If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

134565

NCCD

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
685 Market Street, Suite 620 San Francisco, CA 94105 ■ (415) 896-6223
S.I. Newhouse Center at Rutgers, 15 Washington Street, Fourth Floor Newark, NJ 07102 ■ (201) 643-5805
6409 Odana Road Madison, WI 53719 ■ (608) 274-8882

EVALUATION OF THE

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

124565

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

1984

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
1045 East Dayton, Suite 214, Madison, Wisconsin 53703 608/251-0371

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON
CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Allen F. Breed; Chairman, Board of Directors
Barry Krisberg, Ph.D.; President
James Austin, Ph.D.; Research Director

CONTRIBUTING STAFF:

S. Christopher Baird; Director, Midwest Office
Douglas A. Holien; Senior Analyst, Midwest Office
Audrey J. Bakke; Senior Analyst, Midwest Office
Gladys Petry; Word Processing Technician, Midwest Office

CONSULTANTS:

Gary Arling, Ph.D.
Jim Brittain
Adelaide Krahn

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report acknowledge the cooperation of the many Tennessee Department of Corrections staff who willingly gave of their time and themselves to assist us during the course of this evaluation. In particular, the assistance of Ronnie Lane, Director of Classification and Linda Layda of the classification office was invaluable and is greatly appreciated.

The Department is to be commended for the steps taken in the past few years to implement the NIC Classification Model. Although this report is quite critical of aspects of the Tennessee Department of Correction classification system, it does appear that the foundation is in place from which the Department can build a sound and useful classification system.

We hope that this evaluation is helpful and aids in improving classification in the Tennessee Department of Corrections. Any errors or omissions in this report are, of course, the responsibility of the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. OVERVIEW OF THE NIC CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	13
3. TDOC COMPLIANCE WITH NIC CLASSIFICATION PRINCIPLES	21
4. THE TDOC CLASSIFICATION PROCESS	38
5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	58
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	73

APPENDIX A: TDOC CLASSIFICATION FORMS (9 Pages)

APPENDIX B: CLASSIFICATION EVALUATION (14 Pages)

APPENDIX C: CMC - STRATEGIES FOR CASE SUPERVISION (39 Pages)

TABLE OF TABLES

		PAGE
Table 1.1	Comparisons of Incarceration and Crime Rates Among Selected States	6
Table 1.2	Racial Differences in TDOC Institutional Populations	8
Table 2.1	Security Designations	18
Table 2.2	Custody Designations	19
Table 4.1	TDOC Inmate Profiles	53
Table 4.2	Comparison of Initial Security Scores and Actual Placement.	54
Table 4.3	Comparison of Reclassification Security Scores and Actual Placement	54
Table 4.4	Types of Overrides at Initial Classification. .	55
Table 4.5	Types of Overrides at Reclassification.	55
Table 4.6	Comparisons of Number of Disciplinary Reports Received: Close Security and Other Security Inmates (By Score)	55
Table 5.1	Availability of Reports in TDOC Files	64
Fig. 6.1	Recommended Classification Process.	82

PREFACE

The findings and recommendations of our evaluation are discussed in detail in chapters five and six. The following listings are provided as a synopsis for the reader's convenience.

FINDINGS

1. Goals and objectives for classification have not been developed and clearly articulated to staff.

2. The Tennessee Department of Correction does not have a functioning classification system in place.

3. The Tennessee adaptation of the NIC System ignores custody issues and reduces the role of classification.

4. Classifications are often based on inadequate information.

5. The error rates in completing initial classification forms appears to be in the 30-35% range.

6. The currently used cut-off points result in too high a proportion of the inmates rated as minimum security.

7. Many inmates are currently double celled in the reception centers. This situation is not consistent with sound classification practices.

8. The current classification system appears to have been added to existing procedures, rather than replacing old processes where appropriate.

9. Classification data has not been integrated into the agency's information system.

10. The current management information system is inadequate, expensive, inflexible, and outdated. In its present condition, it cannot support management's needs.

11. Use of the inmate needs assessment is presently unclear.

12. Many inconsistencies in classification practices were evident among reception centers and institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Goals and objectives of the classification process should be developed and clearly articulated to staff. These goals and objectives must relate directly to the mission statement of the Department of Correction.

2. Current legislation should be modified to allow TDOC more flexibility in managing its population. Security assignments must be based on classification, if the agency is to make optimal use of limited resources.

3. Information sources for classification must be upgraded significantly.

4. TDOC should immediately develop comprehensive custody definitions and classify inmates to appropriate custody, rather than security, levels. Housing areas of each institution should be designated for specific custody levels.

5. Cut-off scores used to assign inmates to minimum security settings should be altered to reduce eligibility.

6. In accordance with NIC guidelines, all inmates should be reclassified at six month intervals.

7. Overrides of classification scores must be reduced dramatically. Acceptable reasons for overrides should be established by policy.

8. Inmates in reception centers should not be double celled before the classification process is completed.

9. The reception center process should be shortened from 60 to 30 days.

10. A well designed structured interview format should be used to obtain information from inmates. Counselors should receive training necessary to use such an instrument.

11. Management information system capabilities should be upgraded.

12. The purpose and use of inmate need assessments in TDOC should be determined.

13. Staffing requirements for both reception centers and institutions should be ascertained through a carefully constructed workload analysis.

14. It is recommended that a task force be developed to restructure the current classification process.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In September, 1984 the Tennessee Department of Corrections contracted with the Midwest office of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the Department's inmate classification system. Classification is one of several critical issues addressed in Grubbs, et. al., vs. Pelligrin et. al., a suit filed in the Middle District of Tennessee. In an agreement between plaintiff's counsel, Special Master, Patrick McManus and the Department of Corrections, outside evaluators were brought in to analyze Department operations in designated areas including:

- Management;
- Inmate Jobs;
- Inmate Educational Programs;
- Institutional Environment;
- Security at TDOC facilities; and
- Classification of inmates

In evaluating the Department's classification system, NCCD focused on several key issues. TDOC, in 1982, adopted the Model Prison Classification system developed by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), a federal technical assistance agency under the administrative auspices of the U. S. Department of Justice. This system, with some modifications, is currently the most widely used system in the nation. It has been implemented in Colorado, Wisconsin, Virginia, Vermont, Nevada and Kentucky as well as Tennessee. While the system, as designed, offers an excellent

base for classification, success in each state depends on modifications made, staff understanding of the intent of the system and on policies regarding overrides (assigning a classification level outside of the system's guidelines), reclassification, and monitoring processes established to ensure compliance.

The basis for development of the NIC system is well documented in Prison Classification: A Model Systems Approach, published in 1982. This report provided a basis for evaluating TDOC use of the system. The primary issues addressed in this evaluation are:

- Are TDOC policies and practices in compliance with NIC's fourteen Principles of Classification?
- Are modifications made to the NIC classification scales consistent with the intent of the system?
- Have clear definitions of security and custody levels been developed? If so, how do they compare to NIC definitions?
- What is the current level of override and what are the principle reasons for overrides?

In addition to these primary issues, several important secondary issues were examined:

- Are instructions found in the TDOC Users Guide adequate to ensure consistency among staff members?
- Is the classification process uniformly applied throughout the agency? If not, what differences exist?
- Is the process efficient? Could it be streamlined to make better use of staff resources?
- Are the NIC scales accurately completed by TDOC staff? If not, what is the degree and direction of error?
- How is the system monitored...are agency information system capabilities sufficient?

- o Are inmate needs adequately assessed?
- o Are information sources adequate? What percentage of cases come to the Department with pre-sentence investigations completed?

Each of these issues was thoroughly analyzed during the course of the project. Based on specific requests from the Department of Corrections, the User's Guide and the agency's management information system received added attention and findings and recommendations are presented for both of these areas.

Project Methodology

The project methodology included a thorough review of all relevant documents, including the Corrections Plan of the 80's (TDOC), The TDOC Users Guide, and A Management History of the Tennessee Department of Corrections. Evaluations of other systems completed by NCCD as well as the NIC document Prison Classification: A Model Systems Approach were also reviewed for comparison purposes.

In addition to the review of documents, staff at each reception center and at selected institutions in each region were interviewed by NCCD staff and consultants. James Britain, Superintendent of the Colorado Territorial Prison completed a thorough analysis of three Tennessee institutions to ascertain the degree of compliance with NIC custody and security specifications.

Finally, NCCD staff completed manual files searches to collect data on 528 inmates. This information was computerized and provided the basis for the following assessment:

- o Estimated the level of accuracy attained by TDOC in completing classification forms;

- o Established the degree and direction of classification overrides;
- o Determined if adequate information is available to properly classify inmates; and
- o Analyzed the appropriateness of current item weights and cut-off scores used to designate classification levels.

A TDOC data tape of disciplinaries was requested so that a comparison of critical paper file data and automated file information could be completed. The Department, however, was not able to produce this tape.

TDOC Population Parameters

The Tennessee Department of Corrections appears to house a very high percentage of violent offenders. Of the random sample of 528 cases, nearly 75% were convicted of some degree of homocide, kidnapping, sexual assault, robbery, or arson. This level of assaultiveness among the incarcerated population is similar to that of states with much lower incarceration rates (i.e., states where high percentages of non violent offenders receive sanctions other than prison sentences). There are undoubtedly many factors contributing to this phenomenon, but only one surfaced from our review of the data. Most of the violent offenders in our sample did not have extensive prior records (although lack of comprehensive background information generally and juvenile records in particular, probably resulted in an underestimation of prior criminal histories.) However, persons convicted of violent offenses in Tennessee appear to serve longer sentences than those imposed in many other states. As a result of these longer terms of imprisonment, violent offenders comprise a

high proportion of the average daily population of Tennessee prisons. A review of annual admissions to Tennessee prisons would probably indicate a higher percentage of non violent offenders are coming into the system. However, since these offenders receive shorter sentences, they comprise a smaller proportion of average daily populations statistics. This trend is supported by age comparisons as TDOC inmates appear to be somewhat older than many other incarcerated populations. Two thirds of our sample were over 25; half were over 30 and about 16% were over 40 years of age.

Nationally, Tennessee places 37th among the 50 states in overall crime rate, 24th in rate of violent crime but 15th in incarceration rate.*

Table 1.1 presents the ten states with the highest incarceration rates and also outlines general crime rates and rates of violent crime for these states. The data clearly illustrates that incarceration rates and crime rates are not always directly related. For example, Alabama has the nation's sixth highest rate of incarceration, but ranks 34th overall in crimes reported per 100,000 population and 22nd in violent crimes reported. Tennessee's position is similar; the incarceration rate is higher (relative to other states) than the crime rate indicates it might be. This circumstance has implications for classification. Generally, states that have high incarceration rates can place high proportions of inmates at lower custody

*Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1985.

TABLE 1.1

COMPARISONS OF INCARCERATION AND CRIME RATES AMONG SELECTED STATES (1983)[1]

STATE	INCARCERATION RATE* (per 100,000)	CRIME RATE* (per 100,000)	VIOLENT CRIME RATE* (per 100,000)
Nevada	354 (1)	6701 (2)	655 (7)
Louisiana	290 (2)	5027 (19)	641 (8)
Maryland	277 (3)	5357 (15)	806 (3)
South Carolina	276 (4)	4771 (24)	617 (9)
Delaware	273 (5)	5466 (14)	453 (20)
Georgia	259 (6)	4505 (28)	457 (19)
Alabama	243 (7)	4101 (34)	416 (22)
Florida	235 (8)	6781 (1)	827 (2)
North Carolina	233 (9)	4184 (31)	410 (23)
Arizona	223 (10)	6392 (6)	494 (15)
TENNESSEE	187 (15)	4012 (37)	403 (24)

*Rank in Parentheses

[1] Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States 1985, 105th Edition, pp. 167, 184.

levels. Our data indicates that this is the case in Tennessee: Well over half of the population scores at the minimum level on the Tennessee scales. Some adjustments to these scales are recommended in a subsequent section of the report which should decrease the number of inmates rates as minimum custody. However, the proportion of inmates that can be placed in minimum security settings will remain quite high.

Some racial disparities were also noted in our random sample of cases. A majority of inmates in Fort Pillow and Lake County are Black while the vast majority (77%) of offenders in Morgan county and 60% of inmates at the Tennessee State Penitentiary are White. However, the racial composition of facilities corresponds generally to regional differences in overall population in Tennessee. By policy, Tennessee attempts to keep inmates housed within the region where their families live, so the racial composition of facilities should approximate that of each region. Table 1.2 outlines the racial breakdown of our sample by institution, as well as proportion of Blacks and Whites in the major city of each region. Additional statistics regarding the inmate population are presented in later sections of this report.

Because types of crimes vary somewhat by race and by urban and rural settings, regional differences could have implications for classification in TDOC facilities.

Summary of TDOC Staff Concerns

As further introduction to problems, encountered with the TDOC classification system, an overview of results of interviews with staff is presented.

TABLE 1.2

RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN TDOC INSTITUTIONAL POPULATIONS
(Based on Random Sample)

REGION	INSTITUTION	N	% BLACK	% WHITE	MAJOR CITY	% BLACK	% WHITE
WEST:	Fort Pillow	69	58%	42%	Memphis	40%	59%
	Lake County	86	70%	29%			
CENTRAL:							
	Tennessee State Penitentiary	149	39%	60%	Nashville	16%	83%
	Tennessee Women's Prison	49	33%	67%			
EAST:	Morgan County	167	22%	77%	Knoxville	7%	92%

NCCD staff visited each reception center, the Tennessee State Prison, the Tennessee Prison for Women, Fort Pillow, Morgan County, Turney Center, and the Lake County Regional Correctional Facility.

Wardens, Associate Wardens, Correctional Counselors, and Psychological Examiners were interviewed. There were many common themes voiced by different people at each institution. The following information is a synopsis of TDOC staff comments regarding how classification actually functions and their attitudes about the system.

A general theme echoed by several staff involved the TDOC use of the Corrections Plan of the 80's. Many felt the plan abandoned treatment and programming and was a misguided attempt to provide a clear mission and statement of priorities for TDOC. It was indicated that significant loss of treatment staff occurred and institutional programming was significantly curtailed. Many staff question if TDOC is really concerned about providing meaningful treatment and programming. The vast majority of all levels of staff interviewed feel that treatment staff are significantly overworked and do not have sufficient time to do investigation of inmate self reported data and generally do not have time to do a thorough job. Extreme examples cited include counselors responsible for hundreds of inmates and at least one institution that reportedly has only one psychologist available for over 800 inmates. As a result, staff indicate that many treatment jobs have become simply an exercise in paperwork and little effective treatment or programming actually occurs.

All staff interviewed cited lack of bedspace systemwide as presenting significant problems for the classification process. Many staff indicate an inability to appropriately place "special need" inmates. Additionally, a high priority is placed on allowing inmates to serve their sentences in a region of the state near their families. Staff indicate this often cannot occur due to bedspace limitations and/or attempting to meet programming needs at "speciality" institutions. Many staff felt that speciality institutions, as indicated in the Correctional Plan of the 80's, looked good on paper but have proven unrealistic in practice. These staff felt that a return to strong general programming at each "time building" institution, while maintaining some speciality programs, will allow more effective inmate placement.

Many reception center staff acknowledge that the current result of the initial classification process simply boils down to "placing inmates where the space is". Staff point to numerous examples where the classification panel and warden have made institution assignments based on classification evaluation results, only to have to change that assignment because bedspace was not available at the intended facility. When this occurs, staff point out that no formal process exists to return the inmate to the institution to which he/she was originally assigned. As one staff member stated, "the inmate must ride a counselor to ever get to the institution of original classification". Staff acknowledge that this results in a "non process" that precludes a rational approach to classification and programming.

Staff indicate other concerns with the initial classification process. Many point to the Class X and Judges Sentencing Law as prohibiting appropriate classification. Staff cite everyday occurrences where inmates score minimum, but must be overriden to higher security levels due to these statutes or agency policy based on interpretation of law. As a result, maximum and medium units have no space available while minimum security beds are half full. As a result, staff feel that the TDOC classification process is often a meaningless exercise in paperwork due to these override statutes and subsequent lack of bedspace. As one staff member stated, "if the judges are going to classify inmates for us at sentencing, why should we do it here?" Another staff member stated, "most inmates are treated the same regardless of classification and there aren't many real differences between institutions. The forms make no real difference and classification doesn't really matter".

Many staff view the reclassification process as a "job board" and see reclassification as simply meaning a change or review of job assignments for an inmate. Many staff did not see a value in the program review items. Likewise, staff indicated that reclassification scores were also frequently overriden due to Class X or Judges Sentencing Law. Thus, many staff also viewed the reclassification process as fairly meaningless. They felt reclassification usually had no effect on inmates, other than changes in job assignments.

In general, many staff at all levels expressed frustration at "constantly changing priorities", inconsistencies between institutions, and lack of overall direction. In addition, staff

frequently voiced concern about high workload, low pay, lack of appropriate training, and lack of public support for the department. Many staff indicated that TDOC has many dedicated and exceptional personnel at all levels and expressed the hope that conditions will improve.

Subsequent sections of this report will cover the following areas:

- An overview of NIC Classification System
- TDOC Compliance with Principles of Classification Established by the National Institute of Corrections
- Review of Policies and Practices as Presented in the TDOC User's Guide
- Review of the TDOC Classification Process
- Summary of Findings
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 2

An Overview of the NIC Classification System

The classification system developed by the National Institute of Corrections in 1982 is unique in several respects. The system was developed with input from correctional administrators, researchers from both correctional and university settings, and attorneys from the American Civil Liberties Union's National Prison Project. NIC's intent was to achieve a balanced view of classification and devise a system that was well grounded in research, met the operational requirements of correctional officials and would withstand even the most rigorous tests of the courts.

The NIC approach recognizes classification as the management system of corrections. Thus, it is far more comprehensive than other systems incorporating custody and needs assessment, program monitoring and assessment reclassification and a management information system into a single package.

Like the Federal Bureau of Prisons system, NIC sought to clearly delineate custody and security issues. Definitions of each incorporated standards set by the American Correctional Association, the American Bar Association and relevant court decisions. Under the NIC system, security is defined as physical (architectural or environmental) constraints and custody as the degree of staff supervision provided. Inmates are classified according to custody needs and assigned to institutions where differential levels of supervision are provided.

The distinction between custody and security recognizes that while a given inmate may pose a significant threat to the community, resulting in the need for close security, his or her behavior during confinement may be sufficiently non-dangerous as to allow for reduced supervision within the confines of the prison. Clearly, maintaining inmates at excessive custody levels represents a waste of supervisory resources within security levels and may well contribute to undue stress on staff and inmates alike.

This seemingly simple differentiation has allowed several correctional systems increased flexibility in using available resources.

Experience indicates, that the role of many security classification systems ends after assignment to a facility. Decisions regarding housing, job assignments, movements allowed, etc. are based on other, often unspecified criteria. The NIC system however, designates the appropriate type of housing, allowable movement, and degree of supervision required for each inmate.

The National Institute of Corrections also recognized the limitations involved in predicting inmate behavior and based scale development on two assumptions:

> Custody decisions should be based, to the extent possible, on actual past relevant behavior. The frequency, recency, and severity of past behavior is the best indicator of future similar behavior. At intake, however, it may be necessary to consider other variables demonstrated to be correlated with institutional adjustment (such as age, employment history, etc.), but these should be replaced at <u>reclassification</u> by measures of actual institutional behavior (e.g., disciplinary reports).
>
> Inmates should be classified to the least restrictive custody

required to protect society, staff, and other inmates. Therefore, maximum custody placements should be reserved for inmates who have demonstrated through past violent behavior that they are a serious threat to other inmates or staff. The highest level assigned at the initial classification should be close custody (with specific exceptions such as protective custody cases, temporary assignments for pending investigations, etc.). The decision to place an inmate in close custody should be based on past assaultive behavior and history of escape attempts.

Although the initial classification scale is based on available research and is somewhat predictive in nature, the reclassification instrument is based entirely on actual past behavior with considerable emphasis placed on institutional adjustment. Thus, the system quickly assumes a "just desserts" approach to classification: Inmates who present few disciplinary problems move to lower custody levels, while those adjusting poorly remain at or move to higher levels.

The format of the NIC instrument is also somewhat unique. It attempts to incorporate the strengths of both the "Decision Tree" - different custody level assignments are based on different criteria - and the additive models -- decisions are not unduly influenced by a single variable. As a result, only inmates with histories of violence are assigned to close and maximum custody. This was accomplished while maintaining a simple format that requires no mathematical operations other than summing for a score.

The NIC model also contains a standard needs assessment and suggests a means for incorporating the classification data into an agency's automated information system. Some states have expanded the needs assessment instrument to the point where it is considered a valuable tool for both data collection and case

planning. The data collection process recommended is simple and efficient and allows for routine monitoring of decisions and evaluation of programs, policies and procedures.

The NIC classification model has been implemented in Vermont, Colorado, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Kentucky and Virginia. Each state has introduced some minor modifications, and overall, the system has been well received by both staff and inmates. States using the NIC Model system consider the benefits to include greater consistency in classification decisions, more appropriate classification decisions, greater accountability with decisions based on standard policies and procedures, ability to use limited resources more efficiently, and the availability of better data for planning, evaluation and monitoring.

