CI	5	1.0
Hocking CF	3	.6
Montg. EPRC	3	.6
Oakwood CF	2	.4
Franklin PRC	1	.2
N Coast CTF	0	0
Dayton CI	0	0
N East Pre R	0	0
Corr Rec Center	0	0
TOTAL	509	100%

AUGUST 2005 INSPECTOR'S REPORT

Grievance data contained in the TOCI Inspector's monthly report for August 2005 was reviewed. Filing an Informal Complaint is the first step to using the grievance procedure. According to the monthly report, 83 Informal Complaints were filed in August 2005. If an inmate is not satisfied with the response to his Informal Complaint, he may file a grievance with the Inspector who may investigate and take or recommend any corrective action found warranted. (Note: The month of August was reviewed due to the fact that there were zero reported grievances in the month of September at TOCI.)

Of the 10 grievances that received dispositions in the month, five were classified as "Not Resolved," comprising 50 percent of the grievance decisions. All five resulted in a finding of "Insufficient evidence to support claim." The breakdown of other categories of reasons why the grievances may result in "Not Resolved" Dispositions is provided below:

Reasons for Unresolved Grievance Dispositions by the Inspector of the Toledo Correctional Institution in August 2005

Insufficient evidence to support claim	5
Contrary to Administrative Rule	0
Staff Action was valid exercise of discretion	0
Contrary to DRC Policy	0
Contrary to LECI Policy	0
Contrary to Ohio Revised Code	0
Failure to use informal complaint procedure	0
Not within scope of grievance procedure	0
Not within time limit	0
False Claim	0
TOTAL	5

Of the five "Not Resolved" grievance dispositions, White inmates filed three of the grievances, and Black inmates filed two of the grievances. There were six 14-day extensions of grievance decisions and one 28-day extension of grievance decisions during the month.

Of the 10 grievances dispositions in July 2005, there were five grievances categorized by the Inspector as "Resolved." White inmates filed three of the five resolved grievances. The remaining two of the resolved grievances were filed by Black inmates. Four of the five resolved grievances were categorized as "Problem noted, report/recommendation to the Warden." The one remaining grievance was categorized as "Problem noted, correction pending." The five resolved grievances were in the Personal Property and Staff/Inmate Relations categories.

GRIEVANCE REVIEW: October 2003 - November 2004

System-wide, 7,381 grievances were filed for the time period of October 2003 through November 2004. There were 384 grievances filed at the Toledo Correctional Institution, or 5.2% of all grievances filed system-wide. In the same time period, the number of grievances filed ranged from eight or 0.1% at the Dayton Correctional Institution, to the highest number of grievances filed at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, with 722, or 9.8% of all grievances filed.

Caution should be taken in interpreting the meaning of a large or small number of grievances filed. A large number of grievances could mean that a multitude of problems exist, or that inmates have enough faith and confidence in the grievance procedure that they are willing to use it to relay problems and to seek assistance. Similarly, a low number of grievances could mean that very few problems exist, or that inmates do not use the grievance procedure to seek help with a problems due to lack of faith in the grievance procedure or fear of retaliation for complaining. Therefore, a low number of grievances is not necessarily a positive factor. It can be a cause for concern.

The following information reflects the subject and number of grievances filed at the Toledo Correctional Institution from October 2003 through November 2004.

**Number of Grievances Filed at the Toledo Correctional Institution by Subject from
October 2003 through November 2004**

SUBJECT OF GRIEVANCE	NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES
Force/ Supervision	78
Personal Property	63
Non-Grievable Matters	35
Staff Accountability	35
Health Care	30
Food Service	18
Mail/Packages	16
Inmate Account	15
Special Mgt Housing	14
Protective Control	10
Recreation	8
Library	8
Security Classification	6
Psychological/Psychiatric	6
Visiting	5
Job Assignment	5
Legal Services	5
Commissary	5
Dental Care	4
Safety and Sanitation	4
Facilities Maintenance	4
Recovery Services	2
Laundry/Quartermaster	2
Education/Voc Training	2
Institution Assignment	2
Religious Services	1
Records	1
Discrimination	1
Housing Assignment	1
*	
UNRESOLVED	300 (78.12%)
RESOLVED	84 (21.88%)
TOTAL	384 (100%)

*No grievances were filed in the categories of Inmate Groups or Telephone.

