

**Overview of Monthly Activity**

*The Bureau received 89 complaints during the month of May 2013.*

*84 complaints were closed*

*3 required more information to proceed with an investigation*

*39 were closed due to lack of Bureau jurisdiction*

*15 were referred back to the DOC*

*27 complaints were investigated*

*3 assists were given (referred back to DOC for action, however, the offender did not attempt to resolve with the facility previously)*

*5 complaints were substantiated (see below)*

*19 unsubstantiated*

*22 complaints remain open (5 from April; 17 from May)*

**Substantiated Complaints & Recommendations to IDOC for Resolution****1. Pendleton Correctional Facility**

<b>Complaint Type</b>	Confinement Conditions
<b>Complaint Summary</b>	The offender states that the facility did not have any heat on when nightly temperatures were below freezing.
<b>Basis for Claim</b>	ACA (“American Correctional Association”) standards dictate minimum temperatures in housing areas.
<b>Investigative Summary</b>	Bureau contacted Neil Potter on 4/23/13 regarding reports that the heat had been turned off in G housing unit and temperatures between the dates April 17-20 were in the 30s at night making the temperatures inside the cell house as cold as 52 degrees, according to the logs received by the Bureau. The Bureau requested the temperature logs from the housing unit to review. Logs were provided and reviewed. The facility informed the Bureau that it turned the heat back on as of 4/24.

---

<b>Outcome</b>	The Bureau reviewed the decision-making process for the heat to be shut down with the Physical Plant Director. IDOC administration represented to the Bureau that it will monitor future weather forecasts to provide appropriate facility temperatures.
<b>Follow-up</b>	In 30 days the Bureau will review the updates pertaining to the protocols of shutting the heat down.

## **2. Plainfield Correctional Facility**

<b>Complaint Type</b>	Classification - coding
<b>Complaint Summary</b>	Offender claims that he has wrongfully been denied entrance to the GED Program due to his educational code signifying that he already has a GED, but he does not.
<b>Basis for Claim</b>	IDOC Classification policy 01-04-101 Offender Classification Policy, Appendix XV-B2
<b>Investigative Summary</b>	The Bureau reviewed the paperwork that the offender sent including a letter from the facility indicating that he needed to provide proof that he never received his GED. He also included a letter from Sullivan University indicating that entrance does not indicate completion. Previously, in his Presentence Investigation, he indicated that he received a GED and was enrolled at Sullivan University for a semester, which indicates that he has one.
<b>Outcome</b>	The Bureau contacted Mr. Nally, DOC Education Director. Mr.Nally confirmed with Sullivan University that there was no evidence of completion for him and upon confirmation of this Mr. Nally changed the offender's education code to "c," which allows the offender to enroll into the GED program.
<b>Follow-up</b>	The Bureau will follow up with facility in 60 days to confirm facility's compliance with IDOC policy.

## **3. Reception Diagnostic Center ("RDC")**

---

<b>Complaint Type</b>	Offender's Safety
<b>Complaint Summary</b>	Offender's family member contacted Bureau concerned for offender's safety. He is at RDC and she is concerned that offender will be sent to the same facility as another offender who threatened him last time they were incarcerated together.
<b>Basis for claim</b>	IDOC policy 01-04-101 - Establishes monitoring between offenders due to a potential threat between two offenders.
<b>Investigative Summary</b>	The Bureau notified RDC and Central Office Internal Affairs. Central Office Internal Affairs indicated that the offender should have the opportunity to name the other offender as a separatee. The facility indicated that there was insufficient information to implement the monitoring due Internal Affairs not having any history between the two. The Bureau received additional confidential information about the relationship between the offenders and contacted Central Office Internal Affairs.
<b>Outcome</b>	Monitoring was placed between the offenders.
<b>Complaint Follow-up</b>	The Bureau will follow-up in 30, 60, and 120 days to confirm that monitoring is still in place between the two offenders and they remain in separate locations.

#### **4. Liberty Hall**

<b>Complaint Type</b>	Confinement Conditions
<b>Complaint Summary</b>	Offender claims that he was put in a holding cell after receiving a conduct report without any heat and missed meals, medication treatment, and was not given any toilet paper or drinking water.
<b>Basis for Claim</b>	IDOC Administrative Segregation policy 02-01-111 V. C. outlines the proper use of "In-Cell Administrative Segregation".
<b>Investigative Summary</b>	The Bureau contacted the facility and went to the facility to interview staff. The Bureau obtained the logs from the

time that he spent in the holding cell. The Director of the Bureau also traveled to Putnamville where the offender is now located to speak with the offender.

**Outcome**

The Bureau found that the log used while the offender was kept in the holding cell was not clear and did not indicate the condition of the cell, property allowed, meals, or medications that the offender received while held there. The Bureau worked with the facility to develop a new log to be used, which will provide more accurate information of the condition of the cell when an offender is placed into it.

**Complaint Follow-up**

The Bureau will follow-up with the facility in 30 and 60 days to ensure that logs are being kept correctly while the offenders are being held in the holding cell area.

**5. Indiana State Prison****Complaint Type**

Visitation

**Complaint Summary**

Offender contacted Bureau concerning a Gate Closure that was issued by the facility on all “current and future visitors.”

**Basis for Claim**

IDOC Visitation Policy 02-01-102 XVI. Denial and Suspension of Visitation and Gate Closures. The Definition of a Gate Closure is, “The refusal to permit a visitor to enter any Department facility for an indeterminate period of time.”

**Investigative Summary**

The Bureau contacted Deputy Commissioner Basinger in IDOC Central Office to review the Gate Closure.

**Outcome**

The gate closure was lifted by Superintendent Wilson at the direction of DC Basinger.

**Complaint Follow-up**

The Bureau will follow-up in 30 and 60 days with the facility and D.C. Basinger to confirm the facility’s continued compliance with IDOC policy.

---

**Follow-up From Previous Months****April 2013****1. Tippecanoe Work Release – Personal Property**

**Synopsis:** Facility was not setting up re-entry accounts for offenders as they are required to under DOC policy.

**Follow-up:** Facility had immediately begun setting up the accounts and is doing so now daily.

**2. Miami Correctional Facility – Medical Care**

**Synopsis:** Corizon was seeking another Ortho doctor to contract with near Miami Correctional Facility.

**Follow-up:** A contract has been signed with a new Ortho provider.

**3. New Castle and Rockville Correctional Facilities – Visitation**

**Synopsis:** The DOC Visitation policy is in the process of being redrafted to address concerns raised with the implementation of the Visitation with Minor Restriction.

**Follow-up:** The policy is moving through the approval process. I will be reviewing it this week and Legal has been reviewing it and from there it goes to the Commissioner. I will review further progress of the redrafting of the policy again in 30 days.