Problems encountered with the NIC instruments have led to the modifications previously mentioned. Several states have indicated that use of the scales often moved inmates too quickly to lower custody levels. To correct this problem, these states increased weights given specific items and/or raised cut-off points for each custody level. One state, Virginia, also added a sentence length variable to the scale.

Vermont addressed this issue in a different manner. A policy grid was developed which made placements dependent both on time to release and the custody score. A copy of this matrix is presented on page 17.

NIC custody and security specifications are outlined in Tables 2.1 and 2.2.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sentence Structure

Custody Classification Instrument	Time to Serve to Minimum Release Date	Custody Placement
Community	0 - 6 Months	Community
	6 - 9 Months	Minimum Regional
	More than 9 Months to Less 5 Years, Over-Ride to	Minimum Central
	More than 5 Years to Less than 12 Years, Over-Ride to	Medium Central
	More than 12 Years*	Out of State(Recommendation)
Minimum	0 - 9 Months	Minimum Regional
	More than 9 Months to 5 Years	Minimum Central
	More than 5 Years to Less than 12 Years,Over-Ride to	Medium Central
	More than 12 Years*	Out of State(Recommendation)
Medium	0 - 15 Months	Medium Regional
	More than 15 Months to Less than 12 Years	Medium Central
	More than 12 Years and Up, Over-Ride to	Out of State(Recommendation)
Close	Less than 15 Months	Close Regional(2 x 30 Days)
	More than 15 Months	Close Central(2 x 6 Months)
		Over-Ride to
		Then Out of State Recommendation
Maximum	Less than 6 Months	Close Regional (2 x 30)
	More than 6 Months	Out of State(Recommendation)

*Inmates with more than 12 years to serve (with good time), regardless of custody level, should be considered for an out of state hearing.

TABLE 2.1

SECURITY DESIGNATIONS

	COMMUNITY	MINIMUM	MEDIUM	CLOSE	MAXIMUM
PERIMETER	None	Clearly designated by single fence or unarmed "posts"	Secure	Secure	Secure
TOWERS	None	Optional (manned less than 24 hours)	Manned 24 hours	Manned 24 hours	Manned 24 hours
EXTERNAL PATROL	None	Intermittent	Yes	Yes	Yes
DETECTION DEVISES	None	None	Yes	Yes	Yes
HOUSING	Single rooms and/or multiple rooms	Single rooms and/or multiple rooms and/or multiple dorms	Single cells or rooms and/or dormitories	Single ouside or inside cells	Single inside cells, corridor grills

DEFINITIONS:

SECURE PERIMETER: Walled or double-fenced perimeter with armed towers. All entry and exit into and out of the compound is via sally ports.

INSIDE CELL: A cell which is contained on four sides within a cellblock; i.e., if an inmate escapes from the cell, he is still confined within the building.

OUTSIDE CELL: A cell with a wall or window immediately adjacent to the outside of the building; i.e., if an inmate escapes from the cell, he has escaped from the building.

TABLE 2.2

CUSTODY DESIGNATIONS

	COMMUNITY	MINIMUM	MEDIUM	CLOSE	MAXIMUM
DAY MOVEMENT	Unrestricted	Unrestricted	Unrestricted	All normal movement unescorted but, observed by staff	Escorted only
NIGHT MOVEMENT	Unrestricted	Unrestricted	Under staff observation	Escorted or check-out/check-in basis	Only on order of Watch Commander and on escorted basis
SUPERVISION	Periodic as appropriate to circumstances of work or activities	Supervised in groups by an unarmed officer	Frequent and direct observation by staff	Always observed and supervised	Always escorted
LEAVE THE INSTITUTION	Daily and unescorted Eligible for unescorted furloughs	Under supervision Eligible for unescorted furloughs	Under close and/or armed supervision. Eligible for escorted furloughs	Armed one-on-one escort and in handcuffs. Not eligible for furloughs	Armed one-on-one escort and in full restraints. Not eligible for furlough
ACCESS TO PROGRAMS	Unrestricted, including all community based programs/activities	All inside the perimeter and selected community based programs and activities	All inside the perimeter	Selected programs and activities inside the perimeter	Selected cell activity only
ACCESS TO JOBS	All, both inside and outside the perimeter	All inside, and supervised jobs outside the perimeter	All inside the perimeter	Only day jobs inside the perimeter	None
MEAL MOVEMENT	Unrestricted	Unrestricted	Under staff observation	Controlled and supervised	Fed in cell or on the cellblock

DEFINITIONS: CONTROLLED MOVEMENT: Performed under constant staff observation and direction, usually on a check-out/check-in basis.

NCCD Consultant, Jim Brittain, Superintendent, Colorado Department of Corrections, conducted site visits at Fort Pillow, Turney Center, and Tennessee State Prison to evaluate these institutions according to NIC security standards. Significant security deficiencies at each facility coupled with the high degree of overrides prevented an evaluation of TDOC use of NIC guidelines. As a result, Brittain's report dealt with security, construction and other issues related to, but technically beyond the scope of the classification process. However, we felt his comments were accurate, of considerable value to TDOC, and are therefore presented in Appendix B.

CHAPTER 3

Compliance with National Institute of Corrections Classification Principles

This section evaluates the extent to which the Tennessee Department of Corrections (TDOC) classification policies (400 series) conform to accepted correctional practices; more particularly the extent to which these policies implement the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) classification model for adult institutions. We will also review the agency classification User's Guide for clarity and consistency in its approach to implementation of TDOC classification policies.

The American Correctional Association (ACA) has promulgated a number of recommendations concerning the establishment of an effective classification process within correctional institutions. Guided by these recommendations, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) developed a model systems approach to classification which further defined and operationalized the ACA standards. As part of their manual, Prison Classification: A Model Systems Approach, NIC proposes fourteen principles as being basic to the operation of any valid classification system. These fourteen principles can also be used as criteria on which an assessment of the functioning of the TDOC classification system can be based.

The primary concerns addressed in this section are TDOC statements of policy and not with potential discrepancies between policy and function. Therefore, this section simply examines how TDOC stated policies measure up to each of the NIC principles of classification as presented below.

Principle 1. There must be a clear definition of goals and objectives of the total correctional system.

The statement of goals and objectives establishes the foundation of a classification process. Any correctional system, by its existence, has implicit responsibilities extending beyond incarceration. In order for a classification program to function appropriately there needs to be an explicit statement of prioritized objectives which address issues such as risk to staff, inmates, the community; inmate rehabilitation; and system risk.

The only document provided to us, which contained such a statement, was the Correction Plan for the 80's. The declaration of policy contained in that publication can be summed up as the corrections system's recognition of its role as an agent of social control through the restriction of individual liberty. The restriction of liberty through incarceration is a last resort but having utilized it, the system is required only to maintain minimum standards of humaneness in institutions. Finally, in

> "there will be no 'rehabilitation or job training programs offered in the adult correctional system except those that are directly related to making it possible for prisoners to work at the specific skilled occupations necessary to maintain the prison system."(p. iii)

discussion with TDOC staff, the status of this plan as a statement of policy seemed unclear. We could find no references in the written policies governing the classification procedures which used this document as a reference.

Principle 2. There must be detailed written procedures and policies governing the classification process.

Having defined goals and objectives, the classification process becomes one vehicle for attaining these goals. Detailed and clearly written policies are necessary to assure the uniform implementation of the classification program to achieve the appropriate objectives. Included in the issues to be addressed are the composition and responsibilities of classification committees, instructions concerning changes in inmate custody and/or program plarticipation, transfer procedures, etc.

The TDOC has developed a comprehensive series of policies (400 series) outlining classification procedures. In addition, TDOC has produced a User's Guide which operationalizes these policies for staff. At one level, the 400 series appropriately speaks to all of the classification issues cited by NIC. However, at another level, the policies are basically flawed in that there is no apparent, clear point of reference guiding the classification process toward some stated departmental goal(s).

Policy 401.03, dealing with the initial classification process states the purpose of the policy is

> "to establish a uniform procedure for the initial classification of all inmates entering the custody of the Department (TDOC)."

It defines classification as follows:

> "Classification: the continuous process of reviewing an inmate's behavior and circumstances to assure that needs are assessed and that appropriate decisions are made and implemented to the fullest extent which inmate cooperation and TDOC resources will allow. Initial classification is completed by reception center staff. Subsequent classifications are called classification reviews.
>
> Initial Classification: This process commences with the receipt of newly committed or of certain returning inmates and involves the assignment of

> a unique TDOC number, the establishment of files, and examinations, and assessments. At the conclusion of a hearing decisions are made about the security designation, transfer and/or assignment to an institution, and about which work, educational, vocational, and to treatment program assignments are appropriate according to needs and TDOC resources."(sic)

A clear definition of the ultimate goal of the processes is lacking within these statements. For example, are security designations assigned to minimize risk to the public or to assure that inmates are classified at the least restrictive level of security necessary? Are the needs of the inmate secondary to those of the system or vice versa? Is it more important that classification attempt to minimize breaches of security or address the rehabilitation needs of inmates? A statement of prioritized objectives is necessary to guide the classification process, both for the establishment of policy and directing changes in procedure.

Principle 3. The classification process must provide for the collection of complete, high-quality, verified, standardized data.

In order to maintain necessary safeguards that classification decisions are based on sufficient information, essential procedures must be developed to assure that the information is reliable and provided to the institution staff in a timely manner. The availability of such information not only enhances equity and standardization of classification decisions, but provides a data base for the analysis of trends in a department.

Policies 401.04 and 401.04.1 deal most specifically with this principle. Standardized forms or formats are mandated for obtaining data from appropriate sources in the field and during

the reception process. However, it should be noted that there exists the potential for violations of this principle. Given the classification iunstruments TDOC has selected the availability of valid information on criminal history is of critical importance. Presentence investigations (PSI's) and National Crime Information Center (NCIC) reports are the primary sources for this information. If TDOC is to avoid reliance on the questionable validity of inmates' self report, the need for accurate, complete and timely information received in PSI's is critical.

Principle 4. Measurement and testing instruments used in the classification decision-making process must be valid, reliable, and objective.

It becomes obvious that the system being advocated by NIC is both rationally and incrementally developed. The increments are:

1) a basic statement of intent;
2) written policies governing implementation;
3) definition of information necessary; and
4) an information format or scoring system to generate reliable, valid and objective data to assist in classification decisions.

To this last point, NIC has developed from their survey of various classification schemes, classification instruments which attempt to meet the above criteria.

TDOC has attempted to fulfill the requirement of the above principle by adapting the NIC custody and needs assessment forms to its system. However, in adapting these instruments, changes were incorporated which could significantly effect the desired qualities mentioned above. A detailed discussion of these changes and potential impact is contained in Chapter 4 dealing with the User's Guide.

Principle 5. There must be explicit policy statements structuring and checking the discretionary decision-making powers of classification team staff.

The relationship of the first four principles to the one above is clear: with the implementation of a valid, reliable and objective system of classification, clearly defined parameters must be drawn to limit the ability to override recommended placement for less than valid reasons. To this point, TDOC policy defines a series of checks including recurrent monitoring of the classification process by central office staff and defined procedures for inter-institutional transfer with central office veto power. However, by statute and departmental policy, overrides of the system clasification system appear to be mandated in a significant number of cases. The picture that emerges is somewhat uniuque in that as opposed to the situation in which policy must be developed to prevent or limit overrides, in TDOC overrides are specifically required for large groups inmates.

Principle 6. There must be provision for screening and further evaluating prisoners who are management problems and those who have special needs.

The intent is twofold: to attempt to protect inmates from assault and to identify those that may have unique physical or psychological impairments requiring attention. As part of the classification process, it is necessary to develop procedures to systematically identify those inmates who are likely to be victims as well as those who show proclivities toward assaultiveness requiring close supervision. As a separate but related issue, special screening for the physically, mentally or psychologically impaired is necessary.

A number of policies have been developed to deal quite specifically with these issues. Policies 402.02.1, 404.03 and 404.03.1 state policy regarding incompatible inmates, special need inmates and handicapped inmates. These policies address the recommended procedures for appropriate handling.

Principle 7. There must be provisions to match offenders with programs; these provisions must be consistent with risk classification.

This can be viewed as a three level process:

1) accurate identification of the specific program needs of each offender;
2) program assignment based on the assessment; and
3) using the assessments as a means of evaluating system needs for planning further program development.

Overlapping this process is the requirement that program assignment be consistent with custody requirements and the availability of resources. However, if significant demonstrable program needs are not available at a necessary level of security, this information becomes part of the department's planning for development or reallocation of program resources. Also, contained within this principle is the recommendation for individualized program plans.

TDOC policy 404.01 cites available programs and the security designations of each institution, although this may be outdated, and also states prioritized considerations to be used in making placement decisions.

Principle 8. There must be provisions to classify each prisoner at the least restrictive custody level.

The focus of this principle is to deal with a problem prevalent in many correctional department classification systems:

overclassification. This is the tendency to assign inmates to higher levels of supervision than might be reasonably required. Equally as important as the custody assignment, is that guidelines clearly differentiate the expectations for staff supervision and physical security needed for each level of custody.

Policy 404.07 places TDOC in philosophical compliance with this principle. However, this same policy also defines classes of offenders who are generally excluded from placement in minimum security and specifically, minimum community. As is mentioned in the discussion of Principle 5, these prohibitions are derived from both statute and policy and include large segments of the inmate population.

Principle 9. There must be provision to involve the prisoner in the classification process.

Inmate involvement is necessary in order to insure an understanding of the implications of the recommended classification. This can be accomplished by providing a written explanation of the classification process, custody criteria and program availability. Additionally, with the possible exception of committee deliberations, efforts should be made to have the inmates present during the classification process.

TDOC specifically mandates inmates' presence at hearings and acknowledgement of the classification recommendation through signature of a form. Rights of appeal are also spelled out. However, we were not able to discover a policy statement directing classification teams to provide prisoners with written explanation of the classification process, security designations or program availability.

Principle 10. There must be provision for systematic, periodic reclassification hearings.

Review of inmates' adjustment within the system on specified anniversary dates is necessary to appropriately change custody level and program involvement to meet changing needs. While making the frequency of reviews dependent on length of sentence, NIC recommends that reviews occur no less frequently than every six months.

TDOC appears to have struck a compromise between compliance with the principle and absolute adherence to the suggested guidelines. Custody reclassification is required every one or two years, depending on the length of sentence. Policy requires a review of an inmate's program involvement at six-month intervals.

Principle 11. The classification process must be efficient and economically sound.

The key to fulfilling this mandate is data generation, retrieval and communication. The simplicity of the NIC scales which place classification on data that should be readily available to any correctional agency, greatly assist adherence to this principle. However, the principle also implies that classification data be aggregated efficiently and used for planning, management and evaluation purposes.

Reference to the central office OBCIS is made in a number of TDOC policy statements. The intent appears to be that the basic management information system be maintained at this level.

Additionally, NCIC is cited as the appropriate clearing-house for inter-agency data. However, no mention is made of retaining and aggregating classification data for management use. The TDOC Management Information system is discussed further subsequent sections of this report.

Principle 12. There must be a provision to continuously evaluate and improve the classification process.

A basic system for monitoring the process is required for two essential purposes. First, on the assumption that the components of the process are fundamentally sound, ongoing audit of these classification functions is required to maintain the integrity of the system. Second, any classification scheme, particularly one which is based on objective standards must be dynamic and responsive to changes in the inmate population, the correctional system and the profession.

Specific mandates for auditing the system are assigned by policy to central office classification staff. Specifications as to scope, timing and routing of audit evaluations are also outlined.

Principle 13. Classification procedures must be consistent with constitutional requisites.

This principle derives from recognition of the number of suits which have been brought against correctional agencies across the country. Often, decisions emanating from these suits impact directly or indirectly on classification practices.

This is obviously an appropriate caution for any correctional system, but, it does not seem an entirely appropriate subject for a policy statement. TDOC's cannot be faulted for not addressing

this issue but one would hope, particularly given their recent past history, that safeguards would be built in to ensure that they stay abreast of legal developments in this area.

Principle 14. There must be an opportunity to gain input from administration and line staff when undertaking the development of a classification.

Given the historical nature of this issue, TDOC's current level of development and the focus of this section of the report, this point will not be addressed here.

TDOC POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The User's Guide is written as a 'how to' manual. It is intended to operationalize the policy statements, assign specific responsibilities for task completion to classification staff, define sequence and timing of tasks and instruct in the completion of required forms. To these ends, the guide is a thorough and comprehensive document. It provides a tutorial for classification staff on performance of all major phases of their job responsibilities. There are, however, some problems with the classification forms, processes and instructions outlined in the guide, and these problems require attention.

TDOC has essentially adopted the scales produced by NIC as part of their model prisoner classification project. In adapting these to the Tennessee system, apparently minor changes have been included which could result in major problems in the classification process.

The initial classification summary security sheet (CR-1391, p.2) is essentially a duplication of NIC model custody classification form. However, a significant difference is contained in item 4, Escape History. The NIC form differentiates between escapes or attempts on three dimensions; level of security, violence and recency. Tennessee has elected to drop the level of security dimension, plartially collapse the recency consideration and modify the numerical values. These changes could potentially produce significantly different results between scores on the two forms. For example, an escape from maximum security, over one year ago with no violence would score 2 on the TDOC form and 5 on the NIC form. On the other hand, an escape from minimum security over one year ago with actual or threatened violence would score 7 on the TDOC form and 5 on the NIC.

In making these changes it appears that TDOC was attempting to simplify the scoring by doing away with the level of security dimension and placing greater weight on escapes or attempts involving violence or threats.

TDOC Classification Review (CR-0078, p. 2) corresponds to the NIC, Inmate Custody Reclassification. As on the initial security classification scale, the concept of differentiation between escapes from varying levels of custody appears to have been dropped on the TDOC form and changes have been made in scale values. The result is even greater potential discrepancy between how an individual might score on one form or the other. For example, an individual who escaped within the last year from

medium custody with no violence would score 7 on the NIC form and 1 on the TDOC form.

In addressing the issue of scoring the severity of current offense item (#2) of the custody scale, NIC recommends that "each agency is free to substitute an index more appropriate to its jurisdiction" (NIC, p. 41). Indeed, TDOC has appropriately 'tailored' this scale to include factors such as "habitual criminal", "arson", etc. However, the appropriateness of including the offense of incest in the high severity cataegory (TDOC, p. A.19) which also includes armed robbery, arson and manslaughter might be questioned.

There are some discrepancies between the listings of offenses for the severity of offense scale as they are presented in two different locations in the User's Guide. On page A-62, arson and habitual criminal are listed in the high category while on p. A-19 they are included in the highest category. On p. A-62 incest is not cited while on p. A-19 it is included in the high category. Counterfeiting is broken into three clases on p. A-62 and not mentioned on p. A-18 or A-19. Finally, there are some explanatory terms concerning types of armed robbery which are not printed on p. A-19.

The instructions for scoring the alcohol/drug abuse item in the NIC manual read that an individual who has been committed to a treatment facility within the past 3 years receives a score of 3 on the custody scale. TDOC has expanded this time frame to a commitment within the last 5 years.

TDOC has also modified the score values assigned to the "number of disciplinary reports" item on the custody classification review form. The effect of this adjustment is to give an individual less credit for having a clean disciplinary record for a period of 7-18 months.

Inconsistencies are present in the numerical coding of institution disciplinary offenses. The coding of offenses as they appear on pps. B-46 and B-47 are at variance from that indicated in the Disciplinary Report Form (CR-1832) for offenses 41 through 48.

Page 3 of TDOC Form 1391, Initial Classification Summary Assessment Sheet appears to have been modeled after the NIC Assessment of Needs form. Some language found on the NIC form has been deleted. For example, under both the alcohol and abuse and drug abuse items, the highest scoring includes the words "needs treatment" which is left off the TDOC form. While this may appear a minor variation, it could be interpreted as indicative of an attitude reflecting the philosophy set forth in the "Corrections Plan for the 80's; TDOC's priorities do not include treatment. If this is indeed the mind-set, then it makes little sense to evaluate inmate treatment needs.

A program review is to be completed on each inmate every six months. Page one of the CR-0078 is the designated form for the process. It covers a number of areas of program performance. While the areas selected seem appropriate, scoring of this section would be difficult in that it relies heavily on the judgment of

the individual evaluator to determine what constitutes satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance with no bench-marks provided. For example, under the general area of social adaptation the rater is to record the number of conduct reports with guilty disposition. Taking into consideration the number and seriousness of incidents of misconduct, performance is rated as satisfactory, unsatifactory or above satisfactory. This seems to introduce a significant degree of subjectivity. In addition, the role of this form in the classification process is unclear at best.

TDOC provides a two page form (CR-2547 Social Background Summary) which is meant to be used when a pre-sentence investigation report is not available. Page one of the forms is devoted to the offender's version of the offense and record of prior charges. Page two provides space for a recording of employment history, military service, educational and vocational history. While this is preferred to having no social background information, it is a minimal substitute for an adequate pre-sentence investigation.

Summary

In adapting the NIC scales, TDOC has made changes in language and scoring which have had a negative impact on the classification process. A clear distinction between "custody" and "security" needs to be made. The User's Guide, although fairly thorough and comprehensive, contains some confusing instructions and conflicting information. The severity of offense scale is also conflicting and confusing. This scale omits several crimes which forces guesswork in rating.