RESOLVED/UNRESOLVED

The ODRC Inspector of Institutional Services Monthly Reports provide three types of “resolved” dispositions and list 10 possible reasons why a grievance was “unresolved.” The following are the three types of resolved dispositions:

- Problem corrected
- Problem noted, correction pending
- Problem noted, report/ recommendation to the Warden.

The following are the possible reasons why a grievance results in an unresolved disposition:

- Contrary to Ohio Revised Code
- Contrary to administrative rule
- Contrary to department policy
- Contrary to institution policy
- Staff action was a valid exercise of discretion
- Insufficient evidence to support claim
- False claim
- Failure to use informal complaint procedure
- Not within the scope of the grievance procedure
- Not within the time limits.

Based on 2004 data, the Toledo Correctional Institution ranked sixth system-wide in number of unresolved grievances with 303, an average of 25.2 unresolved grievances per month.

INVESTIGATOR CASELOAD

The Chief Inspector’s 2004 Annual Report provides information on the number of investigations initiated by the Investigator at each institution. In 2004, a total of 6,660 investigations were initiated system-wide. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 25th in the number of investigations, with 75 in the year, or one percent of all investigations system-wide. The number of investigations ranged from the low of 15 at the Montgomery Education Pre-Release Center, to the largest number at the Ohio State Penitentiary, where 583 investigations occurred. The Madison Correctional Institution ranked second, with 538 investigations.

The number of investigations increased system-wide by 984 from 5,676 in 2003 to 6,660 in 2004. Similarly, the number of investigations increased at the Toledo Correctional Institution from 67 to 75, and increase of eight. The breakdown of 2004 investigations per institution is provided below:

Number of Investigations Initiated by Investigators in 2004 by Institution

INSTITUTION	2004 INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED BY INVESTIGATOR	PERCENT
Ohio State Pen	583	8.75%
Madison CI	538	8.08
Noble CI	436	6.55
Trumbull CI	416	6.25
Warren CI	357	5.36
Ross CI	352	5.29
Belmont CI	342	5.14
Mansfield CI	293	4.40
N Central CI	287	4.31
Corr Medical C	270	4.05
Lorain CI	263	3.95
Richland CI	257	3.86
Pickaway CI	256	3.84
Lake Erie CI	240	3.60
Lebanon CI	212	3.18
Southeastern CI	164	2.46
Allen CI	145	2.18
Northeast PRC	143	2.15
Chillicothe CI	142	2.13
ORW (Women)	134	2.01
Corr Recept C	123	1.85
Oakwood CF	104	1.56
Franklin PRC	99	1.49
Marion CI	82	1.23
Toledo CI	75	1.13
Hocking CF	69	1.04
S Ohio CF	62	.93
London CI	60	.90
N Coast CTF	57	.86
Grafton CI	43	.65
Dayton CI	41	.62
Montg EPRC	15	.23
TOTAL	6,660	100%

STAFF MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

According to the Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report, there were 242 investigations system wide by the Investigators regarding staff misconduct. The Toledo Correctional Institution had eight such investigations in 2004. There were no such investigations at three prisons, including North Central Correctional Institution. The remaining prisons ranged from two such investigations at the Correctional Medical Center to 37 such investigations at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

According to the Chief Inspector's 2003 Annual Report, there were 274 investigations of staff misconduct in 2003. Such investigations decreased by 32 in 2004. In 2003, the number of staff misconduct investigations ranged from zero at Mansfield Correctional Institution to 40 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. There were seven such investigations at the Toledo Correctional Institution in 2003.

System-wide from 2003 to 2004 there was a decrease in the number of staff misconduct investigations from 274 to 242. The following is a breakdown of staff misconduct investigations from 2003 to 2004:

Staff Misconduct Investigations in 2003 and 2004 by Institution

Institutions	2003	2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	40	37
Oakwood Correctional Facility	34	13
Trumbull Correctional Institution	21	7
Correctional Reception Center	14	15
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	20
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	13	6
Richland Correctional Institution	11	10
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	10	8
Belmont Correctional Institution	10	6
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	10	6
Corrections Medical Center	9	2
Allen Correctional Institution	9	1
Franklin Pre Release Center	8	14
Grafton Correctional Institution	8	6
Ross Correctional Institution	7	17
Toledo Correctional Institution	7	8
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	7	0
Southeastern Correctional Institution	5	10
Warren Correctional Institution	5	4
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	4	5
Marion Correctional Institution	4	3
Northeast Pre Release Center	4	3
Lebanon Correctional Institution	4	1
Madison Correctional Institution	3	20
London Correctional Institution	3	3
Hocking Correctional Facility	3	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	2	3
Lorain Correctional Institution	2	5
Noble Correctional Institution	2	4
Dayton Correctional Institution	1	0
North Central Correctional Institution	1	0
Mansfield Correctional Institution	0	4
Totals	274	242

