



REVALIDATING EXTERNAL PRISON CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

**The Experience of Ten States and
Model for Classification Reform**

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20534

Morris L. Thigpen, Director
Larry Solomon, Deputy Director
Susan M. Hunter, Chief, Prisons Division
Sammie D. Brown, Project Manager

National Institute of Corrections
World Wide Web Site
<http://www.nicic.org>

**Revalidating External Prison
Classification Systems:
The Experience of Ten States
and
Model for Classification Reform**

By

Patricia L. Hardyman, Ph.D.

James Austin, Ph.D.

Owan C. Tulloch, M.C.P.

**The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections
at
The George Washington University**

January 2002

This report was funded by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) under cooperative agreement #97P09GIF7 and #98P09GII2 with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and subcontracted to The George Washington University and cooperative agreement #99P04GIJ7 between NIC and The George Washington University. 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 U.S. Department of Justice or the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Acknowledgments

The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections would like to sincerely acknowledge the National Institute of Corrections for its continuing commitment to the development and improvement of state and local correctional objective classification and information systems. In particular, we want to acknowledge and thank our program manager, Sammie D. Brown, for her guidance, expertise, involvement, and patience with our efforts.

This initiative would not have been realized without the dedication and endless hours of hard work expended by the revalidation task forces from each of the 10 states. It was their dedication, determination, and diligence that ensured the successful completion of this project. Thank you. Special recognition is due to the project leaders: Elizabeth Neal (Delaware), Candyce Neubauer (Montana), Dan Reynolds and Randy Parker (Oklahoma), Brian Bemus (Oregon), Jennifer Toupin (Rhode Island), Howard Cook and Theresa Schweizer (Tennessee), Gary Johnson (Texas), Sharon Sutton (Virginia), Pam Brandon (Wisconsin), and Robert Ortega (Wyoming).

Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Executive Summary	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. NIC Classification Goals and Objectives	5
Chapter 3. Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives	7
Virginia Department of Corrections	7
Montana Department of Corrections	9
Oregon Department of Corrections	12
Oklahoma Department of Corrections	14
Texas Department of Criminal Justice	17
Wyoming Department of Corrections	20
Wisconsin Department of Corrections	29
Delaware Department of Correction	32
Rhode Island Department of Corrections	34
Tennessee Department of Correction	38
Chapter 4. Recommended Methodology for Testing, Implementing, and Monitoring Classification Reforms	41
Task 1: Determine the Department's Commitment and Readiness for Reform	41
Task 2: Establish a Classification Task Force	43
Task 3: Conduct an Assessment of the Current Classification System	44
Task 4: Revalidate the Classification System	45
Task 5: Plan for Implementation	50
Task 6: Prepare a Detailed Report to Document the Revalidation Effort and Modifications	51

Chapter 5. Common Issues, Problems and Solutions, and Next Steps	53
Common Issues	53
Frequent Problems and Possible Solutions	54
Implications and Future Steps	57
Appendixes	59
Appendix A: External Classification Instruments Validated by Select States.....	59
Appendix B: Statistical Tables	109
Notes	121
References	125
Suggested Readings	127

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level23

Exhibit 2. Age Categories by Gender in Delaware34

Exhibit 3. Revalidation Time-Task Chart.....42

Executive Summary

Objective prison external classification systems that decide which facility an inmate should be housed in are well-established in virtually every state correctional system. Despite considerable progress in the area of classification, many systems are under significant pressure to review and update their institutional classification systems in response to changes and pressures associated with truth-in-sentencing and three-strikes-and-you're-out laws, tremendous growth and diversity of the correctional populations, overcrowding, and public sentiment against programs and services. As systems have become overcrowded with diverse populations, they have faced fiscal and public pressures to remove or substantially reduce offender access to institutional jobs, education, and treatment programs. These pressures have undermined the integrity of classification systems that were designed to encourage and reward inmates' participation in work or treatment programs. These combined pressures have also diminished the power of classification items to predict an inmate's threat to the safety and security of the institution.