TDOC should review and revise their classification scales to remedy the noted deficiencies and comply with NIC principles.

The User's Guide should be revised as needed and updated regularly. In addition, numerous TDOC classification policies contain procedural instructions. All procedural instructions contained in policy statements should be contained in the User's Guide in order to prevent inconsistent application of the classification process.

The program review form appears to be of marginal utility and consideration should be given to replacing it with a "needs reassessment" scale which could contain factors included in program review. Such a scale could provide more meaningful information that could be routinely related to initial assessments..

The social background summary, designed to be completed if a pre-sentence investigation report (PSI) is not available, is

useful only if a thorough investigation is conducted to verify inmate reported information. Without a good P.S.I. classification judgments and ratings can easily be based on faulty data. A P.S.I. or similar type report should be delivered with the initial commitment papers to enable proper classification ratings to be made.

The Presentence Investigation Report or Prison Report must contain verified, factual information describing:

- o The circumstances of the present offense
- o Prior juvenile arrests & dispositions
- o Prior adult arrests and dispositions
- o Defendants statement of offense, if given
- o Educational background
- o Employment history and job skills
- o Social background, including drug/alcohol habits, emotional stability, and marital/family relationships.

CHAPTER 4

The TDOC Classification Process

The Tennessee Department of Correction (TDOC) applies the initial classification process to new inmates entering the TDOC system from criminal courts in the state; parole violators absent from TDOC custody more than 6 months; returned escapees absent from TDOC custody more than 30 days; court returns absent from TDOC custody more than one year, and returns from Interstate Compact.

TDOC operates three reception centers for male inmates and a womens' prison which doubles as a reception center for female inmates. The three reception centers for male inmates are the East Tennessee Reception Center (ETRC) near Knoxville, the Middle Tennessee Reception Center (MTRC) near Nashville, and the West Tennessee Reception center (WTRC) near Memphis. Generally, each Reception Center serves as the receiving point for inmates committed from courts in their respective region of the state. All female inmates are received at the Tennessee Prison for Women (TPW) in Nashville.

The reception centers are designed to be temporary housing for all inmates while the initial evaluation and classification process is conducted. An inmate should complete evaluation and classification within 60 days and, based on evaluation and classification results, be transferred to appropriate long term housing at one of the "time building" institutions in the state.

Upon arrival at a reception center, the commitment papers are examined for accuracy and transportation officials are asked to

either deliver or fill out a background or jail questionnaire (CR-2574). This questionnaire asks county officials to indicate how the inmate behaved while in county custody, type of celling (single, double), existence of "incompatible inmates, history of violence or escape, and other indications of aberrant behavior. If the form is not delivered, or cannot be completed, it is to be transferred to the Records Division and a telephone call is to be made back to the previous location of incarceration. The records clerk is to then complete the form based on the telephone call.

The remainder of the form requires the intake worker to complete the Initial Classification Summary Security sheet (Initial Risk Assessment, CR1391,Pg.2) and indicate whether or not the NCIC report, Pre Sentence Investigation Report, Local Arrest Record, FBI Record, or a prior TDOC file has been received. Additionally, the intake worker is to complete an incompatible list, visiting list, and health screening form. All of the above is to be completed within the first two hours of the inmate's arrival.

The inmate's sentence is to be computed within two days (CR-1130) and an NCIC report is to be obtained, if it has not already been received. The Background (jail) Questionnaire, Initial Risk Form, the NCIC report and any prior TDOC file is to be forwarded to the Warden or Associate Warden of Security to determine single or double cell assignment. Policy designates that inmates will be single celled unless multiple occupancy is approved by the Warden or Associate Warden of Security after review of these documents.

The identification section is to complete identification forms and send requests for background information to the District Attorney General, parents, and spouse (CR-2019, CR-1378, and CR-2116).

Throughout the 60 days at the reception center, an inmate is involved in several activities involving various staff and members of the "classification team". The primary staff involved directly are a testing diagnostician, psychological examiner, chaplain and a correctional counselor who functions as the "team leader". Additionally, an inmate is medically examined and treated, as needed.

The testing diagnostician is responsible for administering and scoring tests such as personality profiles, intelligence tests, achievement and aptitude tests. The results of the tests are delivered to the psychological examiner who reviews the data, conducts at least one psychological interview of the inmate and records the assessment results (CR-2546).

The chaplain interviews the inmate and is available for personal counsel throughout the classification process. The chaplain records his perceptions of the inmate as it relates to religions and emotional needs, interest in religious programs, support of family or significant others, and potential for changing inappropriate behaviors (CR-2634).

The correctional counselor coordinates the classification process and updates the Initial Classification Summary Security Sheet (Initial Risk Assessment, CR-1391, Pg.2) as additional information is received or further investigation is conducted. The correctional counselor completes the Initial Classification

Summary Assigment Sheet (Initial Need Assessment, CR-1391, Pg.3). Additionally, if a presentence investigation report (PSI) is not received, the correctional counselor is to complete the Social Background Summary form (CR-2547).

The initial security assessment form, initial need assessment form and social background summary forms are attached in the Appendix.

The security and need assessment forms require that the correctional counselor make a forced choice rating of many items. The security assessment items include questions about an inmate's history of institutional violence, severity of current offense, prior assaultive offense history, escape history, alcohol/drug use, charges pending, prison felony convictions and stability factors. The need form items include questions about an inmate's health, alcohol/drug use, behavior/emotional problems, functioning ability, vocational status and test results, educational status and test results, job skills, social skills, and marital/family relationships.

The correctional counselor requires a great deal of factual information about an inmate in order to correctly score the items on the risk and need forms. The P.S.I. or in its absence the Social Background Summary, NCIC reports or FBI "rap sheets", the Jail Questionnaire, I.Q. and achievement test results, and inmate/family reported information are the primary sources for scoring decisions.

The scores on the security assessment form are totaled for assignment to a security level. The TDOC security assessment

form scores indicate assignment to close, medium or minimum security. TDOC has set off cutoff scores as follows:

Close Security	Score of 10 or above on first four questions.
Medium Security	Score of 7-22 on all questions.
Minimum Security	Score of 6 or less on all questions.

The scores on the needs form are not totalled and are not used to determine a security or custody level. The need form is used as a "standardized information base" which the classification team is to use in developing an "incarceration plan".

The correctional counselor completes the aforementioned forms, collects all classification data from team members, conducts interviews with the inmate, and performs background investigations as needed or as time permits. The correctional counselor utilizes all available information and makes recommendations to the classification panel.

The classification panel, by policy, should consist of the Associate Warden of Treatment, the Correctional Counselor or Psychological Examiner, and a "staff member from any department or section". Actual membership of the classification panel varied between reception centers with some panels including the warden, chaplain, or others.

The panel meets with the inmate and uses the Initial Classification Summary worksheet (CR 2544) as a tool in making classification decisions. The panel is to reach agreement on inmate security designation, institution assignment, job and work

recommendations, program recommendations and identify "special need" inmates.

The panel completes the initial classification description sheet listing the total score from the security assessment form and the corresponding security level based on TDOC cutoff scores. The panel decides if an "override" of the security level is necessary. The security level as designated by score may be overriden to any other security level. TDOC lists the following as legitimate resons for security level overrides:

1) Medical Needs
2) Security Needs
3) System Needs (i.e. lack of bedspace)
4) Statutory/TDOC Policy (i.e. Class X offenses or Judges Sentencing Law)

The Classification Panel then assigns an inmate a final security level. Although the initial security assessment score does not permit maximum security designation, TDOC lists the following security levels available at initial classification:

1) Minimum Community Security
2) Minimum Trusty Security
3) Minimum Direct Security
4) Medium Security
5) Close Security
5) Maximum Security

After final security level assignment, the panel considers policies that identify speciality programs at institutions, job needs, inmate desires, and bedspace in determining institutional assignment. TDOC policy provides that an inmate's security

designation must be within the receiving institution's range of security capabilities. Based upon interviews with staff, the following appear to be general differences and guidelines that are at least informally used in population programming. These general differences do affect assignment from reception centers, although most institutions house, in part, most security levels of inmates.

DeBerry Correctional Institute

Psychiatric and psychological facility for special need male and female inmates.

Tennessee State Prison

Maximum and Medium Security inmates from reception centers.
Medical facility.
Involuntary segregation inmates.

Fort Pillow

Maximum Close and Medium Security inmates from reception centers.
Involuntary segregation inmates.
Farming program for all level of inmates.

Turney Center

Prison Industries programs.
Medium Security inmates from reception centers.

Lake County Regional

Educational Programs.
Medium Security inmates from reception centers.

Morgan County Regional

Farming Programs.
Medium Security inmates from reception centers.
Voluntary segregation inmates from all institutions.

Bledsoe County Regional

Farming Programs.
Medium Security inmates from reception centers.

Community Service Centers

Minimum Security inmates.

The classification panel forwards the Initial Classification Summary Description sheet to the warden for approval. This sheet identifies the panel's recommended security level, override (if any), institution assignment, work and vocational recommendations for an inmate. TDOC policy requires that the warden of the reception center approve these items. If desired, the warden may change anything prior to institution transfer.

The warden's change or approval of the classification panel's decisions marks the conclusion of the initial classification process, designed to be completed within 60 days. The inmate is then transferred to the appointed "time building" institution to serve the required sentence.

Reception Center Staffing Patterns

East Tennessee Reception Center

On May 29, 1985, approximately 241 inmates were undergoing the initial classification process. An Associate Warden of Treatment supervises two classification teams. Each team consists of a Correctional Counselor 2 and a Psychological Examiner 2. One Chaplain provides services to inmates and one Clerk 2 acts as a testing diagnostician. Interviewers, recently upgraded to Correctional Counselor 2's, perform the initial file building and intake processing during the first few days after admission.

Middle Tennessee Reception Center

On May 29, 1985, approximately 325 inmates were undergoing the initial classification process. An Associate Warden of Treatment supervises two classification teams and a Correctional Counselor 3 also acts as a supervisor. A vacant Psychological Examiner 1 position exists. One team consists of a Correctional Counselor 2 and a Psychological Examiner 1. The other team consists of a Correctional Counselor 2 and a Psychological Examiner 2. As is the case in ETRC, one Chaplain provides services to inmates and one Clerk 2 acts as a testing diagnostician. Correctional Counselor 2's, perform the initial file building and intake processing during the first few days after admission.

West Tennessee Reception Center

On May 29, 1985, approximately 205 inmates were undergoing the initial classification process. The staffing patterns approximate that of the two other centers. An Associate Warden of

Treatment supervises two classification teams, and one Correctional counselor 3 also acts as a supervisor. One team consists of a Correctional counselor 2 and a Psychological Examiner 1. The other team consists of a Correctional Counselor 2 and a Psychological Examiner 2. One Chaplain provides services to inmates and a Clerk 2 acts as a testing diagnostician. Correctional Counselor 2's, perform the initial file building and intake processing during the first few days after admission.

Personnel Requirements

The Associate Warden of Treatment positions have a requirement of a Bachelors degree and 5 years experience, including 2 years as a supervisor and 1 year of adult treatment work. Additional treatment experience may be substituted for education on a year for year basis up to four years.

Correctional Counselor positions have a requirement of a Bachelors degree. A Correctional Counselor 2 is to have 1 year of counseling experience and a Correctional Counselor 3 is to have 3 years of counseling experience. Additional experience may be substituted for education on a year for year basis up to four years.

Psychological Examiner positions have a requirement of a Masters degree in Psychology and must be licensed as a Psychological Examiner. Experience is not required for a Psychological Examiner 1. Two years experience is required for a Psychological Examiner 2. A Doctorate may be substituted for experience.

The Clerk 2's do not have college degree or professional requirements.

Reclassification Process

The TDOC classification process continues after an inmate is transferred from the reception center initial classification process to long term housing within the Department of Correction.

At each TDOC institution, a program review (CR-0078, Pg.1) is to be completed on each inmate in the custody of TDOC once every six months. A full classification review (CR-0078, Pgs. 1-3) is to be completed every year for inmates sentenced to a 3 year term or less. This same review is to be completed every 2 years for inmates sentenced to a term greater than 3 years. The classification review is also to be completed on parole violators absent from TDOC less than 6 months; returned escapees absent from TDOC less than 30 days; work release violators, and court returns absent from TDOC less than one year.

The program review and classification review is to be coordinated by the assigned correctional counselor at each instituton. The correctional counselor, teacher, work supervisor, and correctional officer are to complete the program review form. The correctional counselor is to discuss it with the inmate and receive inmate sign off.

A classification review panel convenes to conduct all classification reviews. The review panel is to be comprised of a correctional officer and a member of the treatment division, usually the correctional counselor. The makeup of the panel differs between institutions and sometimes includes the Associate

Warden of Treatment, chaplain, psychological examiner, or other staff persons.

The program review and classification review forms are attached in Appendix B. The program review and the first page of the classification review are the same form (Cr-0078, Pg. 1). This page requires a forced choice rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, above satisfactory or not applicable on several items regarding the inmate. Factors assessed include housing adjustment and relationships with staff, work performance and behavior, academic adjustment, number of disciplinary reports, and others.

The classification review requires completion of pages 2 and 3 of CR-0078. Page 2 is a reclassification form similar to the initial risk assessment done at the reception center. It too requires a forced choice rating of many items. It contains some of the same items as the initial risk form such as history of institutional violence, severity of current offense, prior assaultive offense history, escape history, charges pending, and prior felony convictions. However, it also includes measures of performance in custody as indicated by disciplinary reports.

To properly rate the program review and classification review items, a great deal of factual information about an inmate needs to be gathered.

The scores on the classification review form are totaled for security level reassignment. TDOC reclassification scores indicate assignment to Maximum, Close, Medium, Minimum Direct/Trusty and Minimum Community Security levels. Reclassification cut off scores are as follows:

Maximum Security	-	Score of 15 or above on first four questions.
Close Security	-	Score of 10-14 on first four questions or 17 or more on all questions.
Medium Security	-	Score of 12-16.
Minimum Direct/ Trusty/Restricted	-	Score of 7-11.
Minimum Community	-	Score of 6 or less.

In addition to the length of sentence and the other listed criteria, another factor also triggers program and classification review. At the institutions visited, an inmate's file is reviewed anytime a change in work assignment is considered. These reviews usually result in updated completion of the program review and classification review forms.

At some institutions, other events also trigger program and classification review. These events include placement in administrative segregation; a minimum security inmate receiving disciplinary report, or a minimum security inmate receiving a detainer. Fairly substantial differences among the institutions in what triggers program and classification review were observed.

The classification review panel meets with the inmate and completes page 3 of CR-0078. The panel lists the review security level by score, assigns overrides, if needed, and assigns a final review security level. The panel also designates changes in work assignments.

The panel's findings are forwarded to the warden for approval. The warden's change or approval of the classification review penel's findings marks the conclusion of the reclassification process.

SUMMARY

Tables 4.1 through 4.6 illustrate the results of analysis of data collected on a sample of inmates in TDOC. Fifty-eight percent of the sample were White and 41% Black. Roughly half of the inmates (49%) were under 30 years of age and half (51%) were over 30 years of age. The majority (60%) had 3 or more felony convictions in their history, although the current term of incarceration was a result of the first felony conviction for 18% of those inmates in our sample. Over a quarter (28%) of the inmates had never served a prior term of incarceration; roughly half (53%) had either not served or only served one prior term of incarceration, while the remainder (47%) had served two or more prior terms of incarceration. Twenty-two percent did not have an assaultive conviction in their history; 37% had one assaultive conviction and 41% had two or more assaultive convictions. Of our sample cases, 77% were "regular" admissions; 11% were returned from escape and 12% were returned from parole.

Of a subset of inmates who had participated in the initial classification process at one of the regional reception centers, half (50%) were transferred to "time building" institutions within 70 days and 70% transferred within 99 days.

In our total sample, Presentence Investigation reports were missing in the vast majority (90%) of cases. Likewise, the

Background or Jail Questionnaire was missing in the majority (64%) of cases. Newer inmates appeared to have a greater percentage of PSI's and Background questionnaires in their file than did inmates admitted in past years. This indicated improvement, but this is still woefully inadequate source documentation on which to base classification decisions in TDOC.

Our data supported the contention that an inordinate percentage of overrides are occurring at initial classification and reclassification. The vast majority of minimum classification inmates by score at initial classification (87%) are overridden to higher security levels.

The predominant reason for minimum overrides appears to be indicated as "Statutory/TDOC Policy" (i.e., Judges Sentencing or Class X Laws). Eighty-six percent of initial overrides and 71% of reclassification overrides were for this reason.

The vast majority of Close inmates by score at initial and reclassification are overridden to lower levels, 85% and 78% respectively. A reason cited fairly frequently for overrides of close security inmates appears to be indicated as "System Needs" (i.e. lack of space or supervision at that level). Eight percent of total overrides at initial and 18% of overrides at reclassification were for this reason.

The result of all overrides is that most inmates, 82%, ultimately end up in the Medium category. Placement of inmates with close security scores in Medium security settings is a dangerous policy. As Table 4.6 illustrates, these inmates have significantly higher rates of misconduct reports. In total,

TABLE 4.1

TDOC INMATE PROFILES

A)	RACE:	White	58%
		Black	41%
		Other	1%
B)	AGE:	18 to 24 years	24%
		25 to 30 years	25%
		31 to 40 years	35%
		41 to 70 years	16%
C)	NUMBER OF FELONY CONVICTIONS IN HISTORY:		
		One	18%
		Two	23%
		Three	17%
		Four	13%
		Four or More	29%
D)	NUMBER OF PRIOR TERMS OF STATE OR LOCAL INCARCERATION:		
		None	28%
		One	25%
		Two	16%
		Three	13%
		Four or More	18%
E)	NUMBER OF ASSAULTIVE CONVICTIONS IN HISTORY:		
		None	22%
		One	37%
		Two	19%
		Three	10%
		Four or More	12%
F)	ADMISSION STATUS:		
		Regular Admission	77%
		Returns from Escape	11%
		Returns from Parole	12%
G)	LENGTH OF TIME IN RECEPTION CENTER CLASSIFICATION PROCESS:		
		1 to 70 Days	50%
		71 to 99 Days	20%
		100 or More Days	30%

TABLE 4.2

COMPARISON OF INITIAL SECURITY SCORES AND ACTUAL PLACEMENT

INITIAL CLASSIFICATION BY SCORE		ACTUAL PLACEMENT			
		MAXIMUM	CLOSE	MEDIUM	MINIMUM
Close	100% (109)*	4% (5)	11% (11)	77% (84)	8% (9)
Medium	100% (125)	0% (0)	2% (3)	90% (112)	8% (10)
Minimum (all catagories)	100% (232)	3% (7)	3% (6)	81% (188)	13% (31)

*Numbers in parenthesis

TABLE 4.3

COMPARISON OF RECLASSIFICATION SECURITY SCORES AND ACTUAL PLACEMENT

RECLASSIFICATION BY SCORE		ACTUAL PLACEMENT			
		MAXIMUM	CLOSE	MEDIUM	MINIMUM
Maximum	100% (4)*	25% (1)	50% (2)	25% (1)	0% (0)
Close	100% (36)	11% (4)	11% (4)	75% (27)	3% (1)
Medium	100% (73)	0% (0)	1% (1)	94% (68)	5% (4)
Minimum (all catagories)	100% (294)	0% (1)	1% (4)	83% (243)	16% (46)

*Numbers in parenthesis

TABLE 4.4

TYPES OF OVERRIDES AT INITIAL CLASSIFICATION

Medical Needs	0%
Security Needs	6%
System Needs	8%
Statutory/TDOC Policy	86%

TABLE 4.5

TYPES OF OVERRIDES AT RECLASSIFICATION

Medical Needs	1%
Security Needs	11%
System Needs	18%
Statutory/TDOC Policy	71%

TABLE 4.6

COMPARISONS OF NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS RECEIVED:
CLOSE SECURITY AND OTHER SECURITY INMATES (BY SCORE)

CLASS OF MISCONDUCT REPORT	MEAN NO. RECEIVED BY INMATES SCORING 9 OR LESS AT INITIAL CLASSIFICATION	MEAN NO. RECEIVED BY INMATES SCORING 10 OR MORE AND PLACED IN MEDIUM SECURITY
A	0.360	0.464 (+28.9%)
B	0.722	1.048 (+45.2%)
C	2.619	2.976 (+13.6%)
TOTAL	3.701	4.488 (+21.4%)

inmates with close security scores placed in minimum security received 40% more serious (A and B class) misconduct reports than other inmates in the same security level.

TDOC must remedy the extraordinarily high percentage of overrides if successful implementation of the NIC Model is to occur. Overrides should not exceed 10% of the scored population.

In terms of process, TDOC has done a highly commendable job of writing policies and a user's guide for classification. While there are many inadequacies in system application, given the state of classification prior to implementation of the NIC Model, TDOC has made considerable progress. The following suggestions, if implemented, would further enhance operation of the classification system.

The current procedure used to obtain the Jail Questionnaire appears overly complex with significant potential of error. Transportation officials delivering the inmate often may not have enough knowledge to complete the form. Likewise, a telephone call back to the prior location of incarceration appears to be a poor remedy for completion. The Jail Questionnaire should be completed by a knowledgeable person <u>prior</u> to an inmate's transfer to TDOC and delivered with the commitment papers upon entry to the reception center.