STAFF/INMATE RELATIONSHIP INVESTIGATIONS

According to the Chief Inspector's Annual Report for 2004, there were 186 investigations system wide regarding staff/inmate relationships, ranging from no such investigations at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and Belmont Correctional Institution, to a high of 21 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported seven such investigations, as did Ross Correctional Institution and the Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center.

There were 229 investigations of staff/inmate relationships system wide in 2003. Such investigations decreased by 43 in 2004, to a total of 186. In 2003, such investigations ranged from no such investigations at three prisons (Ross Correctional Institution, Ohio State Penitentiary, and Corrections Medical Center) to a high of 37 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 5th with the Pickaway Correctional Institution, with 13 such investigations at each institution.

The following is a breakdown of staff/inmate relationship investigations system-wide for 2003 and 2004:

Number of Staff/Inmate Relationship Investigations in 2003 and in 2004 by Institution

Institution	2003	2004
Ohio Reformatory for Women	37	21
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	22	4
Franklin Pre Release Center	18	7
Madison Correctional Institution	14	16
Pickaway Correctional Institution	13	8
Toledo Correctional Institution	13	7
Northeast Pre Release Center	12	3
Allen Correctional Institution	11	6
Mansfield Correctional Institution	9	7
Southeastern Correctional Institution	9	5
Richland Correctional Institution	8	12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	8	9
Hocking Correctional Facility	7	6
Oakwood Correctional Facility	5	5
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	5	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	4	5
London Correctional Institution	4	4
Dayton Correctional Institution	4	2
Lorain Correctional Institution	3	13
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	3	11
Correctional Reception Center	3	4
Trumbull Correctional Institution	3	3
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	3	1
Belmont Correctional Institution	3	0
Warren Correctional Institution	2	6
North Central Correctional Institution	2	3
Lebanon Correctional Institution	2	2
Marion Correctional Institution	1	3
Noble Correctional Institution	1	2
Corrections Medical Center	0	5
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	3
Ross Correctional Institution	0	3
Totals	229	186

POSITIVE DRUG URINALYSIS INVESTIGATIONS

According to the July 2004 written information provided on site at the Toledo Correctional Institution, inmate drug testing and the results from the year 2000 to July 1, 2004 consisted of the following:

Number of Drug Tests at TOCI from 2000 to July 1, 2004 with Number and Percentage Positive

YEAR	NUMBER TESTED	NUMBER POSITIVE	PERCENT POSITIVE
2000	176	7	3.98
2001	172	10	5.81
2002	599	31	5.18
2003	1004	72	7.17
2004 (to 7-1-04)	1148	19	1.66
TOTAL	3099	139	4.49%

According to the 2004 Annual Report of the Chief Inspector, there were 936 positive drug urinalysis tests system wide in the 12-month period. Six institutions had no positive drug test results, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Ross Correctional Institution, London Correctional Institution, Franklin Pre-Release Center, Oakwood Correctional Facility, and Corrections Medical Center. The largest number of positive drug test results occurred at the North Central Correctional Institution, with 202 positives. According to the Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report, the Toledo Correctional Institution had 11 positive drug tests investigations in 2004. As noted above, TOCI reported 19 positive drug tests from January 1, 2004 to July 1, 2004.

System wide in 2003, there were 898 positive drug tests, ranging from zero at the Corrections Medical Center to 141 at the Ross Correctional Institution. In 2003, the Toledo Correctional Institution only had nine positive urinalysis investigations. The breakdown of positive urinalysis investigations system-wide from 2003 to 2004 is shown below:

Number of Positive Drug Tests in 2003 and 2004 by Institution

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Ross Correctional Institution	141	0	-141
Southeastern Correctional Institution	130	16	-114
Dayton Correctional Institution	102	31	-71
Lebanon Correctional Institution	100	23	-77
North Central Correctional Institution	48	202	+154
Richland Correctional Institution	45	92	+47
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	41	96	+55
Belmont Correctional Institution	36	78	+42
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	33	46	+13
Allen Correctional Institution	29	59	+30
Trumbull Correctional Institution	28	54	+26
London Correctional Institution	25	0	-25
Mansfield Correctional Institution	19	46	+27
Pickaway Correctional Institution	19	33	+14
Madison Correctional Institution	14	13	-1
Grafton Correctional Institution	12	13	+1
Warren Correctional Institution	11	9	-2
Noble Correctional Institution	10	35	+25
Ohio Reformatory for Women	10	2	-8
Toledo Correctional Institution	9	11	+2
Ohio State Penitentiary	9	7	-2
Correctional Reception Center	7	15	+8
Marion Correctional Institution	5	25	+20
Lorain Correctional Institution	4	12	+8
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	3	7	+4
Hocking Correctional Facility	2	2	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	2	0	-2
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	1	6	+5
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	3	+2
Franklin Pre Release Center	1	0	-1
Oakwood Correctional Facility	1	0	-1
Corrections Medical Center	0	0	0
Totals	898	936	+38

INMATE/VISITOR DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

From 2003 to 2004, drug investigations regarding inmates or visitors increased by 28, from 245 drug investigations in 2003 to 273 investigations in 2004 system-wide. In 2003, the Toledo Correctional Institution only had three such investigations, but increased to seven drug investigations in 2004. A breakdown of the number of investigations at each institution in 2003 and 2004 is provided below:

Number of Inmate/Visitor Drug Investigations in 2003 and in 2004 by Institution

Institution	2003	2004	Change
Lebanon Correctional Institution	53	82	+29
Warren Correctional Institution	53	34	-19
Richland Correctional Institution	20	20	0
Trumbull Correctional Institution	13	10	-3
Dayton Correctional Institution	11	2	-9
Southeastern Correctional Institution	10	11	+1
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9	21	+12
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	9	3	-6
Mansfield Correctional Institution	8	14	+6
Madison Correctional Institution	7	7	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	7	1	-6
Grafton Correctional Institution	6	7	+1
Correctional Reception Center	6	3	-3
Belmont Correctional Institution	4	8	+4
Noble Correctional Institution	4	8	+4
Lorain Correctional Institution	4	7	+3
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	4	0	-4
Toledo Correctional Institution	3	7	+4
Ross Correctional Institution	3	5	+2
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	2	3	+1
Marion Correctional Institution	2	2	0
Ohio Reformatory for Women	2	2	0
Allen Correctional Institution	1	9	+8
London Correctional Institution	1	2	+1
North Central Correctional Institution	1	2	+1
Northeast Pre Release Center	1	2	+1
Corrections Medical Center	1	0	-1
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	1	+1
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0	0
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	0	0
Totals	245	273	+28

STAFF/INMATE DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

In 2004, there were 72 Staff/inmate Drug Investigations system-wide. Such investigations ranged from no such investigations at 14 prisons, to the high of 20 such investigations at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported only one such investigation.

In 2003, staff/inmate drug investigations system-wide totaled 36, and doubled to 72 in 2004. The Toledo Correctional Institution showed no change in the number of staff/inmates drug investigations between 2003 and 2004. Each year had one such investigation. The breakdown per institution in 2004 is provided below:

Number of Staff/Inmate Drug Investigations in 2003 and 2004 by Institution

Institution	2003	2004
Pickaway Correctional Institution	9	17
Richland Correctional Institution	7	4
Lebanon Correctional Institution	3	20
Warren Correctional Institution	3	3
Lake Erie Correctional Institution	2	3
London Correctional Institution	2	0
Chillicothe Correctional Institution	1	0
Correctional Reception Center	1	0
Ross Correctional Institution	1	0
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	1	0
Grafton Correctional Institution	1	3
Mansfield Correctional Institution	1	2
Madison Correctional Institution	1	1
Ohio Reformatory for Women	1	1
Southeastern Correctional Institution	1	1
Toledo Correctional Institution	1	1
Marion Correctional Institution	0	5
Trumbull Correctional Institution	0	4
Allen Correctional Institution	0	3
Belmont Correctional Institution	0	1
Lorain Correctional Institution	0	1
Noble Correctional Institution	0	1
Ohio State Penitentiary	0	1
Corrections Medical Center	0	0
Dayton Correctional Institution	0	0
Franklin Pre Release Center	0	0
Hocking Correctional Facility	0	0
Montgomery Education and Pre Release Center	0	0
North Central Correctional Institution	0	0
North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility	0	0
Northeast Pre Release Center	0	0
Oakwood Correctional Facility	0	0
Totals	36	72

DRUG INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING STAFF

System-wide in 2004, drug investigations pertaining to staff totaled 25, ranging from one each at six prisons, to the high of eight such investigations at the Pickaway Correctional Institution. There were 21 prisons with no such investigations. The Toledo Correctional Institution had one such investigation in 2004. In 2003, drug investigations pertaining to staff system-wide totaled only six, with one such investigation at six prisons. The remaining institutions, including the Toledo Correctional Institution, had no such investigations.