In response, many states have reconsidered their classification systems in terms of their policies and procedures, classification items, relative weight of the respective items, scale cut points, and override factors for differentiating minimum, medium, close, and maximum custody offenders. It is important to recognize that a state's need to update or refine its classification system is not a criticism or an indictment of the department's current system, but rather an indication that the department is prepared to monitor and update the system to respond to an often rapidly changing correctional population and organizational environment.

Recognizing these needs, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) funded two 15-month projects to assist 10 states with the revalidation of their external objective classification systems. This initiative represented a continuation of NIC's efforts to develop and improve the capacity of state correctional agencies' classification systems. NIC's goals were to—

1. Provide technical assistance to 10 states to revalidate their external classification systems to enhance and facilitate the management, safety, and security of their prison systems.
2. Assist the states with implementing revisions to the classification process or instruments, including the development of classification system criteria for female inmates.
3. Provide onsite training for supervisory and line staff.
4. Revise and update written documentation of classification policies, procedures, and instructions.
5. Assess the outcomes and impact of training and assistance provided through these cooperative agreements.

Executive Summary

This report describes the work undertaken by the participating states, provides an outline of the fundamental tasks required for a revalidation effort, and summarizes the external classification trends and lessons learned from these classification reforms. Copies of the classification instruments and statistical tables are provided to illustrate options for other states faced with similar issues. The 10 states and their initiatives are described below.

Virginia Department of Corrections. VA DOC sought to establish a separate classification system for women, if necessary; rate existing and newly planned facilities according to a standardized set of security definitions; refine, as needed, the current classification system to ensure its validity; and develop standardized definitions of classification custody levels. Preliminary classification instruments and security matrices were developed and tested by the classification task force for VA DOC inmate populations. Among the findings was that a separate classification system for the female population was not warranted because the revised classification instruments appeared to be adequate for both the male and female populations.

Montana Department of Corrections. MT DOC had agreed to modify its classification policy and instruments to identify predatory and vulnerable inmates as part of a settlement agreement. MT DOC undertook the development and validation of classification item(s) to identify inmates who *repeatedly* threatened the safety of staff and other inmates. Data analyses demonstrated that the new item and modified Close Custody Scale differentiated predatory and vulnerable inmates and suggested that the new item was appropriate for both male and female inmates.

Oregon Department of Corrections. OR DOC developed and simulated the impact of alternative classification scoring criteria for minimizing the negative impacts of a truth-in-sentencing initiative and other sentencing reforms that had altered the number and type of offenders and expected lengths of stay among OR DOC inmates. Because the classification system relied heavily upon an inmate's expected time to serve, it was anticipated that the system would overclassify its inmate population. As a result of this validation effort, minor revisions to the instruments and custody matrix were implemented.

Oklahoma Department of Corrections. OK DOC sought to refine its classification risk factors to better assess the risks posed by female offenders. In particular, the age, current offense, criminal history, and escape items were revised. The custody scale cut points were also adjusted to create statistically distinct custody levels. OK DOC has implemented the revised instruments and custody scales and addressed the availability of its services and programs to ensure that women are placed within the least restrictive custody level.

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. TDCJ sought to revise its policies, procedures, and operations to reduce the number of inmates in administrative segregation units without jeopardizing the safety of inmates and correctional staff. Based on statistical data and a review of departmental policies, the following was recommended: continuing single-celling within the administrative segregation unit;

revising the criteria for placement and retention of inmates in administrative segregation; establishing an antigang housing unit program; and developing ongoing management reports to monitor and evaluate the administrative segregation policies. Estimates of the impact of revisions to the policies were computed.

Wyoming Department of Corrections. WY DOC sought assistance with staff training; documentation of the system; and development of organizational and/or procedural changes necessary for efficient, effective, and full implementation of the classification system. Intensive staff training that included reliability testing was provided, as was a detailed classification manual. A comprehensive classification policy that provided for a centralized classification unit and independent audits to periodically review a random sample of the classification instruments for accuracy and completeness was implemented. Audits completed at the four facilities indicated scoring error rates of less than 10 percent.