As previously noted, there is <u>no</u> substitute for a PSI or similar type report. Such a report should be considered mandatory and be delivered with the commitment papers upon entry to the reception center. The Social Background Summary is of marginal utility and should be eliminated, as previously discussed.

The initial security assessment form is not designed to be completed immediately upon entry since information to rate items may not be readily available. The TDOC immediate rating appears to be one factor to enable an initial celling decision to be made. Problems related to this action will be discussed in a subsequent section of this report. To eliminate confusion, there should only be one initial security assessment form completed during the initial classification process, and this should be done by the Correctional Counselor based on gathered source documentation.

The severity of offense scale should include all offenses, as previously discussed.

NIC classification principles require reclasification of inmates every 6 months. TDOC policy reclassifies yearly for inmates serving a 3 year term or less. Inmates serving longer sentences are reclassified every two years. TDOC should adopt a 6 month reclassification process for all inmates.

As previously discussed, the program review form is of marginal utility and appears to be a holdover from the previous system. It should be replaced with a "needs reassessment" form that incorporates program review items.

A clear distinction between reclassification and "job" reviews or changes needs to be made. Reclassification and job reviews or changes should be separate processes and be separately and clearly distinguished in practice.

Events triggering reclassification should be clearly identified and applied consistently by all institutions.

CHAPTER 5

Summary of Study Findings

This study actually resulted in two separate analyses. The first was a review of the classification system as it exists on paper; the second as it exists in operation. The two "systems" share little in common and unfortunately, the paper system is far superior to the operational system.

On the positive side, although some modifications are recommended, procedures outlined in the User's Guide compare favorably to those found in many other systems. Tennessee has selected, in our opinion, the strongest Prison Classification system available. This system was developed by the National Institute of Corrections with input from the courts, wardens, corrections directors and researchers.

In operationalizing this system, however, the Tennessee Department of Corrections has encountered serious problems and consequently made several critical errors. Crowding and the consequent lack of bedspace at needed levels has undoubtedly contributed to the difficulty of maintaining a valid, reliable classification process. However, the old refrain that classification systems cannot work under conditions of severe crowding is, from our viewpoint, without merit. Crowding only increases the need for sound population management based on classification data.

TDOC's current classification system has little impact on placement decisions and needs substantial changes at every level. However, the basis for an excellent system, the NIC classification

scales and a well written User's Guide are already in place. Thus, while our findings are quite critical of current processes, remedies are available which could be implemented in a reasonable timeframe.

The results of our analysis are presented in step-wise fashion. A separate section outlining our recommendations follows.

1. Goals and Objectives for Classification Have Not Been Developed and Clearly Articulated to Staff.

The Tennessee Department of Correction has experienced substantial change in direction over the last five years. This, coupled with obvious conflict between The Correction Plan of the 80's and the current court order has resulted in confusion regarding the mission of corrections in Tennessee. Consequently, the appropriate role of classification in the department is less than clear.

Further complicating the issue are the presence of both "specialized" institutions and department policy to place inmates close to home. When conflicts arise between need for programs and this policy, which prevails?

Currently, clearly articulated goals and objectives for the classification system do not exist. Thus, the basis for policy and procedure formulation is missing and uncertainties regarding the role of classification are evident among staff (see Section of this report for details.

2. The Tennessee Department of Correction Does Not have a Functioning Classification System in Place.

Data collected in Tennessee reveal that regardless of classification scores, nearly all inmates (82% of our sample) end up in Medium security. Throughout the course of the study, staff alluded to the degree of interference caused by the Judge Sentencing Law which keeps many inmates eligible for Minimum security placement at higher security levels. Indeed, our data indicates that only 31(13%) of 232 inmates initially receiving Minimum security scores are actually placed in Minimum security settings. The vast majority, 188, were placed in Medium security. While overclassification violates the NIC least restrictive custody principle, it is a conservative approach that, in itself, does not impose increased risk on staff or other inmates. More troubling are the overrides from Close security to lower levels. No department policy or legislation directs such decisions (although bedspace is undoubtedly a primary determinant). Of 109 persons rated Close security at admission, only 11 were actually placed in Close security settings; another 5 were placed in Maximum security. Eighty-four rated Close security were placed in Medium; an additional 9 received Minimum security placements.

To obtain a Close security designation at admission requires a substantial degree of violence in an inmate's history. Mixing these inmates with the general population before a record of institutional adjustment is established puts undue risk on other inmates and staff. Such practices could well result in increased assaults, escapes and management problems.

The level of overrides (to both higher and lower security) in the Tennessee Department of Correction relegates the classification process to a paper system with no impact on operations.* Under such conditions, classification is no longer considered a valuable tool by staff, but simply a time consuming exercise in futility. It is doubtful that much attention is paid to proper forms completion making the data collected not only useless, but inaccurate as well.

3. The Tennessee Adaptation of the NIC System Ignores Custody Issues and Reduces the Role of Reclassification.

The two most important innovations of the NIC Classification Model are a clear and careful delineation of custody and security issues and a heavy emphasis placed on a behaviorally based reclassification process. The use of the system in Tennessee negates these major improvements in prison classification.

Under the NIC Model, inmates are classified to custody levels. Custody refers to the amount of supervision required, broken down into the following categories:

Day Movement
Night Movement
General Surveillance
Leaving the Institution
Access to Programs
Access to Job
Meal Movement

*For example, only 19% of all reclassifications in our sample were not overridden.

Security under NIC guidelines refers only to institutional configuration - that is, type of housing, perimeter, detection devices used, etc. Institutions are classified according to security levels; inmates receive custody ratings. In Tennessee, however, the instruments used to classify inmates are titled, "Security Classification Scales". According to staff, the terms security and custody are used interchangeably.

The delineation between custody and security in the NIC Classification System is more than a matter of semantics. Security classification systems often only designate an institutional assignment with housing, job, movement and supervision decisions left to the institution. As a result, important data from classification instruments often have no effect on housing and other critical decisions. In addition, because so much is left to the discretion of staff at each facility, different classification systems emerge within an agency. Medium at one facility may be significantly different than Medium at another institution.

Several states using the NIC system have found it very helpful in optimally allocating available institutional resources. Institutions can be designated to house several different custody levels, deploying more staff to high custody areas and reducing staffing in lower custody units. Differentiating custody and security specifications also allows flexibility in dealing with special offenders. For example, agencies may prohibit sex offenders from Minimum security placements. Thus, when sex offenders obtain Minimum custody ratings they must be housed in a higher security setting. Establishing Minimum custody units

within a secure perimeter meets the requirements of least restrictive custody while maintaining adequate public protection.

The additional flexibility provided by clear delineation of custody requirements has served several correctional system (e.g. Vermont, Colorado) extremely well.

The NIC system also places considerable emphasis on the reclassification process. NIC guidelines call for reclassification to be completed every six months. This accomplishes two things: First, classification of each inmate is quickly based primarily on individual behavior factors, not group predictive data. Second, inmates quickly see the ramifications of adjustment and non adjustment are quickly apparent and therefore classification can become an important tool in helping to manage inmate behaviors. Because TDOC schedules reclassifications at 1 to 2 year intervals, the influence of the initial classification remains in effect longer than NIC recommends and institutional behavior has less effect on placements. Inmates with good behavior records will not move to lower security and less expensive beds as fast as they would under proper utilization of the system.

4. Classifications are Often Based on Inadequate Information.

A basic working assumption of the NIC Classification system (page 36) states:

> "Classification can only be done appropriately when quality information is available. Therefore, it is essential that a standard, high quality pre-sentence or admission report be completed by field staff on all incoming inmates. In addition,

> the intake process should include a standardized interview administered by a thoroughly trained intake worker. The purpose of these two processes is to provide complete and reliable data on which custody and program placements can be made".

Three documents are crucial to inmate classification in Tennessee: The Presentence Report, the Jail Questionnaire, and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Arrest Report. Of these, only the NCIC report was found with any regularity in files of our sample cases. Three other less critical reports are also required: The Local Arrest Report, the Social Background Report and the Sentence Data Sheet. The frequency with which each of these six reports were found in sample files is presented in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1

AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS IN TDOC FILES

REPORT	% ON FILES	% NOT ON FILES
Jail Questionnaire	36.4%	63.6%
Local Arrest Record	12.8%	87.2%
NCIC Arrest Record	90.6%	9.4%
Presentence Report	10.1%	89.9%
Social Background Report	93.9%	6.1%
Sentence Data Report	69.5%	30.5%

NOTE: The Jail Questionnaire appears to have been completed on a more regular basis for recently (last 2 years) admitted inmates.

The Social Background Report is completed when a presentence investigation is not available. However, this report consists almost entirely of inmate self reported data, and a qualitative analysis indicates that it is completely inadequate for classification purposes. Presentence reports (PSI's) were available for only one of every ten sample cases. In most systems, the PSI, is a primary source of information needed for classification. The absence of this critical information is a situation that must be rectified. Because probation officers are employees of the Department of Correction, it should be reasonably easy to develop procedures to provide reception centers with accurate and timely reports. Successful implementation of new processes, of course, will depend on many factors including the staffing level of the probation department and prioritization of the probation workload.

New procedures are also required to assure that the jail questionnaire is routinely completed as accurately as possible. Current procedures permit hasty completion of the form by individuals that could lack critical information.

5. <u>The Error Rates in Completing Initial Classification Forms Appears to be in the 30-35% Range</u>.

Comparisons of initial classification forms completed both by NCCD and TDOC staff indicates that the TDOC error rate is approximately 30-35%.

NCCD scoring is assumed to be more accurate based on the following factors:

a. NCCD staff were involved in the development of the NIC system and are consequently very familiar with the content of the forms.

b. NCCD scoring occurred later in the process when more information may have been available for accurate completion

c. Comparisons of NCCD and TDOC scoring with subsequent institutional behavior indicated a much stronger relationship between NCCD scores and behavior than TDOC scores and behavior. The NCCD results are generally comparable to statistics reported in other evaluations of the NIC system; the TDOC scoring shows considerably less correlation than that obtained in other sites.*

The overall error rate observed in TDOC scoring is not surprising given the lack of information available during the reception process. In many instances, NCCD raters were not able to obtain information required to accurately complete the forms even though data collection occurred at a later date when more information was available. Errors in scoring generally resulted in <u>underclassification</u> of inmates, further adding to the risk imposed on inmates and staff. In total, 28 of 86 inmates (33%) were misclassified; 19 were underclassified, and 9 were placed at higher levels than required.

*NCCD scores demonstrated a .30 correlation with subsequent misconduct reports. TDOC scoring showed no significant correlation with the subsequent misconduct. The NCCD correlation was significant at the .01 level.

6. The Currently Used Cut-Off Points Result in too High a Proportion of the Inmates Rated as Minimum Security.

Currently, all inmates scoring six or fewer points at admission are eligible for minimum security placement (ignoring the effects of administrative overrides, due basically to Class X and the Judge Sentencing Laws). At reclassification, inmates scoring seven or less are eligible for Minimum. Based on these cut-off points, 51% of the sample cases analyzed received Minimum security classifications at the reception centers. At reclassification, this figure increased to 81%.

In the opinion of NCCD evaluators these figures are too high and use of the instruments as intended (without overrides) could result in an unacceptable level of risk to the public. More conservative cut-off points are recommended because:

1) The lack of quality data at the initial classification stage makes forms completion tentative at best. Until better information is routinely obtained a more conservative approach is advisable.
2) Few systems are willing to place 50% of admissions in Minimum security settings before individual adjustment records are established.

To continue to use cut-off scores that result in so many Minimum security classifications invites overrides and can diminish staff confidence in the scales.

Specific recommendations on cut-off scores are presented in the next section of the report.

7. Many Inmates are Currently Double Celled in the Reception Centers. This Situation is not Consistent with Sound Classification Practices.

Inmates are currently double celled in the reception centers. This situation is not consistent with sound classification practices.

Inmates are currently being double celled before the classification process is complete. To double cell inmates at the reception centers is to do so without sufficient information on:

1) Potential for Violent Behavior
2) Emotional Instability
3) Mental Retardation or other deficits which may add to potential for victimization.

This practice could well lead to increased assaults and leaves the agency conspicuously vulnerable to law suits based on negligence.

8. The Current Classification System Appears to Have Been Added to Existing Procedures, Rather Than Replacing Old Processes Where Appropriate.

Implementation of the NIC Classification system affords agencies an opportunity to review existing procedures, streamline paperwork and thoroughly integrate the new system into agency operations to ensure that managers take full advantage of classification data. When implementation is not done well, old

procedures which are often at odds with the new system continue to be used. The result is confusion regarding the role of the new system, resentment toward additional paperwork and inappropriate use of the system.

In Tennessee, classification is not an integral part of the Corrections system. If classification was discontinued tomorrow, the impact would be minimal. This is due (1) to the high degree of overrides and overuse of Medium security; (2) to failure to replace old procedures or change them to "fit" the new system; and (3) to the fact that classification data is not routinely aggregated and used for planning, evaluation and management purposes. The override issue was covered earlier and the lack of data utilization is addressed in Finding #9.

Two examples of the failure to fully integrate classification and replace old processes as appropriate were discovered during our review of reclassification. NIC guidelines require reclassifications every six months; in Tennessee reclassifications are scheduled every 12 to 24 months, depending on sentence length. At six month intervals, a Program Review Form is completed. This instrument rates performance in a somewhat less structured form than the Reclassification Scale. Its role in the system is unclear, and it is often completed in very cursory manner.

More importantly, job changes seem to drive the reclassification process. Unscheduled reclassifications are completed whenever a job change occurs. This is totally inappropriate. Inmates should be classified to determine custody requirements, and thus are eligible only for jobs at that level.

9. Classification Data has not been Integrated into the Agency's Information System.

Although initial classification data is summarized on a form obviously designed for data input, no evidence was available that this data was captured, automated, and used by Management. Classification is the cornerstone of sound corrections management and its importance to planning and evaluation has been recognized by the courts in Palmigiano vs. Garrahy, 443 F. Supp. 956(D.R.I. 1977):

> "Classification is essential to the operation of an orderly and safe prison. It is a prerequisite for the rational allocation of whatever program opportunities exist within the institution. It enables the institution to gauge the proper custody level of an inmate, to identify the inmate's educational,vocational, and psychological needs, and to separate non-violent inmates from the more predatory . . . Classification is also indispensible for any future planning."

A recent editorial in a publication of the American Correctional Association stated:

> "Corrections must recognize that classification is first and foremost a management tool. It should, in fact, be perceived as the veritable

> cornerstone of correctional administration. As a means of setting priorities, its purposes are to promote rational, consistent, and equitable methods of assessing the relative needs and risk of each individual and then to assign agency resources accordingly. Data generated through the classification process are also vital to program and facility planning, monitoring, evaluation, budgeting, and accountability."*

10. The Current Management Information System is Inadequate, Expensive, Inflexible, and Outdated. In its Present Condition, it Cannot Support Management's Needs.

The information revolution of the 1980's seems to have largely by-passed Corrections. TDOC is tied to a computer operation controlled by another agency, where all changes or special requests require additional programming. Data is batch processed centrally, with potential for critical delays in bringing information "on file". The system is an expensive mainframe operation with no microcomputer applications or distributive processing. The data collected is limited basically to information used to "track" inmates with little ability to produce aggregate reports for management. In sum, the system, as currently configured, will never meet TDOC's needs.

The system was unable to produce a simple tape "dump" of inmate data in a timely and cost-effective manner for this evaluation. Department of Correction systems staff are obviously frustrated with the lack of control and seem to be doing the best

*Solomon, L. and Baird, S.C. Corrections Today. "Classification: Past Failures, Future Potentiall", May/June, 1981, P. 6.

they can with a bad situation. However, given available hardware and software options, major imporovements could be implemented rather quickly at a very reasonable cost.

11. Use of the Inmate Needs Assessment is Presently Unclear.

Inmate need assessments are completed at the reception centers, but their impact on program assignments is unclear. Current confusion over the mission of the Department caused by apparent conflicts between the Corrections Plan for the Eighties, the current court order, specialized institutions and the priority given to placing inmates in regions close to their families, has made the role of correctional programs uncertain at best.

Under current conditions, inmate need assessments are not an important component of classification, but merely an exercise in paperwork.

12. Many Inconsistencies in Classification Practices Were Evident Among Reception Centers and Institutions.

The classification process is not uniformly applied at all facilities. While an audit process is in place, it apparently has not effectively dealt with inconsistencies. Lack of an automated monitoring process has hampered efforts to maintain a reliable classification system.

CHAPTER 6

Recommendations

In order for classification to attain its proper role in the Tennessee Department of Correction, substantial improvements in policies and procedures are required. A sound classification system is central to safe and orderly institutions and to maintaining adequate public protection.

The following set of recommendations if enacted, will, in the opinion of the evaluators, greatly enhance operations, safety, staff morale, and provide the basis for effective planning and evaluation of agency programs, policies and procedures. Other recommendations regarding specific processes are found in preceding sections of the report.

1. Goals and objectives of the classification process should be developed and clearly articulated to staff. These goals and objectives must relate directly to the mission statement of the Department of Correction.

The importance of goal and objective statements cannot be overemphasized. Current staff confusion regarding the intent and importance of classification has resulted in inconsistent application of scales and procedures. Program and bedspace priorities are currently not addressed by classification, greatly reducing its significance in the minds of staff.

Classification must be viewed as the population management tool of the Department with classification policies directly addressing the realities of existing resource levels.

2. Current Legislation should be modified to allow TDOC more flexibility in managing its population. Security assignments must be based on classification, if the agency is to make optimal use of limited resources.

Existing legislation, specifically the Class X and Judge Sentencing laws interfere tremendously with the Department's ability to manage the correctional population. Recent changes in policies regarding interpretation of the Judge Sentencing Law have allowed the Department to place more individuals in Minimum security, thus easing bedspace problems at higher security levels. However, additional legislative changes are required to afford TDOC more flexibility in housing inmates.

3. Information sources for classification must be upgraded significantly.

Presentence investigations or prison admission reports should be required for all inmates. The reports should follow a standard format and be completed by probation staff. No inmate without a presentence or prison admission report should be admitted to a reception center.

An increase in probation resources may be necessary to routinely furnish high quality data to reception centers. However, such costs pale beside the potential human and economic costs of prison housing assignments that are based on insufficient information. It is estimated that 30-35% of Tennessee inmates are currently misclassified, due primarily to a lack of data.

In addition, training and coordination activities should be undertaken with local jails to ensure that jail questionnaires are

completed before an inmate is transported to a reception center. One staff person at each local jail should be designated to review and verify information contained in the jail report.

These two steps, coupled with Recommendation #10 will substantially enhance the quality of information critical to the classification process. It also eliminates need for the social background report, which is based largely on inmate reported data and totally inadequate as a source document for classification.

4. TDOC should immediately develop comprehensive custody definitions and classify inmates to appropriate custody, rather than security, levels. Housing areas of each institution should be designated for specific custody levels.

Using the NIC scales to designate inmate security levels seriously alters the intent of the system. The scales were initially established as custody designation instruments. Even though Tennessee security definitions contain references to the degree of supervision required at each level, failure to clearly differentiate between custody and security quickly permits the concepts to blur. This has obviously occurred in Tennessee. Most inmates rated Close or Minimum security are overridden to Medium with no apparent differentiation in supervision requirements maintained. They are simply assigned the security level of the institution. Thus, classification scores become meaningless.

However, the amount of supervision provided is not dependent upon the physical structure of a facility. Rather than override these classifications, assigned custody levels should be

maintained by differentiating supervision requirements for different units within each facility. It is evident that once overrides occur, important distinctions among inmates (potential for violence, escape risk, etc.) are lost.

5. Cut-off scores used to assign inmates to minimum security settings should be altered to reduce eligibility.

Currently, all inmates scoring six or fewer points on the classification scales receive Minimum security designations. In the random sample of cases analyzed, 51% of initial classifications and 81% of reclassifications were rated Minimum. These figures are high for any system, and unacceptable in Tennessee because of the high proportion of violent offenders incarcerated. It is recommended that the cut-off point for Minimum security be reduced to 3 at initial classification. This will result in Minimum designations for approximately 25% of all new admissions. At reclassification, inmates receiving scores of 6 or less should be placed in Minimum security. This more conservative approach should still permit an estimated 35% of the average daily population to be housed in Minimum security settings.

6. In accordance with NIC guidelines, all inmates should be reclassified at six month intervals.

This recommendation will result in increased reliance on ratings of institutional behavior of individuals as classification criteria. Thus, the system becomes a just desserts approach. Inmates without adjustment problems move to lower custody levels while problem inmates remain at or move to higher levels.

In addition, more frequent assessments help to keep staff apprised of the problems and progress of individual inmates.

Use of the program review form (CR0078) should be discontinued. A six month reclassification schedule eliminates the need for this document. Progress information will be captured by the needs assessment form (see Recommendation 12).

7. Overrides of classification scores must be reduced dramatically. Acceptable reasons for overrides should be established by policy.

While the affects of the Judge Sentencing Law on Minimum security placements was well established, the proportion of overrides from close to medium or minimum security (85%) was unexpected and particularly disturbing. This situation greatly increases risk to both inmates and staff and renders classification meaningless.