DRUG INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING MAIL

There were 69 Drug Investigations Involving Mail/Packages system-wide in 2004, ranging from no such investigations at 15 prisons, including the Toledo Correctional Institution to the high of 13 at Ross Correctional Institution. Richland Correctional Institution ranked second with 10 such investigations. The Toledo Correctional Institution is one of nine prisons that had no such investigations in 2003 or 2004. Such investigations system-wide in 2003 totaled 66, with a slight increase to 69 in 2004.

OTHER DRUG INVESTIGATIONS

The “Drugs (Other)” category of investigations initiated by the Investigator totaled 353 system-wide in 2004. The Toledo Correctional Institution had 11 such investigations, the same number as the Trumbull Correctional Institution. There were no such investigations at eight prisons. Such investigations at the remaining institutions ranged from one each at the Warren Correctional Institution and Northeast Pre-Release Center, to 47 such investigations at the Chillicothe Correctional Institution. Richland Correctional Institution ranks second with 45.

A total of 263 such investigations occurred system-wide in 2003, and increased by 90 in 2004, to a total of 353 such investigations. The Toledo Correctional Institution had 13 “other” investigations regarding drugs in 2003. Six prisons had no such investigations in either year.

SEARCHES, SHAKEDOWNS: ILLICIT PILLS CONFISCATED

According to the 2004 Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, 447 searches/shakedowns were conducted system-wide in which illicit pills were confiscated. There were 25 prisons including the Toledo Correctional Institution reporting no such incidents. The remaining seven prisons had from two such incidents at Belmont Correctional Institution to 349 at the Ross Correctional Institution. Noble Correctional Institution ranked second, with 76 such incidents reported.

In 2003, there were 565 searches/shakedowns resulting in confiscation of illicit pills system wide, with 20 prisons including the Toledo Correctional Institution, reporting no such incidents. However, three prisons reported over 100 such incidents, with 128 at the

Grafton Correctional Institution, 137 at the Ross Correctional Institution, and 152 at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The number of incidents system-wide declined from 565 in 2003 to 447 in 2004.

CRACK/COCAINE CONFISCATED

In 2004, crack/cocaine was confiscated in 12 prisons. However, none of the substance was confiscated from the Toledo Correctional Institution, along with 19 other institutions. From two to 7.6 grams were confiscated from London, Pickaway and North Central Correctional Institutions. The largest amount was confiscated at the Ross Correctional Institution, with 15.44 grams.

The reporting of zero crack/cocaine being confiscated from the Toledo Correctional Institution in 2004 was a huge decrease from 2003 when 19.55 grams were confiscated from TOCI. This was the second highest amount confiscated in 2003. Warren Correctional Institution reported confiscation of 44.4 grams in 2003, the largest amount of all Ohio prisons. Other institutions reporting such confiscation included Ross Correctional Institution with over 12 grams, Richland Correctional Institution with over six grams, and Trumbull Correctional Institution with five grams. Fifteen Ohio prisons reported zero grams confiscated in 2003.

HEROIN CONFISCATED

In 2004 there were nine prisons in which heroin was confiscated during searches or shakedowns, including Lebanon Correctional Institution. Mansfield, Ross and Richland Correctional Institutions each confiscated 8.5 grams. London Correctional Institution reported confiscation of three grams, and Lebanon Correctional Institution confiscated two grams. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 6th in amount confiscated of all Ohio prisons with 1.6 grams. Smaller amounts of heroin were confiscated at the Marion and Noble Correctional Institutions, and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

In 2003, there were nine prisons in which heroin was confiscated during searches or shakedowns, with the largest amount at the Mansfield and Trumbull Correctional Institutions, at 8.5 and eight grams respectively. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported 4.97 grams confiscated in 2003. Other prisons in which heroin was confiscated in 2003 include Lebanon, London, Ross, Richland, Lake Erie and Chillicothe Correctional Institution.