Wisconsin Department of Corrections. WI DOC assessed the reliability of, validity of, prevalence of racial bias in, and rates of discretionary overrides for its classification system. The analyses indicated that the system was reliable; however, the validity of the risk assessment was questionable and it appeared that the system overclassified many inmates. No racial bias was evident in the risk or custody designation process because equal proportions of black and white inmates were assigned to the various risk and custody designations. Key recommendations for improving the reliability, validity, and automation of the system were provided.

Delaware Department of Correction. DE DOC undertook the design and validation of an objective classification system to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its classification system and to update its classification policies and procedures to ensure the system includes current trends and technology. Preliminary initial and reclassification custody assessment instruments were developed and refined to create statistically strong instruments for identifying the safety and security risk an offender poses.

Rhode Island Department of Corrections. RI DOC sought to revalidate and fine-tune its objective classification system to ensure its appropriateness for both male and female inmates and to design a systematic administrative review process to document the transfer to minimum custody of inmates with sentences of less than 6 months. The analyses suggested the need to create a subset of predatory institutional infractions to identify aggressive inmates, develop an offense severity index that focused on institutional risk, and modify the custody scale cut points. Pilot testing of the administrative screening process suggested that the instrument would serve as a simple, objective mechanism for identifying cases appropriate for minimum custody. This classification initiative also suggested the need to revise RI DOC's disciplinary code, develop a public safety screening instrument for work release and community housing decisions, discontinue regular custody assessments for minimum-custody inmates, restrict discretionary overrides, provide intensive, ongoing training to all classification staff, develop a strong, centralized classification unit, and upgrade the automated information system.

Executive Summary

Tennessee Department of Correction. TN DOC assessed the reliability and validity of its custody assessment process, refined some of its risk factors, and updated the classification policies and classification screens within its information system. The use of a single instrument for both initial and reclassification decisions was a key consideration. The analyses indicated that separate initial and reclassification instruments created a stronger process for identifying distinct custody levels for male and female inmates at initial and reclassification stages.

An important component of this NIC initiative was developing and testing a model for assessing, implementing, and monitoring classification reforms. The following basic tasks were found to be critical for validating and updating classification systems:

- Determining the department's commitment to and readiness for reform.
- Establishing a revalidation task force.
- Conducting an assessment of the current classification system.
- Revalidating the classification system.
- Planning for implementation.
- Preparing a detailed report to document the revalidation effort and modifications.

The revalidation initiatives completed by these 10 states were unique as to the set of issues, revalidation methodology, and recommendations for refining each system. However, the states faced common themes and problems in their efforts to validate their classification systems. These included delays generated by competition for staff time, attention to daily operational responsibilities, legislative demands, other departmental projects, data collection and/or entry, staff turnover, and the like; difficulty in compiling the detailed data required to refine and test the classification items; and difficulty navigating the sociopolitical environment of the correctional system.

As suggested by the lengthy list of reasons for undertaking a revalidation study, this work will continue to evolve. NIC remains committed to supporting state correctional agencies in their efforts to upgrade and fine-tune their classification systems.

one

CHAPTER

Introduction

Objective prison classification systems are well-established in virtually every state. The first generation of prison classification systems was largely concerned with determining an inmate’s custody level. Now referred to as external classification, these systems were used to determine the facility in which an inmate should be housed. External classification systems were first developed in the 1970s in response to a number of major lawsuits filed on behalf of inmates claiming that the lack of an objective classification system contributed to conditions of confinement that were in violation of the inmates’ constitutional rights. Specifically, the courts held that state correctional officials had an obligation to ensure that inmates were being classified according to risk and that the classification criteria were both reliable and valid.