All overrides must be carefully monitored; overrides from close to lower security levels should require authorization by the Chief of Classification. If the override rates exceed 10%, central office should intervene to increase compliance with classification policies.

8. Inmates in reception centers should not be double celled before the classification process is completed.

Double celling inmates before assessments of dangerousness and need for protection are completed poses an undue threat to inmates and leaves the Department extremely vulnerable to litigation should an assault occur.

Steps currently in place to immediately assess an inmates' violence potential are impractical. The security assessment form cannot be accurately completed before adequate information is received and analyzed. The practice of completing these assessments within hours of an inmate's arrival should be discontinued.

9. The reception center process should be shortened from 60 to 30 days.

To accommodate single celling in the reception centers, classifications should be completed within 30 days and inmates moved out to time building institutions. Currently,(based on sample data) 50% of all admissions remain in reception centers 70 or more days; about 30% remain 100 days or more. Reducing the length of stay to 30 days should decrease reception center populations enough to accommodate single celling.

10. A well designed structured interview format should be used to obtain information from inmates. Counselors should receive training necessary to use such an instrument.

Obtaining accurate impressions of inmate problems, attitudes and needs is crucial to the classification process. The interview formats currently used are reasonably well structured, but no summarization or scoring method is used to assist with program planning. Tennessee should strongly consider training intake workers to use the CMC Interview and Case Planning system presented in Appendix C.

11. Management information system capabilities should be upgraded in the following manner.

a. The Department of Correction should obtain hardware dedicated solely to their needs.

Experience clearly indicates that the sharing of computer resources between Corrections and other agencies rarely serves Corrections well. Shared resources nearly always result in misunderstandings, lack of flexibility and low priority for Corrections' work.

b. TDOC should take advantage of recent innovations in microcomputer hardware and software systems. A distributive processing network, with "uploading" of specific information to a central station should be considered.

There are substantial cost and processing advantages of such a system over the traditional shared mainframe approach.

Available software provides considerable flexibility allowing in-house creation of reports, changes in files when aplpropriate and timely data entry. Micro applications also permit site specific processing and reporting without "burdening" central files with data required only for institutional operations.

c. Classification data must be routinely collected and processed for planning, management and evaluation purposes.

12. The purpose and use of inmate need assessments in TDOC should be determined.

The role of need assessments in TDOC will depend greatly on ther mission adopted by the Department. If inmate programs are generally reinstituted, need assessments should be used as:

a. An initial screening device for serious problems and deficits.

b. A method of establishing program priorities for inmates.

c. Data input documents for measuring program participation, adjustment and programming.

d. A method for monitoring institutional compliance with reception center recommendations.

e. A means for aggregating data needed for rational programming, planning and evaluation.

13. Staffing requirements for both reception centers and institutions should be ascertained through a carefully constructed workload analysis:

Workload (or time study) analysis should be used to determine the number and type of staff positions required to carry out classification responsibilities. At a minimum, one classification coordinator should be placed at each facility to maintain the integrity of the system. The coordinator's duties would include:

- o Scheduling of reviews
- o Training/policy interpretation
- o Communication with central office regarding problems/issues
- o Participation in classification hearings
- o Review of overrides
- o Supervision of data entry

These positions should be under the administration of the Office of Classification and not administratively tied to individual institutions.

14. It is recommended that a task force be developed to restructure the current classification process.

This task force should solicit assistance from consultants familiar with both the NIC classification system and implementation strategies. An implementation plan with realistic time frames should be developed so that all work is completed

within 9-12 months. Special attention should be devoted to the following issues:

1. Development of goals and objectives of the classification system.

2. Structure of the Classification Section and required staffing at the reception centers and institutions.

3. Development of definitions of custody levels.

4. Policies and guidelines regarding prioritization of program and bedspace so that placement decisions are driven by the classification process.

5. Policies and guidelines regarding overrides and the reclassification process.

6. Necessary staff training and development of a training schedule.

7. Integration of classification data into the agency's information system. Forms development to facilitate this process.

8. Routine reports needed for monitoring and management of the classification system.

9. Coordination with probation offices and local jails to upgrade information received (a representative of probation should be included on the task force).

10. Reduction of paperwork and elimination of old, outmoded processes.

11. Policies regarding inmate need assessments. Addition of a need assessment with participation and progress information to be used at reclassification.

12. Streamlining of existing procedures to shorten the reception phase to 30 days. Figure 6.1 combines earlier recommendations with proposed time frames.

FIGURE 6.1

Recommended Classification Process

TIME	Sequence of Events
PRIOR TO RECEPTION	Inmate Ordered Transferred from County Jail to TDOC o Jail Questionnaire Completed o PSI or Prison Report Obtained from from Probation Department
FIRST WEEK	Inmate Received at TDOC o Intake Completed (including medical exam) o NCIC Report Obtained o Local Arrest Record Obtained o Requests for Information on Outstanding Detainers Made o Counselor Reviews PSI, Arrest Reports o Counselor Conducts Initial Interview
SECOND WEEK	o Basic Intelligence, Achievement, Vocational Interest Tests Given o Custody Assessment Completed, Needs Assessment Completed o E.D., EMR, and Special Needs Cases Referred for Psychological Evaluation
THIRD WEEK	o Case Plan Developed
FOURTH WEEK	o Staffings Held o Custody Assignment Made o Institutional Assignment Made o Job/Program Recommendations Made

INMATE TRANSFERRED TO TIME BUILDING INSTITUTION

Cost Estimates

At this stage, cost estimates are tentative at best. However, based on experience gained in other agencies, the following cost parameters are presented:

A. Implementation of Classification Recommendations, including training of staff, travel, consulting services, etc.:

$150,000 - $225,000

B. Restructuring of the agency's information system, including hardware (state-of-the-art micros), such as IBM AT's, software, customized programming for uploading information, training, and installation.

$1,000,000 - $1,500,000

This figure includes site specific needs (e.g. inmate accounts, food service, etc.) as well as central office requirements.

APPENDIX A
(9 Pages)

TDOC CLASSIFICATION FORMS:

Social Background Summary (2 pages)

Initial Classification Summary, Section A:
Probation Division P.S.I. Cover Sheet (1 page)

Initial Classification Summary
Security Sheet (3 pages)

Annual Classification Review/Semi-Annual
Program Review (1 page)

Classification Review - Security (2 pages)

ADULT SERVICES
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

SOCIAL BACKGROUND SUMMARY

NAME _____ NUMBER _____
Last First MI

COUNSELOR _____ DATE ___/___/___

OFFENDER'S VERSION OF OFFENSE(S):

PRIOR RECORD:

DATE	AGE	OFFENSE	COURT	DISPOSITION

COMMENTS:

NAME _____ NUMBER _____
Last First MI

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (Most Recent First):

1. FROM/TO:
   EMPLOYER:
   ADDRESS:
   HOURLY WAGES:
   POSITION:
   REASON FOR LEAVING:
   VERIFIED:

2. FROM/TO:
   EMPLOYER:
   ADDRESS:
   HOURLY WAGES:
   POSITION:
   REASON FOR LEAVING:
   VERIFIED:

FROM	TO	EMPLOYER	ADDRESS	WAGES	POSITION	V/U

COMMENTS:

MILITARY SERVICE:

Branch: _____ Time in Service: _____

AWOL'S: _____ Article 15's/Captain Masts: _____

Type of Discharge: _____

COMMENTS:

EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL HISTORY:

Highest Grade Completed: _____ School: _____

Date Highest Grade Completed: _____ Grade Average: _____

Training In: _____ Length of Training: _____ Course Completed: ____

Training In: _____ Length of Training: _____ Course Completed: ____

COMMENTS:

SOURCES:

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

INITIAL CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY

	Judge:	Docket Number(s):
	Court:	Sentencing Hearing Date:
	Region:	Date of Conviction:
	Defense Attorney:	City/County:
Section A: Probation Division P.S.I. Cover Sheet	District Attorney:	Date Referred to P.O.:

Name (Last, First, Middle) Address

AKA:

Report Due:

Prepared By/Date:

FBI Sheet Attached:

Age	DOB	Sex	Race	Height	Weight	Eyes	Hair	Comp

FBI Number:

Social Security Number:

Education:

Religion:

Offense/Date Occurred:

Date When Arrested, By Whom, and Where (County):

Present Location of Defendant:

Bond_____ In Custody_____

Amount_____ Time in Jail_____

Time on Bond_____

Sentence Imposed:

Disposition:

Section B: Adult Services

TDOC (OFFENDER) NUMBER

Date Received:

Date of Sentence:

Release Eligibility Date(s):

Expiration Date:

Incompatible Inmates:	Class X	Judge Sentencing Act	20%	30%	40%	50%

Scars, Marks, Tattoos:

Escapes:

Detainers/Notification/Charges Pending:

Prior Psychiatric Commitment (Where):

Date Released:

In Case of Emergency, Notify:

Relationship:

Name:

Address:

City/State:

Telephone:

INITIAL CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY
SECURITY SHEET

NAME _____ NUMBER _____

CLASSIFICATION MEMBER _____

DATE _____

1. **HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE**
(Jail or Prison, code most serious within last five years)

None	0
Assault not involving use of a weapon or resulting in serious injury	3
Assault involving use of a weapon and/or resulting in serious injury or death	7

_____ score

2. **SEVERITY OF CURRENT OFFENSE**
(Refer to the Severity of Offense Scale. Score the most serious offense if there are multiple convictions.)

Low	0
Low Moderate	1
Moderate	2
High	4
Highest	6

_____ score

3. **PRIOR ASSAULTIVE OFFENSE HISTORY**
(Score the most severe in inmate's history. Refer to the Severity of Offense Scale.)

None, Low, or Low Moderate	0
Moderate	2
High	4
Highest	6

_____ score

4. **ESCAPE HISTORY** (Rate last 3 years of incarceration).

No escapes or attempts (or no prior incarcerations)	0
An escape or attempt with no actual or threatened violence:	
Over 1 year ago	2
Within the last year	4
An escape or attempt with actual or threatened violence	7

_____ score

CLOSE SECURITY SCORE (Add items 1 through 4)
(If score is 10 or above, inmate should be assigned to close security.
If under 10, complete items 5 through 8 and use medium/minimum scale.)

[A]

5. **ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE**

None	0
Abuse causing occasional legal and social adjustment problems	1
Serious abuse, serious disruption of functioning	3

_____ score

6. **CURRENT DETAINER/NOTIFICATION/CHARGES PENDING**

None	0
Misdemeanor detainer/notification/charges pending	1
Extradition initiated—misdemeanor	3
Felony detainer/notification/charges pending	4
Extradition initiated felony	6

_____ score

7. **PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS**

None	0
One	2
Two or more	4

_____ score

8. **STABILITY FACTORS**

Age 26 or over	—2
High school diploma or GED received	—1
Employed or attending school (full or part-time) for 6 months or longer at time of arrest	—1

_____ score

MINIMUM/MEDIUM SCORE (Add items 1 through 8.)

MEDIUM/MINIMUM SCALE:

Medium Security	7 - 22
Minimum Security	6 or less

_____ score
TOTAL SCORE

INITIAL CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY
ASSESSMENT SHEET

NAME _____ NUMBER _____

CLASSIFICATION PANEL MEMBER _____

SELECT THE ANSWER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE INMATE.

DATE _____

PHYSICAL

HEALTH.
1. Sound physical health; seldom ill. 2. Handicap or illness which interferes w/functioning on a recurring basis. 3. Serious handicap, chronic illness, or need for frequent medical care. ____ code

ALCOHOL USAGE:
1. No apparent problem. 2. Occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning. 3. Frequent abuse, serious disruption. ____ code

OTHER SUBSTANCE USAGE:
1. No apparent problem. 2. Occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning. 3. Frequent abuse, serious disruption. ____ code

MENTAL

BEHAVIORAL/EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS:
1. Exhibits appropriate emotional responses. 2. Symptoms limit adequate functioning; may need intervention or medication. 3. Symptoms prohibit functioning; may need significant intervention, medication, or separate housing. ____ code

FUNCTIONING ABILITY:
1. Able to function independently. 2. Independent functioning somewhat limited. 3. Independent functioning severely limited. ____ code

a. Rev. BETA II_____ b. WAIS-R_____ c. PPVT_____ d. Slosson_____

EDUCATIONAL

VOCATIONAL STATUS:
1. Has sufficient skills to obtain satisfactory employment. 2. Minimal skill level. 3. Virtually unemployable. ____ code

e. GATB

G	V	N	S	P	Q	K	F	M	E	C
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

EDUCATIONAL STATUS:
1. Has high school diploma or G.E.D. 2. Some deficits, but potential for G.E.D. 3. Major deficits in math and/or reading. ____ code

f. WRAT: Arith: _____ Spell: _____ Read:_____

SOCIAL

JOB RELATED SKILLS:
1. Has sufficient positive work habits to maintain employment. 2. Some deficits; work program desirable to develop positive work habits. 3. Work habits insufficient to maintain employment; needs strong work program. ____ code

SOCIAL SKILLS:
1. Possesses good social skills. 2. Has basic social skills. 3. Lacks skills necessary for social interaction. ____ code

MARITAL/FAMILY:
1. Relatively stable relationships. 2. Some disorganization or stress, but potential for improvement. 3. Major disorganization, stress, or hardship. ____ code

INITIAL CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY
DISPOSITION SHEET

DATE _____

NAME _____ NUMBER _____

R ☐
_____ NR ☐
Chairperson

R ☐
_____ NR ☐
Member

Reasons why (if not recommended): _____

A ☐
_____ NA ☐
Warden

Inmate _____ Date _____

1. Original Security Score _____ score
Original Security Level _____ code
Override _____ code
Final Security Level _____ code

Override Considerations
0. None
1. Medical
2. Security
3. System Needs
4. Statutory/D.O.C. Policy

Security Level
6. Community
7. Trusty
8. Direct
3. Medium
9. Close
5. Maximum

Comments: _____ score

2. Institutional Assignment: _____ code

3. Security Designation: _____

4. Test Results:

a. Rev. BETA II_____ b. WAIS-R_____ c. PPVT_____ d. Slosson_____ score code

e. GATB score code

G	V	N	S	P	Q	K	F	M	E	C

A

f. WRAT: Arith: _____ Spell: _____ Read:_____ code

5. Work Recommendation(s): score

DOT Title/GOE Sub-Heading: Position Code DOT Code/GOE Code code

a. _____ b. _ _ – _ _ _ _ c. _ _ _ • _ _ _ · _ _ _ score

d. _____ e. _ _ _ • _ _ _ · _ _ _

_____ g. _ _ • _ _ • _ _ code

n. _____ i. _ _ • _ _ • _ _ score

6. Vocational Recommendation(s)/Skill Identification: code

a. _____ b. _ _ _ • _ _ _ · _ _ _ · T or S

c. _____ d. _ _ _ • _ _ _ · _ _ _ · T or S score

7. Other: _____

8. Special Needs: ☐ Yes ☐ No Handicap:_____ Limitation:_____ score

Cert. Ed. Def._____

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
ADULT SERVICES

☐ ANNUAL CLASSIFICATION REVIEW
☐ SEMI-ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

Name:_____ NUMBER:_____ DATE:_____ INSTITUTION:_____

Offense: _____

Sentence:_____ RED/Parole/Exp. Date:_____

	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Above Satisfactory
HOUSING				
Unit Adjustment	( )	( )	( )	( )
Relationship with C.O. Staff	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comments: _____				

Correctional Officer

WORK				
Work Assignment_____				
Work Skills	( )	( )	( )	( )
Work Performance	( )	( )	( )	( )
Behavior on Job	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comments: _____				

Work Supervisor

EDUCATIONAL-VOCATIONAL				
Academic Program_____				
Vocational Program_____				
Ability	( )	( )	( )	( )
Performance	( )	( )	( )	( )
Behavior in Classroom	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comments: _____				

Academic/Vocational Teacher

SOCIAL				
Social Skills	( )	( )	( )	( )
Health_____	( )	( )	( )	( )
General Behavior	( )	( )	( )	( )
Emotional Status	( )	( )	( )	( )
Number of Disciplinary Reports (Guilty Dispositions) For This Period_____	—	( )	( )	—
Comments: _____				

Correctional Counselor

CC: Institutional File (Original)

_____
Inmate Date

ADULT SERVICES
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

CLASSIFICATION REVIEW

NAME:_____NUMBER:_____DATE:_____INSTITUTION_____

1. HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE (Jail or Prison, code most serious within last five years)
   None.....0
   Assault not involving use of a weapon or resulting in serious injury.....3
   Assault involving use of a weapon and/or resulting in serious injury or death.....7 _____ score

2. Did above assault occur within the last six month?
   Yes.....3
   No.....0 _____ score

3. SEVERITY OF CURRENT OFFENSE (Refer to the Severity of Offense Scale. Score the most serious offense if there are multiple convictions.)
   Low or Low Moderate.....0
   Moderate.....1
   High.....3 _____ score
   Highest.....4

4. PRIOR ASSAULTIVE OFFENSE HISTORY(Score the most severe in inmate's history. Refer to the Severity of Offense Scale.)
   None, Low, or Low Moderate.....0
   Moderate.....1
   High.....3 _____ score
   Highest.....4

SCHEDULE A SCORE (Add items 1 through 4.)
Score of 10-14.....Close. Score of 15 or more.....Maximum. [A]
If score is 9 or less, complete remainder of items and use Schedule B Score.

5. ESCAPE HISTORY (Rate last 3 years of incarceration.)
   No escapes or attempts.....–2
   An escape or attempt with no actual or threatened violence:
      Over 1 year ago.....0
      Within the last year.....1 _____ score
   An escape or attempt from custody, or with actual or threatened violence:
      Over 1 year ago.....5
      Within the last year.....7

6. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS WITH GUILTY DISPOSITIONS
   None in last 13-18 months.....–4
   None in last 7-12 months.....–2
   None in last 6 months.....–1
   One in last 6 months.....Class A_____.....Class B_____.....Class C_____.....1 _____ score
   Two or more in last 6 months...Class A_____.....Class B_____.....Class C_____.....4

7. MOST SEVERE DISCIPLINARY REPORT RECEIVED (Last 18 months.)
   None.....0
   Low.....2
   Moderate.....5 _____ score
   High.....7

8. CURRENT DETAINER/NOTIFICATION/CHARGE PENDING
   None, or prosecution/extradition not indicated.....0
   Misdemeanor extradition/prosecution indicated.....3 _____ score
   Felony-extradition/prosecution indicated.....5

9. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS
   None.....0
   One.....2
   Two or more.....4 _____ score

SCHEDULE B SCORE (Add items 1 through 9.)

Close.....17 or more.
Medium.....12-16.
Minimum Restricted/Direct/Trusty.....7-11.
Minimum Community.....6 or less.

_____
TOTAL SCORE

ADULT SERVICES
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

CLASSIFICATION REVIEW

NAME: _____ NUMBER _____ DATE: _____ INSTITUTION _____

Felony X: ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
Judge Sentencing: ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
Incompatible Inmates ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
Special Needs ..... Yes ☐ No ☐
Educational Deficiency (Certified) ..... Yes ☐ No ☐

Handicap: _____
Limitation: _____

TRANSACTION CODE ☐
TRANS. DATE
MO. DAY YR.
☐ ☐ ☐
DOCUMENT NBR. 7 char J
☐ ☐ ☐

Current Review Security Score _____
Current Review Security Level _____
Override ..... _____
Final Review Security Level ..... _____
Comment: _____

Security Levels
6. Community
7. Trusty
8. Direct
3. Medium
9. Close
5. Maximum
0. Restricted

Override Considerations:
0. None
1. Medical
2. Security
3. System Needs
4. Statutory/D.O.C. Policy

Date: _____
Most Recently Approved Review:

Override Code: _____

Current Program

1. Institution: _____ ☐
2. Security: _____ ☐
3. Work Assignments by DOT Title:
   a. _____ ☐
   b. _____ ☐
4. Other:
   a. _____ ☐
   b. _____ ☐

Current Review Recommendations:

No Changes: ☐
5. Institution: _____ ☐
6. Security: _____ ☐
7. Work Assignment Titles, Code and Numbers:
   a. _____ ___-___-____
      ___-___-___
   b. _____
      ___-___-___
8. Voc. Training/Skill Identification:
   a. _____ ___-___-____ T-S
   b. _____ ___-___-____ T-S
9. Other: _____

Comments: _____

Classification Review Panel

Recommended: ☐
_____ Not Recommended: ☐
Chairperson

Recommended: ☐
_____ Not Recommended: ☐
Member

_____ _____
Inmate Date

☐ Approved
☐ Not Approved
_____
Warden

If not recommended or approved, state reasons why: _____

APPENDIX B
(14 Pages)

CLASSIFICATION EVALUATION

CLASSIFICATION EVALUATION

The classification process which establishes an inmate's security and custody designation should strive for the least restrictive placement necessary to adequately contain and supervise the inmate. Efforts to provde an orderly, systematic means of classifying individual inmates are balanced against the correctional systems' capacity to provide differential levels of security and custody. In Tennessee, available bedspace is a major factor contributing to decisions regarding inmate placement. Class X and judge sentencing laws limit the classification system's capability to place inmates in minimum security. Institution design further limits the ability to provide differential levels of custody for inmates housed in the facility.