MARIJUANA CONFISCATED

In 2004, marijuana was confiscated from all but 11 prisons. Amounts confiscated ranged from a "trace" at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, Ohio State Penitentiary, and Northeast Pre-Release Center, to the high of 23.24 ounces at the North Central Correctional Institution. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported 2.25 ounces confiscated.

In 2003, the Toledo Correctional Institution ranked 5th in amount of marijuana confiscated with 8.04 ounces. Southeastern and Lebanon Correctional Institutions reported the largest amount of marijuana confiscated, with 24.46 and 13.5 ounces respectively. Ten institutions reported confiscating zero ounces of the substance.

“HOOCH” CONFISCATED

According to the Chief Inspector’s Annual Reports for 2003 and 2004, the confiscation and destruction of “hooch” varies from institution to institution and may not include Investigator involvement. Therefore, if an institution reports that no hooch was confiscated, it may only indicate that the Investigator had no involvement in its confiscation and destruction.

In 2004, a total of 784.86 gallons of “hooch” were confiscated in nine of the prisons, from 1.75 gallons at the Marion Correctional Institution to over 200 gallons each at the Mansfield and Noble Correctional Institutions. The remaining institutions, including the Toledo Correctional Institution, reported that no “hooch” was confiscated in the year.

In 2003 there were 13 prisons in which “hooch” was confiscated, with the largest amount at the Mansfield Correctional Institution, where 224 gallons were confiscated. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported that eight gallons were confiscated.

MAJOR SHAKEDOWNS

According to the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, there were 52 major shakedowns in 2004 system wide. Thirteen Ohio prisons had no shakedowns. Six prisons received one shakedown, including the Toledo Correctional Institution. Six prisons received two major shakedowns. The remaining seven prisons received from three shakedowns at the Oakwood Correctional Facility and Richland Correctional Institution, to the high of eight at the Madison Correctional Institution. London Correctional Institution ranked second, with seven shakedowns in 2004.

The Toledo Correctional Institution reported zero major shakedowns in 2003, along with 13 other institutions. Madison and London Correctional Institutions received the largest number of shakedowns in both years, with eight and seven respectively. There were 52 major shakedowns in 2003 and the same in 2004.

CANINE SEARCHES

According to the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report, there were 127 canine searches system-wide in 2004. No searches were reported to have occurred at seven prisons. At the remaining prisons, canine searches ranged from one each at four prisons, to 13 searches each at the Lorain Correctional Institution and North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported two such searches in 2004.

In 2003 there were 116 canine searches system-wide, with none at eight prisons. One search was conducted at each of four prisons. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported three such searches.

EMPLOYEE STRIP SEARCH/PAT DOWNS

According to the Chief Inspector's 2004 Annual Report, there were 85 employee strip/pat downs in 2004 system-wide. However, they only occurred at 10 of the prisons, ranging from one each at Grafton and Warren Correctional Institution, to 51 at North Central Correctional Institution. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported four strip/pat downs in 2004.

In 2003 there were only eight employee strip/pat downs in the entire year system-wide, and they occurred at six of the prisons. One each occurred at the Lebanon, Lake Erie, London, Pickaway and Warren Correctional Institutions. The Toledo Correctional Institution ranked first in 2003 with three employee strip/pat downs.

VISITOR STRIP SEARCH/PATDOWNS

In 2004 there were 80 visitor strip/pat downs system wide. No such pat downs occurred at 14 prisons. The remaining prisons had from one to 21 such pat downs, with the largest number at the Warren Correctional Institution, and the second highest at the Correctional Reception Center, with 10. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported four such pat downs in 2004.

In 2003, there were 49 visitor strip/pat downs system wide, with none at 17 prisons. The remaining prisons ranged from one such pat down at Lorain Correctional Institution and the Correctional Reception Center, to seven pat downs at the Lebanon Correctional Institution. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported three such pat downs in 2003. The number of pat downs increased by 31 in the two years, from 49 pat downs in 2003 to 80 pat downs in 2004.