Although considerable progress has been made in the area of classification, prison systems are experiencing tremendous pressure to review and update their institutional classification systems. Although most jurisdictions implemented objective classification systems 10 to 20 years ago, many states must now adapt to critical changes within their prison systems. Inmate populations, for example, are incorrectly perceived as younger and more difficult to manage because of their current offenses, their criminal histories, and the length of their sentences. Recent truth-in-sentencing (TIS) legislation and three-strikes-and-you’re-out laws (three strikes) are perceived to affect not only the average daily population of institutions, but also the types of offenses for which offenders are incarcerated and the length of time served. Both factors—current offense and length of time to serve—are key external classification items that have a significant impact on an inmate’s custody score. Thus, many jurisdictions have begun to question whether their classification systems are still valid, reliable tools for making custody decisions. The appropriateness of specific classification factors and item weights are of special concern.

Several changes in the nation’s prison population are having a major impact on correctional operations in general and prison classification systems in particular. First, correctional systems have grown at an incredible rate. In 1970, state and federal prisons held only 196,429 inmates. Today the number has reached 1.3 million and continues to rise. Managing such growth has proven to be a major challenge for classification systems as they struggle to ensure that inmates are classified in an accurate and timely manner and housed appropriately.

Objective prison classification systems...Now referred to as external classification, these systems were used to determine the facility in which an inmate should be housed.

Chapter 1

As prison populations increase, the associated costs of constructing correctional facilities and operating correctional systems have raised concerns among policy-makers. The total cost of state prison systems was estimated at \$22 billion a year in 1996—more than triple the estimated \$6.8 billion cost in 1984.¹ Classification systems have been expected to determine how best to manage these resources by determining what types of beds are needed to accommodate population growth.

Growth has also altered the types of offenders imprisoned. During the past two decades, the numbers of African-American, Hispanic, and female inmates have grown at unprecedented levels. Increases in female populations, coupled with the knowledge that most classification systems were normed on male populations, have led some jurisdictions to question the validity of the criteria for female populations.²

In addition, as such sentencing policies as TIS, three strikes, and mandatory sentence legislation have become more prevalent, the average time served by each inmate has increased, resulting in an older inmate population. Since age is strongly associated with misconduct, the aging of the inmate population may well result in a less violent and disruptive prison system. On the other hand, the increased presence of well-organized street gangs and groups that pose a security threat within the prison system, coupled with a less experienced workforce, may create a more disruptive and unstable environment.

Given the increased length of stay due to TIS legislation, mandatory minimums, and more conservative parole decisionmaking, other jurisdictions question whether the time schedules for reclassifications and/or needs assessments should be revised. Additional pressures affecting classification systems include budget cuts, overcrowding, and public sentiment against programs and services. Many facilities are overcrowded, yet departmental budgets have been cut. At the same time, public pressure to remove or substantially reduce the availability of inmate programs has increased. These influences have reduced offender access to institutional jobs, education, and treatment programs. This has undermined the integrity of the classification systems that are designed to encourage and reward inmates for their participation in work or treatment programs. Without inmate access to jobs or programs, the power of these classification items to assess the inmate's threat to the safety and security of the institution is diminished.

Other states have expressed concern about the validity of their classification systems for the female population, who are usually nonviolent offenders with limited criminal histories. Because the instruments rely heavily on current and prior criminal history, most women score as minimum custody. However, the high rate of institutional infractions and poor adjustment among female offenders suggest that other factors may need to be considered when classifying female inmates. Still other jurisdictions struggle to differentiate close custody from maximum/administrative segregation populations. Several are faced with the dilemma of objectively identifying predatory inmates and developing plans for their reintegration into the general population.

This combination of issues and pressures has prompted many jurisdictions to reconsider their classification systems. The systems need to be reassessed in terms of their policies and procedures, classification items, relative weight of the respective items, scale cut points, and override factors for differentiating minimum, medium, close, and maximum custody offenders. The need to update or refine a classification system is not a criticism or indictment of the department's current system, but rather an indication that the department is prepared to monitor and update the system in response to a rapidly changing correctional system population and organizational environment.