In an effort to evaluate the relationship between the current classification system and security/custody issues site visits to three institutions were conducted in April 1985. Fort Pillow, Turney Center and Tennessee State Prison were selected as the three institutions for our evaluation because of their size and their ability to represent the types of problems which were being encountered by the agency as a whole. While on site, the consultant sensed a feeling of pride and self-determination in the facilities, together with considerable frustration, low morale among staff and inmates, and uncertainty about the future. Staff are trying to understand and work the classification procedures, but for the most part, are not very supportive of the policy.

The "Plan for the 80's" appears to have had tremendous impact on the correctional system. Turney Center is enjoying a positive

impact of new jobs and high inmate employment. Fort Pillow appears to have been negatively impacted with custody/escape risk inmates that has eroded the agricultural program. All three facilities were negatively impacted with the loss of education and training programs and for Fort Pillow and Tennessee State Prison, an increase of inmate idleness. During the past year, Fort Pillow reported three escapes, Turney Center, five, and Tennessee State Prison, eight. The three escapes from Fort Pillow were from inside the security fence. At Turney Center, three inmates escaped from inside the fence and were inmates who had recently been housed at Maximum Security Brushy Mountain. Two escapes at Turney Center were Minimum walkaways. At Tennenssee State Prison, two escapes were from inside the perimeter and six were Minimum walkaways from the Minimum housing outside the security perimeter.

FORT PILLOW

Fort Pillow Prison and Farm is designated as a Medium security facility with a rated capacity of 617. On 4/23/85 the count was 617 with all cells double bunked except segregation.

According to the warden, 18 months ago the facility had 450 inmates assigned outside the security perimeter working on the 6,000 acre farms. Two hundred thirty were Minimum custody compared to 99 currently assigned to Minimum. When visited, less than 200 were assigned outside the security perimeter. There is a department rule that any inmate with more than ten years to earliest possible release cannot be outside the security perimeter without restraints. There are currently 200 Minimum jobs available that are unfilled.

The Classification Committee usually consists of two staff, one security representative and one treatment representative. A number of staff rotate on the Committee and any member may be designated as Chairman. Any time an inmate is considered for a job change, his file is reviewed. The criterion and numerical values on the reclassification reviews are very similar to the NIC model. The most notable differences are the periods of custody review.

- o Only Minimum inmates' files are reviewed when a detainer is received.
- o A review is done every year for inmates who have less than three years to serve, and a review is done every two years for inmates with sentences exceeding three years.
- o Disciplinary convictions do not automatically trigger a review.

Because of these review procedures, it is reasonable to believe that a significant percentage of inmates are not currently classified according to the review measures.

Security Perimeter: A double fence forms the security perimeter. The inside fence is ten (10) feet high and the outside fence is twelve (12) feet high. The two fences vary in spacing from twelve (12) feet down to eight (8) feet. There is an application of razor wire that also widely varies from a single coil inside the top outer fence and a single coil inside the bottom outer fence to sections so profusely layered that vision is impaired. The double fence meanders around buildings and thus makes line-of-sight impossible and is built much too close to the buildings and activities within. There are six 24-hour towers around the perimeter that, like the fence, meanders along in such a way that

they seldom have overlap relationship to each other; they encounter numerous blind spots along the perimeter and in some instances, can observe very little inmate activity. The towers at best are ten (10) to twelve (12) feet high. The towers appear ineffective. A roving patrol functions on third shift only. Perimeter lighting is very sparse and obsolute. There is no electronic detector system.

Housing: All ranges of security housing from Minimum dormitories and Medium dormitories to solid door Maximum cells were observed. By NIC standards, all of the cells, including the solid door Maximum cells, are outside Medium security cells. Internal movement and supervision appeared to be the same for all classifications except segregation. Staffing patterns in the living units varied from one officer per shift in the Minimum, Medium and Close housing to 4-3-3 in the segregation lockup. Inmate idleness was very evident throughout the institution.

The facility security is Medium; the custody designations are Close. Little distinction is made between Close and Medium. Overrides to Minimum are made within the Warden's comfort zone for agriculture assignments. We did not study the farm operation, but it would appear that some jobs could be done with Medium inmates under supervision.

FORT PILLOW FINDINGS:

1. If the facility is to house any custody higher than Minimum, renovation construction on the perimeter. The double fence should be pulled further away from the iside activities and should be designed in a square of straight lines. New

towers of 25'-30' at standing level should be built so as to have an overlap relationship to each other, line of sight on the fence and maximum possible view of internal activities. Perimeter lighting should be completely redesigned and upgraded.

2. Only Medium and Minimum inmates should be housed at the facility. The mixing of Close custody inmates in the crowded cellblocks with their attending gang showers and numerous blind spots is an open invitation to assaults by inmates on other inmates and staff.
3. If the ten-year rule is to continue in effect, the system should not send any more such inmates to the facility than inside work assignments can accommodate.
4. Detainers, high and medium range disciplinary infractions should trigger custody rescoring so as to keep inmates currently classified.
5. The practice of various staff doubling as Classification Chairman should be replaced with a full time Classification Officer or designated person. This officer should also provide an internal monitoring of the classification system, which currently appears lacking.
6. Part of the plan to reduce capacity includes phasing out the Medium custody dormitory and converting the space into an arts & craft and activity building. Such an activity space would help alleviate idleness and should be followed through.
7. TDOC should develop a program to deal with staff morale and a 56% turnover rate of correctional officers.

8. If the system cannot supply enough Minimum inmates to fill the Minimum farm jobs, it should develop jobs within the perimeter to deal with the climate of tension one senses that is caused in large part by idleness.
9. Serious deficiencies appear to exist in fire safety, hygiene, and general supervision in the crowded cellblocks and numerous deadends and blind spots. All of the previous recommendations are based on the assumption that those areas will be addressed. At a minimum, the individual cell turnkey system should be replaced with a slider system operated from a Control Center in each cellhouse.

TURNEY CENTER

Turney Center was built in 1971 and designed to house juvenile offenders. Due to overcrowding throughout the system, in 1979 the facility began receiving older Medium custody offenders.

In the "Plan of the 80's," the Governor and the Commissioner issued a policy that shifted from treatment and education to a work ethic and Turney Center became a focal point for industries. The capacity was projected to double to 1,000 by double bunking. All industries shops were to be in place by January 1984. Violence and escapes increased and the facility experienced a major disturbance in September 1983. The facility was locked down and privileges severely curtailed. In July 1984, three inmates escaped and left a trail of violence that attracted national attention and $800,000 was appropriated for renovation/upgrading of facility security.

The institution is having difficulty finding enough Minimum custody inmates to fill housing and jobs designed for Minimum. There are several factors that account for the Minimum shortage, and overcrowding:

a. Placement needs at Community/Work Release Centers;

b. Judge sentence act that has resulted in more severe sentencing;

c. Class X sentencing that requires certain violent crime categories to serve 40% of their sentence under direct supervision; and

d. An emergency powers act that drains off what would otherwise be institutional Minimum inmates.

In July 1984, the Court ordered that no Maximum or Close inmates would be housed at Turney Center. The evidence is that there are Close inmates at Turney Center that are classified as Medium. As is the practice at Fort Pillow, inmates with less than 3 years are reviewed annually and inmates with more than 3 years are reviewed every two years. Exceptions are inmates reviewed for job changes. Inmates who are charged with disciplinary infractions are not automatically reviewed. A hypothetical result is as follows:

> Inmate John Doe scores 15 which is Medium custody. He receives two disciplinary reports which, if scored, would result in a score of 19, Close custody. He will continue as a Medium until his next review date, at which time either six months will have elapsed, negating the 4 points, or, if he is scored at Close, an override for Medium will be made.

Reviews are done by assigned counselors. Overrides are initiated by the counselors and the Warden has final override approval. The Warden has the discretion to place inmates in administrative segregation and empanels review committees to consider moving inmates out of administrative segregation. The

Warden, the Associate Warden of Custody and the Chief Counselor all agreed that 10-15% of the 852 inmates (85-125) would be Close custody if the classification process were current.

The correctional officer turnover rate is around 70%. Since July 1984, 142 C.O.'s were hired and 92 have resigned or been terminated. Thus, there exists a situation of a large number of Close inmates called Medium inmates being supervised by very new and inexperienced staff. Classification and custody are in conflict with each other.

Security: As the result of the $800,000 funding and recent security evaluations, perimeter security is being substantially upgraded. A double fence has been installed (previously a single fence), razor wire installation is near completion, new lighting is being installed and a 24-hour roving patrol has been implemented. Seven 24-hour towers are adequately spaced on the perimeter and are of adequate height. There is no detector system in the perimeter fence. It is recommended that a detector system be installed. One might think that the towers, razor wire and roving patrol are adequate. However,there is a feature that poses a security problem with the absence of a good detection system. The facility sits in a horsehoe formed by the Duck River. In the spring and autumn, the river causes an intense fog that the lighting and spotlights cannot adequately penetrate. This situation, coupled with security inadequacies in the housing units, yet to be discussed, pose highly probable escapes. With the addition of a detector system, the perimeter security will be very adequate for Medium custody inmates.

Housing: The major security problems are in the living units. The Voluntary Segregation Unit, the Involuntary Segregations Unit, the Punitive Segregation Unit, three general population units and, outside the perimeter, the Minimum Unit were visited.

Steel bars were recently installed on all cell windows; however, the construction, including the Protective Custody and Involuntary Segregation, is cinder block without steel reinforcement. We were told by several officers that inmates have literally kicked their way out of their cells through the walls.

The Involuntary Segregation Unit has two officers on duty per shift and all other units have one officer pler shift. I visited one complex of three buildings interlinked and containing 100 cells in a maze of corridors all supervised by one officer. Supervision in these units can only be described as minimal.

The security is Medium; custody designations are mainly Close. Delays in classification reviews and overrides are being used to designate all inmates as Medium or Minimum when, in reality, many Medium would grade out as Close. There are no housing units at Turney Center secure enough to house Maximum inmates, or secure enough to assure physical separation for the Voluntary Segregation inmates.

TURNEY CENTER FINDINGS:

1. If Turney Center is to continue housing protective custody and involuntary segregation (Maximum), the present Involuntary Segregation Unit should be used to house protective custody, and a Maximum Security Unit should be built to house the involuntary and punitive segregation units.

2. Staffing is not adequate in the living units. There should be at least one officer per shift per unit in the general population units.
officer per shift per unit in the general population units.

3. As is recommended for Fort Pillow, automatic custody reviews should occur when there are disciplinary infractions and routine reviews should occur more frequently than the current practice. Close custody inmates should be transferred.

4. The living units are built on concrete pillars and have open spaces under the buildings. Those spaces should be blocked off with secure fencing or cinder blocks. All staff we talked with complained of those areas as hiding places for inmates and contraband.

5. Interior lighting in the living units is not adequate and should be upgraded.

6. TDOC should develop a program to deal with staff morale and a 70% turnover rate of correctional officers.

TENNESSEE STATE PRISON

Tennessee State Prison was constructed in 1895 and houses inmates in Maximum, Close, Medium, Minimum inside and Minimum outside custody levels. The total count on 4/25/85 was 1078.

The facility has six counselors who are responsible to initiate classification reviews. The reviews are then reviewed by a Classification Committee and forwarded to the Warden for final revew and approval. Custody reviews are triggered by job changes, placement in administrative segregation and minimum inmates receiving discipolinary reports and detainers. In contrast to the three year procedure at Fort Pillow and Turney Center, Tennessee State Prison is attempting to review every inmate annually. We were advised that overrides are used on inmates who score Minimum but who are Judge Sentence or Class X. This facility has need to override to Minimum to supply their 50 Minimum Outside beds.

Administrative segregation placement placement is usually initiated by a serious disciplinary report. The disciplinary board recommends to the Associate Warden of Security with final

approval by the Warden. Administrative segregation inmates are reviewed every 30 days by a review board. One person is designated as Classification Chairman and Disciplinary Chairman.

Inmates at this facility may be more accurately classified than Fort Pillow and Turney Center. More events trigger a review and reviews are routinely done more often. The major exception is Medium inmates who receive disciplinary dispositions short of placement in administrative segregation. It appears that a percentage of Medium inmates would grade Close. From the standpoint of inmate movement and supervision, it did not appear to matter whether an inmate is Inside Medium, Medium or Close. Unit 2 is Close/Medium and Unit 3 is Medium/Minimum. The unit security features, staffing patterns, degree of supervision and inmate movement were identified in both units. Close, Medium and Minimum inmates had common access, movement and supervision. the only distinctions were segregation (including Death Row) and Outside Minimum. All general population inmates eat at a common central dining area under direct supervision.

Security: The security perimeter is a square stone wall encircling the facility, containing eleven (11) 24-hour towers, 2,300 voltage wires on top of the wall, and a 24-hour roving patrol. There is no electronic detection system on the perimeter and no razor wire. In the past 12 months, there were eight (8) escapes including six (6) Minimum walkaways and two (2) from inside the walls.

A helter-skelter construction of buildings over the years has created a maze of blind spots for towers and ground personnel.

Security has compensated by filling nooks and crannies with staff supervision.

Housing: Unit 1 Maximum is a five-level single block cellhouse with 180 bed capacity but limited by policy to 75 inmates. 7-7-3 staffing pattern. Each cell individually locked by turnkey. All cell walkways are covered with a steel mesh screen. All cells are inside cells.

The only physical differences between Unit 1 Maximum and Units 2 Close/Medium and 3 Medium/Minimum are the steel mesh and the food preparation area in Unit 1. Units 2 and 3 each have a staffing pattern of 4-4-2.

With the exception of an honor dormitory, all living units we observed were, by NIC definition, Maximum security units. One missing feature is the lack of sliding doors. All doors are manually operated, swing open steel doors. As with Fort Pillow, lack of fire, safety and hygiene standards are major concerns.

The security is Maximum; custody designations are Close for general population, Maximum for Maximum inmates. Classification is more accurately describing the true custody of the inmates with some override exceptions for the Minimum outside assignments, than appeared to be the case in other institutions.

The loss of long-standing programs, a feeling of alienation from the central office and building/utilities too old to properly maintain were indicated to have contributed to a low staff morale. Low staff morale, a dirty and depressing environment and uncertainty about the future all contribute to low inmate morale.

TENNESSEE STATE PRISON FINDINGS:

Overall, the best option may be that new prison construction begin as quickly as possible to phase out Tennessee State Prison. The following recommendations are based on the assumption that Tennessee State Prison will continue on the present site.

1. Over a span of time, construct new cellhouses. As they become occupied, demolish the old cellhouses. Construction and transition can occur without temporarily losing beds.

2. Physically separate the heavy industry/shops from the compound/living unit area. There is very little to prevent inmates from manufacturing weapons in the shops and transporting them anywhere in the compound. After seeeing this area, we asked for a contraband report. One quarterly report on shakedowns included 37 homemade knives, 1 zip gun, $656 cash, 359 gallons julip (home brew), 10 needles and syringes, 21 small bags marijuana, 170 various pills, one fifth of Vodka, various tools and supplies.

3. New locking systems are needed throughout the facility. The most critical need is in the living units. As reported earlier, each cell in the five-level blocks has to be manually opened and locked on swing doors. The locks are badly worn. On several occasions, we watched officers twist and jiggle the key to work the lock. There should be concern for the working conditions these locks and doors impose upon the officers. As for the safety of the inmate, if a fire occurred that produced heavy toxic smoke, most inmates would perish in their cells.

4. The new cellhouse construction should include, besides the Medium beds needed for certain inmate jobs, sufficient Maximum and Close beds for the system's needs. When Brushy Mountain was converted to a reception center, Maximum custody inmates were scattered among a number of facilities. From the standpoint of cost effectiveness, public safety, and security readiness, it doesn't make sense to scatter Maximum inmates into facilities that lack the physical security and safety features and staffing to correctly manage this highest risk and management inmate.

5. The existing perimeter and towers appear to need maintenance.

6. It is recommended that an analysis and action plan be implemented that will result in every able-bodied inmate not confined to segregation lockup being afforded a minimum of five activity hours per day. "Activity" can mean a wide range including such things as arts and crafts, visiting, recreation, job assignment, discussion groups. The "Plan of the 80's" in the opinion of all of the staff talked to, caused the facility to lose its educational and other meaningful activity programs. Aside from whatever rehabilitative value such activities might offer, from a practical management viewpoint, anything that converts idleness into well structured and supervised programs of interest to inmates is a key management tool.

APPENDIX C
(39 Pages)

CMC - STRATEGIES FOR CASE SUPERVISION
(39 Pages)

CMC - Interview (15 Pages)

CMC - Institution Treatment
Outline (24 Pages)

CLIENT MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION

Instruction Sheet

There are four parts to the Client Management Classification Procedure:

A. Attitudes
B. Objective history
C. Interview behavior
D. Impressions of contributing factors

Whenever possible, the above sequence (A to D) of procedures should be used with each client.

A Scoring Guide is included to provide criteria and assistance in scoring questionable answers.

Instructions for Attitude Interview (45 items)

A semi-structured interview with suggested questions has been developed to elicit the attitude information. Use a comfortable, natural wording appropriate for yourself and the client when asking questions. If the client presents some interesting information requiring follow-up, feel free to follow through on the information before going back to the structured sequence. For each item, you must choose only one alternative. If you can't choose an alternative, don't rate the item.

Each section of the attitude interview is headed by one or two open-ended questions, which may provide material for rating specific items. If the information has not been obtained from the open-ended questions, more specific questions are also provided for individual items. If the specific questions fail to elicit the information, continue to inquire in a different or more direct manner unless you see the word -STOP-. "-STOP-" means to discontinue inquiry (except to repeat or clarify the question if it was misunderstood). For some items A & B questions are included. If the B question is asterisked (*) always ask it. If B isn't asterisked, ask B if the information wasn't elicited from question A.

Instructions for Objective Background Items (11 items)

These items follow the attitude interview. The information can probably be obtained quite rapidly with direct questions.

Instructions for Interview Behavior Ratings (8 items)

These ratings are based on the client's behavior during the interview.

Instructions for Interviewer Impressions (7 items)

These ratings should reflect the interviewer's impression of the importance of each contributing factor to the client's legal difficulties. On this part the agent must rate at least one factor as "highly significant (1)" and at least one as "not significant (5)."

CLIENT'S NAME_____

ATTITUDES ABOUT OFFENSE

Could you tell me about the offense that got you into trouble?

1a. How did you get involved in this offense?
1b. How did you decide to commit the offense?

2. Could you tell me more about the circumstances that led up to the offense?

3. Looking back at your offense, what's your general feeling about it? -STOP-

1. Motivation for committing current offense
   (a) emotional motivation (e.g., anger, sex offense, etc.)
   (b) material (monetary) motivation
   (c) both emotional and material motivation

2. Acceptance of responsibility for current offense
   (a) admits committing the offense and doesn't attempt excuses
   (b) admits committing the offense, but emphasizes excuses (e.g., drinking, influenced by friends, family problems, etc.)
   (c) denies committing the offense

3. Expression of guilt about current offense
   (a) expresses guilt feelings or spontaneous empathy toward victim
   (b) expresses superficial or no guilt
   (c) victimless crime

SCORING GUIDE

1. A. -using drugs
-assault (not for robbery)
B. -prostitution
-car theft (except for joy riding)
C. -stealing primarily for peer acceptance
-stealing from parents for revenge
-man who won't pay alimony, primarily because he is angry with his ex-wife

2. B. -"I would never have done it if I hadn't been drinking."
-"My friends get me in trouble."
C. Clients who deny committing any significant aspect of the offense are scored "C".
-client admits helping to jimmy a car window but denies responsibility for removing valuables because his friends removed them.

3. A. Client must feel some personal shame and regret (not just verbalization to impress the agent)
B. -"I feel bad because now I have a record."
-"People are disappointed in me." (Indicates some regret but not necessarily guilt.)
-"I know it was wrong" (emphasis on having done wrong, not on feeling bad because one has done wrong).
C. -drug usage
-sexual activities between consenting adults

OFFENSE PATTERN

I'd like to talk about your prior offenses. Have you been in trouble before?
(Obtain a complete picture of client's offense style, including current offense, when scoring items 5-8.)

4a. What prior offenses have you been convicted of? *4b. Were you ever in trouble as a juvenile?	4. Offense and severity (a) no prior offenses (skip items 5, 6, 7, and 8) (b) mainly misdemeanors (c) no consistent pattern (d) mainly felonies
5a. Have you ever been armed or hurt someone during these offenses? *5b. Did you ever threaten anyone?	5. Was client ever involved in offense where he (she) was armed, assaultive, or threatened injury to someone? (a) yes (b) no
6a. How did you decide to commit these offenses? 6b. Did you plan these offenses beforehand? (Discuss offenses individually until a clear pattern emerges.)	6. Offenses were <u>generally</u> (a) planned (b) no consistent pattern (c) impulsive
7. Were you drinking or high on drugs when you committed your offenses?	7. Percent of offenses committed while drinking or high (a) never (b) 50% or less (c) over 50%
8. Did you commit your offenses alone or with others?	8. Offenses were <u>generally</u> committed (a) alone (b) no consistent pattern (c) with accomplices

---

<u>Scoring Guide</u>

4. Items 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 should include juvenile offenses and serious traffic offenses (e.g. drunk driving, hit and run).
B. Should not be used if client has more than two serious felonies. (Use choice "C" or "D".)
D. Over 50% of client's convictions are felonies.