ASSAULTS

Based on data provided by the DRC Central Office on inmate-on-inmate assaults, the Toledo Correctional Institution saw no change from 2003 to 2004. There were five inmate-on-inmate assaults at ToCI in 2003, and five such assaults reported in 2004. System-wide in 2003, the total number of inmate-on-inmate assaults was 482, with ToCI accounting for only 1.03 percent. Similarly, in 2004, the system-wide total for inmate-on-inmate assaults was 411, with ToCI accounting for only 1.2 percent.

Regarding inmate on staff assaults, ToCI ranked seventh system-wide in 2003, with 24 inmate-on-staff assaults. Ohio prisons with more inmate-on-staff assaults were the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (130), Ohio Reformatory for Women (51), Oakwood Correctional Facility (38), Chillicothe Correctional Institution (37), Mansfield Correctional Institution (36) and the Lorain Correctional Institution (28). The Ohio State

Penitentiary also had 24 inmate-on-staff assaults. System-wide 544 inmate-on-staff assaults were reported, with TOCI comprising 4.4%.

In 2004, there was a decrease in the number of inmate-on-staff assaults at ToCI with only 15. The Lebanon Correctional Institution also reported 15 inmate-on-staff assaults. ToCI and Lebanon Correctional Institution ranked seventh system wide, with only the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (133), Ohio Reformatory for Women (40), Mansfield Correctional Institution (31), Oakwood Correctional Facility (25), Ohio State Penitentiary (24), and the Trumbull Correctional Institution (19) with more inmate-on-staff assaults reported. System-wide, 432 inmate-on-staff assaults were reported, with ToCI comprising 3.5%.

ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS

Inmate on Inmate

Data contained in the Chief Inspector's Annual Reports for 2003 and 2004, includes information on the number of inmate on inmate assault investigations conducted by the Investigator. In 2004, there were 254 such investigations system wide, ranging from no such investigations at four prisons, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, to 41 such investigations at the Noble Correctional Institution. The Toledo Correctional Institution had five such investigations.

System wide, there were 258 inmate on inmate assault investigations in 2003, ranging from none at five prisons, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility and North Correctional Institution, to the high of 29 at the Madison Correctional Institution. Five prisons had from 20 to 29 inmate on inmate assault investigations in 2003. There were three such investigations at the Toledo Correctional Institution, with a decrease to two in 2004.

Inmate on Staff

In 2004 there were 188 inmate on staff assault investigations system wide, with no such investigation reported from seven prisons, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The remaining prisons range from one such investigation at the Mansfield Correctional Institution to a high of 22 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. Six prisons had from 10 to 22 such investigations. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported six such investigations in 2004.

There were only 146 such investigations in 2003 system wide, with an increase of 42 in 2004, when there were 188 inmate on staff assault investigations. In 2003, eight prisons reported no such investigations, including the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. The remaining prisons ranged from one at five prisons including the Mansfield Correctional Institution, to a high of 26 at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The Toledo Correctional Institution, Corrections Medical Center and Northeast Pre Release Center each reported

two inmate on staff assault investigations in 2003. Such investigations at the Toledo Correctional Institution increased from two in 2003 to six in 2004.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

According to the Chief Inspector's Annual Report, there were 124 sexual assault investigations system wide in 2004, with 10 prisons reporting no such investigations, including the Toledo Correctional Institution, to 21 such investigations at the Lake Erie Correctional Institution. Madison and Richland Correctional Institutions ranked second and third, with 13 and 10 such investigations, respectively.

According to the Chief Inspector's Annual Report, there were only 39 sexual assault investigations in 2003 system wide, with 18 prisons reporting no such investigations, including the Toledo Correctional Institution, and five prisons reporting one such investigation in the year. The Ross Correctional Institution reported six such investigations; the highest of all prisons in 2003, followed by Richland Correctional, Correctional Reception Center, and Ohio Reformatory for Women, each with five. The number of sexual assault investigations increased from 39 in 2003 to 124 in 2004, an increase of 85.

OTHER INVESTIGATIONS

There were 3,160 "Other Investigations" conducted by Investigators system wide in 2004, which include background checks. There were no such investigations at the Grafton Correctional Institution and Montgomery Education and Pre-Release Center. The remaining institutions reported from two such investigations at the Dayton Correctional Institution to 555 at the Ohio State Penitentiary. There are seven prisons with more than 200 such investigations in the category. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported 18 such investigations in 2004. Such investigations system wide increased from 2,948 in 2003 to 3,160 in 2004, an increase of 212. The Toledo Correctional Institution reported 16 such investigations in 2003, an increase of 2 in 2004 with a total of 18.