The need to update or refine a classification system is not a criticism or indictment of the department's current system, but rather an indication that the department is prepared to monitor and update the system in response to a rapidly changing correctional system population and organizational environment.

NIC Classification Goals and Objectives

Recognizing the need to reform prison classification systems articulated in the introduction, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), an agency within the U.S. Department of Justice, funded two 15-month projects to assist 10 states with the revalidation of their external objective classification systems. This revalidation process was intended to ensure that the classification systems continue to make consistent and reliable custody decisions, use valid criteria for those decisions, systematically assess inmate program needs, and increase the safety and security of staff and inmates.

The specific goals of the initiative were to:

- ◆ Provide technical assistance to 10 states to revalidate their external classification systems to ensure that the systems continue to enhance and facilitate the management, safety, and security of the prisons.
- ◆ Revise written documentation of the states' classification policies, procedures, and instructions.
- ◆ Assist states to implement revisions to the classification process and test instruments, including the development of classification criteria for female inmates.
- ◆ Provide onsite training for supervisory and line staff.
- ◆ Assess the impact of training and assistance provided through this cooperative agreement.

This initiative represented a continuation of NIC's efforts to develop and improve the capacity of state and local correctional agencies' classification and information systems. From 1986 to 1990, NIC contracted with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to develop, test, and evaluate a model system for classifying inmates admitted to jails. That project included the development of training materials designed to help local jails design, implement, and evaluate objective inmate classification systems. Through short-term technical assistance, NIC has continued to support the efforts of many state and local correctional agencies involved in implementing classification and/or information systems. Specific areas of assistance have included consultation and training, program review and evaluation, short-term research, data analyses, and implementation planning.

This revalidation process was intended to ensure that the classification systems continue to make consistent and reliable custody decisions, use valid criteria for those decisions, systematically assess inmate program needs, and increase the safety and security of staff and inmates.

Chapter 2

Most recently, NIC developed a cooperative agreement with NCCD, with a subsequent subcontract to the Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections at The George Washington University, to work with the state correctional systems of Montana, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming to revalidate their external classification systems. A third cooperative agreement was established between NIC and the Institute to continue work with Oklahoma and to undertake initiatives with Delaware, Rhode Island, and Tennessee. A key goal of these efforts was to develop a strategy and methodology for testing, implementing, and monitoring the reforms.

In accord with NIC's previous work and goals, the model included the following tasks:

- ◆ Task 1: Select states for revalidation according to their commitment and readiness for reform.
- ◆ Task 2: Establish a revalidation task force within each state selected.
- ◆ Task 3: Conduct onsite assessments of current external classification systems.
- ◆ Task 4: Revalidate the states' external classification systems.
- ◆ Task 5: Provide onsite technical assistance to each state, as needed, for the implementation of any revisions to classification systems including, but not limited to, development of implementation plans, staff training, and assistance in preparation of local written policies, procedures, and manuals to document changes.
- ◆ Task 6: Prepare a monograph to assess and document changes in classification practices by participating states.

This report describes the work undertaken by the individual states, provides an outline of the fundamental tasks required for a revalidation effort, and summarizes the external classification trends and lessons learned from these classification reforms. Copies of the classification instruments and statistical tables are provided to illustrate options for other states faced with similar issues.

three

CHAPTER

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

This portion of the report provides summaries of the work completed as part of the NIC initiative described above. For each state, more lengthy and detailed reports have been submitted to NIC and each state's correctional agency. These are referenced here and copies can be obtained from each state or NIC.