5-8. Use current and prior offense factors to score 5 through 8.

6. A. -exhibitionist who drives around in a car looking for girls to expose himself to
-person who decides to commit an offense, then drinks to build courage
C. -exhibitionist driving to work, suddenly saw a girl and pulled over and exposed himself
-person gets drunk and into bar fight

SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Now I'd like to find out some things about your background. Let's begin with school. How did you like school?

9.	What was your favorite subject in school? -STOP-	9. Favorite subject (a) vocational (b) academic (c) gym (d) no favorite subject
10a. *10b.	Did you have a favorite teacher in high school? What did you like about him/her?	10. Attitude toward teachers (a) no favorite teacher (b) teacher chosen because of certain qualities the client admired (c) teacher chosen because of close personal relationship with the client
11a. *11b.	How far did you go in school? Did you have any problems with schoolwork? (If client didn't graduate from high school find out why.)	11. Client's school performance (a) no problems (b) learning problems (difficulty performing schoolwork) (c) behavior problems or lack of interest
12.	What kind of jobs have you had?	12. Primary vocation (a) unskilled labor (b) semi-skilled (c) skilled labor or white collar (d) no employment history (homemaker). (Skip 13 and 14) (e) student or recent graduate. (Skip 13 and 14.)

SCORING GUIDE

9.
- *A. -business courses*
- *B. -music or art*

11.
- *A. Don't use A for clients who didn't complete high school.*
- *B. For client whose learning problems result from a lack of capacity (not just from lack of interest or behavioral problems).*
  If client has both a lack of capacity and behavioral problems, score Choice B since lack of capacity takes precedence over other problems.
  -client who's been in remedial or slow learner classes.

12.
- *A. Use Choice A for client who's been in job market over 6 months, but has no employment history. (Also score items 13 and 14.)*
- *D. For homemaker, use prior vocational history if available. If not, check Choice D and skip items 13 and 14.*
- *E. For client who recently (within 6 months) finished school and hasn't had an opportunity to establish an employment pattern, check Choice E and skip items 13 and 14.*

13. How long did you work on your most recent job? (Start with most recent, and go backwards until a clear pattern is established.)

13. Percent of working life where client was employed full time
(a) over 90%
(b) over 50%
(c) 50% or less

14a. Have you had problems getting jobs?
14b. What were your reasons for leaving jobs?

14. Primary vocational problem
(a) none
(b) problems due to lack of skills or capacity
(c) problems due to attitude

15a. Where did you live before coming to prison?
*15b. Have you moved around much? (Deal with time period after client turned 18.)

15. Living stability background
(a) essentially stable living arrangements
(b) some unstable periods
(c) essentially unstable living arrangements

16. Have you had any trouble supporting yourself or received welfare?

16. History of being self supporting
(a) client has usually been self-supporting
(b) client has had several periods when he/she wasn't self-supporting
(c) client has essentially been non self-supporting

FAMILY ATTITUDES

Can you tell me what your childhood was like?

17a. How do (did) you get along with your father?
17b. How do you feel about your father?

17. Present feelings toward father
(a) close
(b) mixed or neutral
(c) hostile

SCORING GUIDE

13. Subtract time in school, institutions, etc. from clients potential working life.

14. A. Don't use A for clients working less than 90% of time.

16. Illegal activities and welfare are not counted as self supporting. For clients who have not had the opportunity to support themselves (e.g. homemaker or person living off relatives) estimate the likelihood of their being able to support themselves.

17. In multi-father families, use the person whom the client identifies as father.
B. -"We get along" (without implication of closeness.)

18a. If you did something wrong as a <u>teenager</u>, how did your father handle it? 18b. What kind of discipline did he use?	18. Type of discipline father used (during client's <u>teenager</u> years) (a) verbal or privilege withdrawal (b) permissive (generally let client do as he/she pleased) (c) physical
19a. How do (did) you get along with your mother? 19b. How do you feel about your mother?	19. Present <u>feelings</u> toward mother (a) close (b) mixed or neutral (c) hostile
20a. If you did something wrong as a <u>teenager</u>, how did your mother handle it? 20b. What kind of discipline did she use?	20. Type of discipline mother used (during client's <u>teenage</u> years) (a) verbal or privilege withdrawal (b) permissive (generally let client do as he/she pleased) (c) physical
21a. Were you ever abused by your parents? 21b. Did they ever go overboard on the punishment? -STOP-	21. Was client ever physically abused by a biological, step or adoptive parent (a) yes (b) no
22a. How would your parents have described you as a child (prior to adolescence)? *22b. Did both parents see you the same way?	22. Parental view of client (prior to adolescence) (a) good kid (normal) (b) problem child (c) parents differed

---

<u>SCORING GUIDE</u>

18. If the client didn't live with father or father figure during at least part of their adolescent years, do not rate Item 18. *B. -"He always left it to Mom."*	*21. Item 21 should be based on <u>facts</u> described, and not whether the client felt abused.* *A. -cuts on face* *-severe body bruises* *-sexual abuse* *-locked in closet or starved for unusual periods of time*
19. In multi-mother families, use the person whom the client identifies as mother. *B. -"We get along" (without implication of closeness)*	
20. If the client didn't live with mother or mother figure during at least part of their adolescent years do not rate Item 20. *B. -"She always left it to Dad."*	*22. A. -no special problem* *-like anybody else* *B. -"parents always complaining about me"* *-"gave them lots of trouble"* *- seen as "strange kid"*

23. How would you describe yourself as a child (prior to adolescence)?	23. As a child client describes self as (a) good kid (normal) (b) problem child
24a. How do you get along with your brothers and sisters? 24b. How do you feel about them?	24. General feelings toward siblings (a) close (b) neutral or mixed (c) hostile (d) no siblings
25. Would you describe your early childhood (prior to adolescence) as happy or unhappy? -STOP-	25. General attitude toward childhood (a) happy (b) not happy
26. If you could change anything about your childhood, what would you change?	26. Satisfaction with childhood (a) basically satisfied (little change) (b) dissatisfied with material aspect (c) dissatisfied with family, self or emotional climate
27. Can you describe your father's personality? (If answer is unclear, ask client to describe another person they know well.)	27. Client's description (a) multi-faceted (b) superficial (e.g. good, bad, nice, etc.)

SCORING GUIDE

23. *Accept what the client says, even if their behavior doesn't match their perception. (Examples from Item 22 also apply here.)*

24. *Include half-siblings, exclude step-siblings.*
B. -"like some, not others"

25. *Accept client's view*

27. *The focus of this item is the complexity with which the client views people. The ability to describe attributes, or explain the reasons for behavior, is being measured. "Superficial" indicates a lack of capacity to perceive depth in personality, and not just an evasion of the question. One or two complex statements are sufficient for an (A) score.*
A. -"ambitious and honest"
-"sensitive to others"
-"Dad was strict because that's the way he was brought up."
B. -"no-good drunk" (with no further elaboration)
-"mean"
-"kind"
-"don't know"

INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONS

Let's talk about your friends now. Did you spend much time with them?

28.	Had your friends (associates) on the outside been in trouble with the law.	28. Client's associates were (a) essentially non-criminal (b) mixed (c) mostly criminal
29a. *29b.	How did you get along with your friends? How did they act towards you?	29. In interactions with friends, client appears (a) used by others (b) withdrawn (c) other problems (d) normal
30a. *30b.	Do you have a closest friend? What do you like best about him/her? -STOP-	30. Description of client's relationship with his/her closest friend (a) talk (share feelings) or help each other (b) do things together (less emphasis on talking or sharing feelings) (c) has none
31.	Are you satisfied with the way you get along with people?	31. Satisfaction in interpersonal relationships (a) feels satisfied (b) feels dissatisfied
32.	In general, do you tend to trust or mistrust people? -STOP-	32. General outlook towards people (a) basically trusting (b) mixed or complex view (c) basically mistrusting

---

SCORING GUIDE

28. Don't count marijuana use (by itself) as criminal.
A. Don't use A if client committed offense with accomplices.

29. This item should be based on the interviewer's judgement of the quality of the client's interactions. If the interviewer feels the client was being used by their friends and the client feels they got along O.K., check Choice A.

30. A. -"Do things for each other"
-"We're like brothers"
B. -"He's a hunter too"

31. Accept the client's statement.

32. B. a complex view of people (e.g., trusts people in certain situations and not others)
-"trust people too much"
-"takes a while to get to know them"

33a. How much socializing did you do with women (men)?
*33b. Did you generally go out with a lot of women (men) or date the same person for long periods?

33. Client's opposite sex relationship pattern generally is
(a) long term (over 6 months) or serious relationships
(b) short and long term relationships
(c) short term less emotionally involved relationships, or little dating experience

34. In your relationship with your wife or girlfriend (husband or boyfriend) who tends to make the decisions?

34. In interaction with the opposite sex, client generally
(a) asserts self or dominates
(b) is average or adequate
(c) is nonassertive or dominated

FEELINGS

Do you have any problems handling your feelings?

35. Do you consider yourself to be a nervous (or anxious) person? -STOP-

35. Does client view himself (herself) as a nervous person?
(a) yes
(b) no

36a. What kinds of things get you depressed?
36b. What do you do when you're feeling depressed?

36. What client does when he (she) feels depressed
(a) seeks someone to talk to, or tries to figure it out
(b) seeks an activity to distract self
(c) drinks or uses drugs
(d) isolates self

37a. Have you ever thought seriously about hurting or killing yourself?
37b. (If client says yes to above) Have you ever tried it?

37. Self destructive behavior
(a) never seriously contemplated it
(b) had definite thoughts of suicide
(c) attempted it

SCORING GUIDE

33. C. Short-term relationships with no solid commitments to people

34. Do not accept the client's response without probing their relationships or how some specific decisions are made (e.g., who decides what to do or whom to socialize with -- who controls the money).

35. Accept the client's statement

36. B. -"forget about them".
-"watch T.V."
D. -"I pray".
-"Go to sleep".

38a. What do you do when you're feeling angry with people? *38b. Have you ever hurt anybody when you were angry?	38. In handling anger, client (a) is physically aggressive toward people (b) avoids expression to others or has trouble expressing anger appropriately (c) responds appropriately
39a. Can you describe your personality? 39b. What do you like and dislike about yourself? -STOP-	39. In describing themselves, client (a) emphasizes strength (b) emphasizes inadequacy (client tends to downgrade self) (c) can't describe self
40. (No question asked - should be based on impression from client's discussion of feelings.)	40. Openness in discussing feelings (a) discusses openly (b) evasive or superficial

PLANS AND PROBLEMS

41. Aside from legal problems, what is the biggest problem in your life now? -STOP-	41. What does the client view as his/her important problem area right now (a) personal (b) relationships (c) vocational - educational (d) financial (e) no big problems presently (score item 42 as A)

SCORING GUIDE

38. Based on all sources of reliable information (e.g., offense), and not just client's statement. Physically aggressive problems should take precedence over other choices.
B. -"break things".
-denies getting angry

39. If the client gives both positive and negative statements about himself, choose the one emphasized the most. If the positive and negative have equal emphasis, choose the one given first.
C. Choice C is designed to pick out those clients who are not capable of showing much insight or complexity in their view of themselves.
-"I'm O.K." (and can't elaborate)
-"I'm a nice person"
-"I get into too much trouble".

40. A. If the interviewer felt that the client was fairly straightforward in talking about his feelings.
B. If the interviewer felt that the client was superficial or evasive.

41. A. -"Drinking or drugs"
-"Get my head together"
B. -"Get things straightened out with my fiancee"
-"Try to get along better with my parents"

42. How do you expect this problem (from item 41) to work out?	42. Attitude toward solving problems (a) optimistic, expects to succeed (include 41e) (b) unclear (c) pessimistic, expects to fail
43a. What goals do you have for the future? *43b. How do you expect to accomplish your goals? -STOP-	43. Future plans (a) short-term goals (most goals can be fulfilled within about 6 months) (b) unrealistic goals (c) realistic long-term goals (most goals are well developed and extend beyond 6 months)
44. (No question asked - based on information throughout interview on education, jobs, training programs, following through on goals, or treatment, etc.)	44. Client usually sticks with or completes things he/she begins (a) yes (b) no
45a. How will being in the institution affect your life? 45b. What do you expect to get from being here? -STOP-	45. Client's general expectations about incarceration (a) no effect (b) monetary, counseling, or program help (c) will teach them a lesson (d) negative expectations (e) mixed or unclear expectations

---

SCORING GUIDE

42. A. -"O.K. Because I'll get a better paying job." *B. -"O.K., I hope."* *-"I'll be O.K. if I get a better paying job."* *C. Client is pessimistic about the outcome or can't figure out a solution.*	*43. A. -"No goals, live day to day"* *B. Strange, way out, or impossible to achieve goals.*

OBJECTIVE BACKGROUND ITEMS

1. Age of earliest court appearance for legal offense:
   a. 14 or below
   b. 15 - 17
   c. 18 - 22
   d. 23+

2. Number of prior offenses:
   a. none
   b. 1 - 3
   c. 4 - 7
   d. 8+

3. Number of commitments to State or Federal Correctional Institutions:
   a. 0
   b. 1
   c. 2 or more

4. Time spent under probation supervision:
   a. none
   b. 1 year or less
   c. over 1 year - 3 years
   d. over 3 years

5. Medical history: (circle all applicable choices)
   a. back or stomach problems or frequent headaches
   b. serious head injuries
   c. prior psychiatric hospitalization
   d. out-patient psychotherapy
   e. none of the above

SCORING GUIDE

1. *Include juvenile offenses and serious traffic offenses (e.g., drunk driving, hit and run).*

2. *Exclude the client's present offense in rating this item. Include juvenile and serious traffic offenses.*

3. *Include current and juvenile commitments.*

4. *Include juvenile supervision.*

5. *A. -vague complaints not diagnosed by a physician*
   B. -skull fractures
   -head injuries which required treatment (beyond X-ray)

School History

6. Highest grade completed:
   a. 9th or below
   b. 10th to 12th
   c. high school graduate (exclude GED)
   d. some post high school training leading toward a degree

7. Did client ever receive special education or remedial help in school?
   a. yes
   b. no

Family Development

8. Client was raised primarily by:
   a. intact biological family
   b. other

9. Did either parent have a history of:
   (circle all applicable choices)
   a. being on welfare
   b. criminal behavior
   c. psychiatric hospitalization
   d. suicide attempts
   e. drinking problems
   f. none of the above.

SCORING GUIDE

7. *Include special programs for learning deficiencies (rather than behavior problems).*

8. *Choice A requires both natural parents in an intact home until client reaches about 16 years of age.*

9. *Includes step and adopted parents.*

10. Have siblings (include half and step sibs) ever been arrested?
    a. none
    b. some
    c. most
    d. not applicable

11. Currently, client is:
    a. single (never married)
    b. single (separated, divorced, widowed)
    c. married (includes common law)

****

BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS

Please rate the following behaviors as observed during the interview.

1. Grooming and Dress:

   A. __Below Average B. __Average C. __Above Average

2. Self Confidence:

   A. __Lacks Confidence B. __Average C. __Overly Confident

3. Attention Span:

   A. __Easily Distractable B. __Average C. __Very Attentive

4. Comprehension:

   A. __Below Average B. __Average C. __Above Average

5. Thought Processes:

   A. __Sluggish B. __Average C. __Driven (Accelerated)

6. Affect:

   A. __Depressed B. __Average C. __Elated

7. Self Revealing:

   A. __Evasive B. __Average C. __Very Open

8. Cooperation:

   A. __Negativistic B. __Average C. __Eager to Please

INTERVIEWER IMPRESSIONS

Please rate the significance of each factor as it contributes to the client's legal difficulties. (Each client must receive at least one score of 1 and 5.)

		#1 Highly Significant	#2 Significant	#3 Somewhat Significant	#4 Minor Significant	#5 Not Significant
a.	Social inadequacy	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Vocational inadequacy	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Criminal orientation	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Emotional factors	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Family history problems	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Isolated situational (temporary circumstances)	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Interpersonal manipulation	1	2	3	4	5

SCORING GUIDE

Item A - Refers to the client's social skills in dealing with others, their ability to perceive the motives and concerns of others, and their ability to survive in society and care for themselves.

Item B - Refers to client's ability or skills to obtain relatively permanent and reasonably paying employment.

Item C - Refers to whether criminal behavior is an acceptable, common part of their life and they attempt to live off of crime. They don't really try to make it in a prosocial way.

Item D - Refers to degree of emotional problems in the client's life.

Item E - Refers to parental family problems experienced during childhood and adolescence.

Item F - Refers to some unusual or temporary circumstance in the client's life, which is unlikely to be repeated.

Item G - Refers to client's need to control others to gain their own end. Generally, these clients aren't overly concerned about using or manipulating other people.

CLIENT MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION (CMC)

INSTITUTION TREATMENT OUTLINE

The Client Management Classification System is an attempt to develop differential supervision models for five different groups of clients. The goals, approaches and techniques delineated are not an exhaustive list, but an attempt to provide a general framework of recommendations to consider with each group. Individual case needs, when they differ from the general recommendations for a group, should override the more general supervision suggestions. These recommendations can lead to a consistent approach in case planning, by providing a framework within which the staff can formulate more specific plans appropriate to the individual. Many possible supervision techniques have not been included because they don't pertain to differences between groups or could be equally applicable to members of all five groups. This outline focuses on recommendations which tend to be differentially applicable to the five groups, thus highlighting differences rather than similarities in supervision.

SELECTIVE INTERVENTION

DESCRIPTION

The most prominent characteristic of clients in this group is that they generally tend to have relatively stable and pro-social life styles. They are usually steadily employed, established in the community, and have minimal offense histories. The current offense will frequently be their first involvement with the law. (Distinction should be made between this group and the successful, professional criminal who has been involved over a long period in law-violating behavior but was never previously caught.) Offenses committed by this group are generally motivated by some isolated and stressful event or a relatively specific, neurotic problem. Their offenses can be viewed as a temporary lapse or suspension of an otherwise normally functioning social value system. The lapse is often brought about by an unusually stressful circumstance or a compulsion to fulfill a particular neurotic need (e.g. exhibitionism). With appropriate intervention these clients are least likely to get involved in further legal difficulties.

As suggested above, there are actually two types of clients within the Selective Intervention (S.I.) group.

A. Selective Intervention - Situational - Clients whose legal problems stem from a temporary lapse or unusually stressful circumstance occuring in their life.

B. Selective Intervention - Treatment - Clients whose offense is caused by a more continuing neurotic need or compulsion (e.g. exhibitionism).

While the scoring system doesn't differentiate between the two Selective Intervention groups, the following criteria are used to indicate which S.I.

clients fall within the "treatment" sub-type.

1. Sexual offense history.
2. Ongoing drug or alcohol abuse.
3. Serious emotional disturbance.
4. Assaultive offense history.

The recommendations which follow apply to both Selective Intervention Sub-types, unless designated otherwise.

GOALS

Assist client to:

1. Identify and resolve the temporary situational crisis or isolated neurotic problem which produced the offense.
2. Get back on the track of their generally pro-social life pattern.
3. Get treatment for their emotional problem (Treatment Sub-type).

CLIENT-STAFF RELATIONSHIP

1. Because these clients generally subscribe to non-criminal values, staff may readily identify with them. Sometimes, however, this identification causes staff to expect more from them and be more critical of them for getting in trouble.
2. Avoid increasing guilt and criminal identification in these clients. They may be highly sensitive about their offense and being incarcerated.

SECURITY

1. These clients generally require the least time and present the fewest management problems.
2. It is generally appropriate to accept the self reports of this group. However, situations may arise where through loyalty to or fear of other inmates, these clients may not be truthful.

3. In situations where long sentences have been imposed and reasonable legal recourses have been exhausted, depression and a sense of hopelessness are likely to be seen. This may include suicidal thoughts, severing of family ties, inappropriate self-blaming, alternating tirades against the system and over dependence on the staff, and an unusual accumulation of conduct reports. Staff should recognize that these problems are likely to be temporary, and should try to help the client resolve the depression and get them back to their more normal cooperative state.

HOUSING/PEERS

1. Upon first entering the institution, their naivete about criminality and attempts to conform to institution rules can create suspicion in other residents.
2. The shock of being sent to an institution will frequently be quite marked. This will often produce an initial response of withdrawal and depression. In time, the individual will seek out contact with less criminally oriented residents and intense friendships can develop. It also may happen that these friendships can become overtly sexual and lead to fears within these individuals about their sexual orientation.
3. They may believe that in order to survive within the institution, they have to align themselves with more criminally oriented peers for protection and end up getting used by these peers. This pattern occurs infrequently but can be a severe problem in those cases where it does occur.
4. These clients may represent themselves as different from or better than other residents. This leads to antagonism from other residents and perhaps, even staff. Other residents typically respond by isolating and verbally harassing them.

5. Because these clients are relatively competent people who eventually achieve a good adjustment to the institution, staff will have a tendency to use them to help manage less stable residents (e.g. room and work pairings). While this can have a beneficial effect, care must be taken to assure that such pairings do not add to the individual's emotional adjustment problems.

SCHOOL/VOCATIONAL

1. Although these clients may not have the highest needs for vocational educational programs, they tend to utilize these programs well in cases where they are necessary.
2. Program planning must take into account changes to be encountered upon release (e.g. offense may bring about need for major vocational change because they can't return to their former occupation).

SOCIAL/CLINICAL SERVICES

1. While these clients tend to be relatively honest and straightforward, attempts to overly minimize their illegal behavior should alert staff and prompt a deeper look into their emotional adjustment. Clinical referral should be utilized if staff is unsure about the seriousness of the emotional problems presented by these clients.
2. Sometimes, these clients will seek to avoid the stigma of being seen as "mental" and resist referral to clinical or social services. They will often seek out a member of the security staff to discuss personal problems. Security staff members should encourage self referral in situations where it is warranted by the level of problems.
3. Individual psychotherapy and family counseling should be considered. When appropriate, attempt to foster a relationship which will facilitate insight oriented discussion of their problems. Short term therapeutic interventions may also be very useful with this group.

4. (Special S.I. Treatment consideration.) Generally, individual psychotherapy will be the most appropriate treatment for clients in this group. While S.I. Treatment clients tend to do well in most areas of their lives (e.g. vocational adjustment, institutional adjustment etc.), it should be recognized that this does not indicate a successful resolution of their specific emotional problem. Being locked up may give them the false sense that their problems have been resolved and treatment isn't necessary.

AUXILIARY SERVICES

1. Generally, these clients won't require many auxiliary services. As specific problems or need areas (e.g. financial planning) are identified, the institution should attempt to help the client deal with those needs.

READJUSTMENT

1. The approach of a release date is likely to provoke a great deal of anxiety and self-doubt about ability to readjust to society. Intensive case planning with community agents and agencies will often be required. Supportive individual or group counseling is most appropriate, and pre-release centers in the community can be very beneficial for this group.

DESCRIPTION

The predominant characteristic of clients in this group is a general instability in their life situation (e.g. inability to hold full-time employment, financial irresponsibility, unwillingness to accept self responsibility, and emotional problems). Habitual involvement with alcohol or other drugs is often a prominent feature with these clients. The offense pattern, once established, usually shows a considerable number of misdemeanor arrests, along with more serious crimes. Offenses generally stem from serious long-term emotional problems, chemical dependency, or negative self-perceptions. While many of these clients possess marketable job skills or have the potential for developing them, their inability to appropriately deal with emotional problems usually prevents them from maintaining steady employment. Their personal histories often include a somewhat chaotic childhood which tends to be repeated with their own families, numerous changes in residence, marital problems or inability to provide consistent financial support.

GOALS

Assist client to:

1. Increase stability in all areas of their life, work, family and housing.
2. Achieve greater utilization of their potential abilities by helping them overcome their basically negative self-concept and eliminate self-defeating behavior. This usually requires helping them deal with long-term emotional, alcohol, or drug problems.

CLIENT-STAFF RELATIONSHIP

1. This group tends to be the most up and down group emotionally. For example, they may report everything is fine one week, and everything is hopeless (even to the point of threats or suicidal gestures) the next week. Staff should slow them down when they're up, and encourage them when they're down.

2. Although these clients seem exceedingly needy (e.g. have frequent crises), avoid taking too much responsibility for them. A balance must be maintained between extending help and making sure these clients put forth some effort on their own.
3. This group has difficulty with sustained efforts, and expect quick, superficial, solutions to their problems. Staff should make special efforts to reinforce sustained and consistent efforts rather than quick but temporary improvements.
4. These clients often create considerable frustration in people who are attempting to work with them, by thwarting plans to improve their situation. Earlier failures to resolve their problems and redirect their life may make them reluctant to involve themselves in new efforts. At times, they may even be testing staff to see whether they too, will readily give up on them.
5. Generally, line staff serve as motivators or facilitators with these clients rather than direct treatment providers. Staff efforts will have to be coordinated, and considerable leverage applied to keep these clients involved in sustained therapeutic efforts.
6. When these clients start to improve, staff sometimes tend to ignore them because they made some positive changes. Support and attention should not be discontinued until the improvement has lasted for some time.

SECURITY

1. These clients will have many conduct problems within institutions because of their interpersonal problems with staff. They tend to pick out specific staff members and have repeated conflict with them, often over trivial issues.
2. These clients produce considerable frustration by their many rules

infractions even when there is an absence of serious violations. They generally have problems with authority stemming from their early family experiences, and will subconsciously sabotage and rebel against staff's efforts to control them even when their behavior is costly to themselves.

3. They may become involved in institutional drug traffic as consumers or dealers because of their own chemical dependency problems.
4. Rules violations can also involve stealing or misusing others' property. Their rationale frequently takes the form of "they owed it to me" or "they took my radio, cigarettes," etc.
5. Self injury or mutilation can be a problem with these clients particularly during periods when they are experiencing considerable stress. Referral for psychiatric/psychological evaluation should be considered.
6. As these clients get older and more institutionalized their energy to fight authority often decreases and a burn-out affect occurs with their behavior being far less provocative.

HOUSING/PEERS

1. These clients tend to have many problems within institutions because of their interpersonal difficulties with other inmates. For example, they are more prone to request changes in roommates because they can no longer get along with the assigned roommate.
2. Friendships with other inmates tend to be intense, but sometimes volatile and short-lived as they move from one inmate group to another. They often feel misunderstood by others, and blame others for the relationship problems.
3. Within a short period of time they may become demanding of privilege levels they haven't earned (e.g. move to more desirable housing). They often tend to feel others are getting more than they receive. Staff should be firm in pointing out the basis for earning privileges and

not allowing them privileges they haven't earned.

SCHOOL/VOCATIONAL PROBLEMS

1. These client's often have or can develop marketable work skills if they can overcome their personal problem.
2. Require their commitment to follow through on any plans which are developed through elaborate use of program contracting. They have a tendency to get intensive programs established for which they feel little personal responsibility.
3. When they enroll in a program, time commitments to the program should be specified so that they can't quit whenever another more attractive program is available. They must recognize commitments need to extend over time to be successful. Prevent hopping from one program to another without completion of any.
4. Closely monitor involvement with proposed programs for attendance and participation. This group often defeats themselves and programs by losing interest and gradually avoiding the help being offered. Problems in participation need to be dealt with quickly, before their problems compound themselves.
5. For clients who have exhausted existing resources, lack motivation or have a need to defeat programs, it may be appropriate to discontinue major efforts to improve their lives. As a last gasp effort, when all else seems to have failed, expect nothing more than rules conformity from them. Those clients who have been fighting staff for a long time may have to make a positive adjustment to prove staff is wrong about them.

SOCIAL SERVICES/CLINICAL SERVICES

1. This group requires a great deal of direct staff attention, as well as considerable coordination of the various programs with which they become involved.
2. They may present themselves for regular crisis intervention (e.g.

sleeping problems, tranquilizers, "miracle cures"). They often seek treatment for institution living adjustment problems and tend to not look at themselves to resolve long term problems.

3. Be supportive of attempts to deal with their long-term problems. This group is easily discouraged by failure and staff support during crisis periods is crucial. However, if they avoid dealing with basic personal problems and long range goals, staff should take a more confrontive stance.
4. Clinical services should be used to evaluate the seriousness of the client's overall problems and to help develop treatment programs. They may become involved in program planning for the hard-to-motivate clients. Collaboration between clinical services and social services may also be useful in working with their spouses and families.
5. Marital and family counseling, individual and group therapy and substance abuse programs should all be considered.
6. These clients sometimes make impossible demands on social service staff (e.g. to resolve chaotic family problems or situations).
7. Avoid feeling personally guilt-ridden or professionally inadequate if these clients continue to get in trouble. They may try to get the staff to feel responsible for problems in their life. They often have a strong need to rebel and fail, which may be difficult for staff to overcome.

AUXILIARY

1. Consider the use of chaplain counseling; they may have a strong affinity for religion.
2. Sometimes they have developed undetected medical problems resulting from their self-abuse. Medical Assistance may be appropriate.
3. Programs geared toward more constructive use of leisure should be considered as a means of decreasing the stress they experience or create while in the unit.

READJUSTMENT

1. They tend to unrealistically minimize the importance of long standing problems when they are anticipating release. For example, they may say that since they have passed up opportunities for drugs or alcohol in prison, they no longer have a problem.
2. Go slow in allowing them free time outside the institution. They need to be monitored more for treatment reasons, than for security. For example, they may look for a way to drink when unsupervised.
3. Half-way housing facilities can provide a controlled environment to test skills they've learned in prison, and to ease them back into the community.

ENVIRONMENTAL STRUCTURE

DESCRIPTION

A predominant characteristic of clients in this group is a lack of social and vocational skills. Intellectual deficits may also contribute to their problems. Their illegal behavior is usually the result of their inability to succeed in the world at large and a strong tendency to be led by more sophisticated associates. They demonstrate little foresight about consequences for criminal activity, and there is a high element of impulsiveness in their behavior. They have difficulty being introspective and learning from past mistakes. Malice as a motivation for criminal activity is rare. However, involvement in physically assaultive offenses could take place at the direction of more sophisticated peers upon whom they tend to be dependent.

GOALS

Assist client in developing:

1. Increased survival (work and daily living) skills.
2. Alternatives to association with criminally oriented peers.
3. Improved social skills.
4. Increased impulse control.

CLIENT-STAFF RELATIONSHIP

1. Assume non-threatening stance with these individuals. Be patient and prepared for very gradual changes and avoid becoming discouraged by slow progress. Attempt to play a guidance (teacher) role.
2. Initially, don't expect these clients to follow through on assignments without some direct assistance. They tend to become overwhelmed when given any new task. Task assignments should initially include patient explanation or demonstration of steps necessary to complete the task.
3. These clients often will work hard on tasks they have mastered if they

can expect praise or a sense of accomplishment in what they're doing. Emphasize positive rather than negative reinforcements.

4. When expectations for these individuals are too high, they are likely to avoid staff and unlikely to bring problems up directly. Staff should take a more directive approach toward rectifying relationship problems and not necessarily expect the clients to express grievances they feel directly.
5. Reward participation and effort by these clients and not absolute achievement or attainment of goals.
6. Deal with one situation or problem at a time and stress achieving a specific solution or conclusion. Provide a few simple, concise rules to help them deal with problem situations. Be redundant. Don't expect these clients to generalize from one situation to another.
7. Utilize behavioral contingency contracting and set small, concrete and achievable goals. Deal with immediate consequences of situations using immediate positive reinforcers.
8. These clients will form quick attachments to those perceived as accepting and helpful. Initially, staff should foster this dependency by providing tangible forms of assistance.

SECURITY

1. Within an institutional setting, it can be expected that the problems they will encounter will be the same as those experienced on the outside. Rule violations will generally be the result of impulsiveness, unclear understanding of rules or expectations or having been used by more sophisticated residents.
2. They are not likely to be leaders in resident groups, but may be used by the leaders as messengers, go-for's etc. As such, they are likely to accumulate a number of conduct reports.

3. These clients are more likely to attempt to resist negative peer pressure by violating an institutional rule in order to be removed from a work, school or room assignment, rather than deal with the pressure more directly. In some cases they may openly confide in a trusted staff member. It is more likely they will provide only vague hints of a problem which the staff member will have to listen carefully for or know the client well to pick up on their concern.
4. Don't be overly confrontive or angry if these clients lie. Their lies often reflect fears of disappointing staff as well as getting into trouble for what they have done. Staff should allow unimportant lies to go unchallenged since constant challenges will make these clients feel more threatened and increase the likelihood of further lying.

HOUSING/PEERS

1. Keeping in mind this client's vulnerability to manipulation by more sophisticated peers and limited ability to differentiate between pro and antisocial role models, room pairing and work assignments should be made with more positive peers.
2. These clients are sometimes perceived by peers as unsophisticated, untrustworthy, "dumb" or odd. As a result they tend to become relatively isolated except for situations where they become manipulated by others. Personal attention by staff can be of major assistance toward positive adjustment, until they find suitable peers with similar interests.
3. After a time, these clients will tend to be positively perceived by staff because they are eager to please. Care must be taken to assure that staff does not take advantage of them and consistently assign them the least desireable housekeeping tasks because they are so willing to please.

SOCIAL/CLINICAL SERVICES

1. Because these clients usually don't take on a high institutional profile (e.g. trouble maker, exceptionally talented individual etc.) they can be overlooked by social services staff. At times, they experience difficulty in approaching social services staff with problems they are encountering with family, peers or other staff. Periodic appointments should therefore be consistently maintained.
2. Evaluation of intellectual and/or vocational potentials should be specifically considered with these residents.
3. Avoid discussing issues at an abstract level. For example, in the case of a client writing threatening letters, focus the discussion on the specific incident and the likely consequences, not underlying personality dynamics.
4. Increase their ability to empathize by pointing out the effects of their behavior on others. Role rehearsal and role playing should be used to assist them in dealing with problems in social situations.
5. These clients can sometimes benefit from problem-solving groups, if the groups are supportive and not confrontive.
6. Clinical services can assist staff in developing contingency behavioral programs, role rehearsal, role playing, assertiveness and social skills training techniques with these clients.

ACADEMIC/VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

1. These clients tend to feel anxious or confused when given a task for which they don't have clear expectations. Initial work or school assignments should be made to maximize one-on-one staff supervision or assistance by more skilled inmates.
2. Academic and vocational goal settings should be realistic in terms of limitations of the client and the sentence length. Adequate aptitude and intellectual testing is most crucial with these clients. Such

testing may disclose an ability which should be fostered to increase the individual's feeling of achievement.

3. The use of remedial academic programs is often appropriate with these clients.
4. Sheltered work situations (e.g. Goodwill type program) or on the job training may be more beneficial to them than long term academic training abstractly related to a job.

AUXILIARY

1. Poor personal hygiene and sloppy grooming are frequent problems. Staff should be aware that such behavior is not done deliberately to offend but comes from a lack of training and knowledge about acceptable behavior. Programs providing personal hygiene and grooming instruction may be very useful.
2. Because of their impulsivity, financial management and budgeting tend to be problematic areas. Instruction should be focused both on managing resources within the institution and after release.

READJUSTMENT

1. Institutionalization can become a problem. While stressing the positive adjustment and gains made, staff should consistently relate these positives to how they can be used in the community after release. These clients are usually well-intentioned and motivated to do "what's right". With appropriate intervention they are not likely to return to the institution.
2. Sheltered or group living situations (e.g. Half-way Houses and even adult foster homes in selected cases) should be considered upon return to the community.
3. Volunteer-type programs (e.g. Volunteers in Parole) can be very helpful in assisting these clients with a variety of daily living problems

after release.

4. Medical assistance, visiting nurse services, county homemaker services, planned parenthood, could all be useful and considered for implementation immediately upon release to the community.
5. Some limited forms of guardianship (e.g. for finances) should also be considered for the less capable members of this group.

LIMIT SETTING

DESCRIPTION

Clients in this group generally display a fair degree of comfort with a criminal life-style and often demonstrate a pattern of long-term involvement with criminal activities. Unlike clients in other groups, members of this group often view "being a successful criminal" as a major goal in their lives, in preference to achieving success in a more conventional manner. Their crimes appear to be motivated by a need to overprove their ability to manipulate people and "beat the system". These needs are generally manifested in crimes motivated toward material gain and could involve situations which present danger to others. Guilt over criminal activities is generally superficial and has a programmed flavor (i.e. little contrition is present). While they often are reasonably capable of functioning adequately in society, they appear unmotivated to use their abilities in a pro-social manner. They tend to minimize or deny personal problems and assign the blame for criminal activity to others or to circumstances. They sometimes function well in correctional institutions because they are adept at dealing with this system. Good behavior and program attainments within prison doesn't necessarily indicate a significant change in the basic values which led them into crime.

GOALS

Assist client to change attitudes:

1. By motivating involvement in non-manipulative relationships.
2. By encouraging pro-social usage of client's abilities.

CLIENT-STAFF RELATIONSHIP

1. Staff is more likely to obtain respect from these clients by demonstrating an openness toward helping the client and willingness to confront their failure to comply with rules. Even minor violations

may be tests and the staff members failure to act assertively will be viewed as a sign of weakness. These tests often begin to appear early in the relationship.

2. Be skeptical when these clients are overly conforming, agreeable and friendly but don't show appropriate behavioral changes to accompany their seemingly positive attitudes. They are often verbal and capable of making a good impression. Sometimes they involve staff in conversations about pleasant, extraneous issues to avoid closer scrutiny of their behavior by the staff.
3. Anticipate hostility from these clients when demands are placed on them. They resent interference with their lives, and may become angry when they are faced with demands they don't like.
4. Manipulation skills are often so well refined as to put staff (especially inexperienced staff) in compromised positions. Ploys designed to promote social guilt and sympathy are commonly used.
5. These clients tend to frustrate and alienate those working with them through their callousness and manipulativeness. Staff can anticipate these feelings and should not allow them to significantly interfere with their working relationship.
6. Try to take a realistic rather than moralistic view with them. For example, they may dislike their work release job, and intend to quit right after release. Consider replacing them or getting them to give notice before they quit. This may prevent increased placement problems with community resources who feel resentment when clients quit without notice.

SECURITY

1. Be prepared to resist the client's attempts to manipulate rules and be willing and able to establish reasonable limits. Don't set limits

you can't enforce, because the failure to enforce rules costs the staff member the respect of these clients.

2. Insure that limits are clearly spelled out for this group, since they tend to abuse more ambiguously structured situations. Good record keeping is often essential in dealing with these clients who tend to argue with staff in legalistic ways, and try to deny and play games when charges being made by staff members are not well documented.
3. Provide necessary surveillance and control to protect society. Unscheduled room checks, urine tests etc. may be a helpful tool to monitor conformity to basic institution rules.
4. Staff communication is essential with these clients since they often attempt to play staff members off against each other. They often go from one staff to another if the first doesn't give them what they want. For ambiguous issues, (e.g. dress of client during job interview), it is better to reach a staff consensus than have each staff member applying their own rules.
5. They may attempt to gain your confidence to get you to relax standards, expecially when they discern the staff member is uncomfortable with the rule.
6. Avoid creating personal confrontation when enforcing rules (e.g. "You'll do what I say"). Rules should be presented as something both client and staff need to follow. If staff doesn't feel a rule is necessary they must try to change it rather than simply sabotage it. These clients often violate societies rules, because they feel rules don't really apply to them. Staff needs to role model a more appropriate approach.
7. Even when these clients tend to present few problems while on the institution grounds, they need close monitoring when away on work or

study release. Enlist assistance from work and street contacts to monitor client's activities.

HOUSING/PEERS

1. They will often assume leadership roles within the inmate power structure and be knowledgeable about inmate codes and subculture.
2. Try to minimize contact with more vulnerable clients in housing and other open assignments because they try to dominate more vulnerable, inadequate people.
3. They will complain a lot if they get menial household jobs, because they view themselves as meriting a more important role within the institution.
4. Sometimes when oldtimers in this group may have burned out on criminal behavior, they may be useful in helping younger inmates see where they're headed, or in helping stabilize inmates having some difficulty.

SCHOOL/VOCATION PROGRAM

1. These clients often tend to get involved in programs to do easy time or impress parole boards (e.g. obtaining certificates in areas they have little intention of pursuing after release). Their intelligence, and knowledge of institution culture often enables them to enroll in the better institution programs.

SOCIAL SERVICES/CLINICAL SERVICES

1. Their crimes appear to be motivated by a need to prove their ability to manipulate people and "beat the system".
2. Clinical services may be most appropriately utilized on a consulting basis to evaluate these clients, to help develop behavioral programs, and to help staff deal with the hostility and frustration these clients arouse.

3. Therapy is often used by this group as a means of avoiding legal consequences or impressing parole boards. Group therapy which emphasizes peer pressure and confrontation is useful because it's more difficult to fool their peers and stay uninvolved from the process.
4. Help focus these clients on their responsibility for their own behavior and their responsibility to follow rules, etc. Don't allow them to distract efforts at dealing with their behavior by throwing up past sufferings or victimization by society. These arguments may have some factual foundation but in working with these clients they are frequently used as an excuse to justify the client's behavior and not as a means of increasing their insight about themselves.
5. Avoid stereotyped value judgement. Attempt to deal with the client's moral deficits in innovative ways. Encourage a realistic point of view concerning the difficulties created for the clients by their criminal lifestyle. Focus on the likelihood of their facing negative long-term consequences in spite of the short-term success or excitement they experience.
6. Try to develop alternative social behaviors with this group. They often spend excessive time around alcohol and drug-related activities. Though they may not be alcoholics or addicts, drugs and drinking are often a common part of the street scene they habituate.
7. Increasing the number of privileges available to them after progress has been made can be a strong, clearly attainable reinforcer for this group.
8. Attempt to develop challenging opportunities to provide this group with satisfying alternatives to a criminal lifestyle. They often have capabilities which can be channeled into profitable legal areas if they can be motivated in this direction.

AUXILIARY

1. These clients can benefit from involvement in structured leisure time activity programs (e.g. sports) to alleviate boredom and broaden their interests.
2. Music, art, drama etc. can often provide a creative outlet for many members of this group.

READJUSTMENT

1. These clients often have both skills and contacts to get jobs, housing etc. in society. Be careful not to ignore them during this crucial period because they seem more self sufficient than other clients.