Virginia Department of Corrections

Classification Issues and Revalidation Tasks

Since 1982, the Virginia Department of Corrections (VA DOC) has been operating an objective prison classification system modeled after the NIC prison classification system. Over the past few years, however, many changes have occurred in the state's sentencing structure that, in turn, influenced the number and types of inmates housed in VA DOC's correctional system. In particular, the state abolished parole as a discretionary release mechanism and implemented truth-in-sentencing legislation that greatly curtailed the amount of good time inmates could earn to reduce their time served. These two reforms were projected to increase the average daily population of inmates incarcerated for violent crimes.

In 1997, when VA DOC was planning its classification revalidation effort, approximately 28,600 inmates were under its supervision. The custody distribution of the average daily population was 20 percent minimum custody, 44 percent medium custody, and 38 percent close custody. Relative to national trends, the percentage of close custody inmates was somewhat high, while the percentage of minimum custody inmates was lower than expected. These proportions accounted for special populations (protective custody, administrative segregation, medical, mental health, etc.) and the use of override factors.

Although the current external classification system appeared to be functioning satisfactorily for the majority of inmates, the classification reassessment committee identified four goals:

- ◆ Establish a separate classification system for women, if necessary.
- ◆ Rate existing and newly planned facilities according to a standardized set of security definitions.

In particular, the state abolished parole as a discretionary release mechanism and implemented truth-in-sentencing legislation that greatly curtailed the amount of good time inmates could earn to reduce their time served. These two reforms were projected to increase the average daily population of inmates incarcerated for violent crimes.

Chapter 3

- ◆ Refine the current classification system as needed.
- ◆ Reach consensus on the departmental definitions of classification custody levels.

To accomplish these objectives, prototype initial and reclassification instruments were drafted. The next phase of the revalidation process required the following tasks:

- ◆ Task 1: Present revised classification instruments and procedures to the VA DOC director for review and approval.
- ◆ Task 2: Conduct a rigorous pilot test using 750 to 1,000 cases.
- ◆ Task 3: Present the pilot test results with recommendations to the classification task force and the VA DOC director.
- ◆ Task 4: Develop an implementation plan.
- ◆ Task 5: Revise the written classification policies and procedures to comply with the changes approved by the VA DOC director.
- ◆ Task 6: Train staff on the revised classification system.
- ◆ Task 7: Monitor the system to verify its reliability and validity.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

VA DOC's external classification system includes an initial classification evaluation instrument completed on an inmate's admission to VA DOC and a reclassification evaluation instrument completed annually, or more often if needed, to ensure that the custody level designation is appropriate. As shown in Exhibits A.1 and A.2 in Appendix A, these classification instruments are composed of standard offender demographic, criminal, and institutional history items. The scored custody level is based on the sum across all the classification items or the sum of the maximum classification items, whichever custody level is higher. The classification summary form provides for consideration of override factors to increase or decrease the scored custody level (see Exhibit A.3).

Development of an assignment level system to identify the facility and program/work assignments for inmates was particularly important to the department. VA DOC sought a two-step system. Step one would identify the potential risk posed by an inmate, based on the initial or reclassification evaluation instrument. Step two would identify the appropriate facility and work/program level based on an inmate's time remaining to be served, institutional experience, and housing restrictions. As shown in Exhibit A.4, the housing restrictions include escape history, felony detainer, and institutional misconduct (type and recency). The two-step system would serve as both the external and internal classification processes.

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

Criminal history, special needs, and disciplinary data were collected for a random sample of 167 initial and 620 reclassification cases to test the preliminary instruments developed by the classification task force. The sample included 527 males and 260 females. The distribution and predictive power of the respective items were considered. Separate analyses were computed by gender to determine the need for separate factors and/or classification instruments for the female population.

Based on these analyses, the preliminary instruments developed by the classification task force were refined. A series of housing assignment models were then simulated that placed inmates into one of six levels according to risk, time to serve, and institutional security mandates. Recommendations were presented to VA DOC regarding the revisions to the classification scale, override criteria, and classification process. A separate classification system for the female population was found not warranted because the revised classification instruments appeared to be adequate for both male and female inmates.

Exhibits A.1 through A.4 represent the instruments and institutional assignment criteria approved by the department. Implementation of the new instruments began in November 1998 and by April 1999, the entire VA DOC population had been classified using the revised instruments and placed according to the new security level matrix. Initial feedback from the administrative and facility staff suggests that the instruments are working well for both male and female populations and that the housing assignment and security level criteria are appropriate.

Montana Department of Corrections

Classification Issues and Revalidation Tasks

During 1992 and 1993, the Montana Department of Corrections (MT DOC) developed and implemented an objective inmate classification system modeled after the NIC prison classification system.³ To ensure that the classification system was implemented as designed, assistance was provided for staff training and documentation for the system and in identifying organizational and/or procedural changes necessary for efficient and effective implementation. The system was fully implemented by January 1994.

In early 1997, MT DOC reassessed its objective classification system, prompted by two different concerns. The first was an ongoing need to review and monitor the system through a formal revalidation of the objective classification system. The second issue was that the state had entered into a settlement agreement (*United States v. Montana*, Civil Action No. 94-90-H-CCL) that contained two stipulations directly related to the classification system. The state agreed to modify the classification policy and instruments to identify predatory and vulnerable inmates and to make reconsideration of classification automatic for serious or violent offenders.

To comply with the settlement agreement, MT DOC began the process of revalidating and modifying the classification systems. Based on 6 months of classification and institutional disciplinary data and an indepth examination of the files for all maximum custody inmates during the same 6-month period, a series of 11 recommendations for revising the system to ensure its compliance with the agreement and to improve its overall predictive power was developed.⁴ The department endorsed 10 of the 11 recommendations and, in July 1997, a second technical assistance request was submitted to NIC to pilot test the revised classification system, implement the changes, and monitor the classification system. The following tasks were required for this revalidation process:

- ◆ Task 1: Conduct a rigorous pilot test of the revised instruments based on 350 to 400 cases.
- ◆ Task 2: Present the pilot test results with recommendations to the director.
- ◆ Task 3: Develop an implementation plan.
- ◆ Task 4: Revise the written classification policies and procedures to comply with the changes approved by the director.
- ◆ Task 5: Train staff on the new classification system.
- ◆ Task 6: Monitor the system to verify its reliability and validity.

It was anticipated that these tasks would require 8 months to complete. MT DOC indicated a strong commitment to complete the process and to implement the necessary changes to its classification system.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

The primary task of the classification task force was the development of classification items to identify inmates who were *repeatedly* threats to the safety of staff and other inmates. The agreement mandated development of objective criteria for identifying predatory inmates who should be housed in maximum custody, as well as criteria for their reintegration into the general population. Through a consensus-building process, MT DOC custody, classification, and administrative staff identified the following disciplinary infractions as predatory:

- ◆ Homicide;
- ◆ Assault;
- ◆ Inciting a riot/rioting;
- ◆ Hostage taking;
- ◆ Setting a fire;

The primary task of the classification task force was the development of classification items to identify inmates who were *repeatedly* threats to the safety of staff and other inmates.

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

- ◆ Engaging in group demonstration;
- ◆ Sexual assault;
- ◆ Assault with intent to transmit a communicable disease;
- ◆ Threats of bodily harm; and
- ◆ Fighting.

For the revalidation pilot test, a new classification item for predatory behavior was added to the “close custody” section (top section) of the initial and reclassification instruments (see Exhibits A.5 and A.6 for the modified MT DOC classification instruments). The first five items were summed for the close custody score and the four remaining items were added to the close custody score for the total score. The close custody scale was modified so that inmates who scored 14 or more points were automatically assigned to maximum custody.

A random sample of 314 cases (approximately 25 percent) was selected from the stock population of male inmates as of December 1, 1997. Because of the relatively small MT DOC female population, all 70 female inmates were included in the revalidation sample. In addition, an automated file from the MT DOC Adult Correctional Information System was obtained, with disciplinary hearing data for the period between September 1996 and December 1997.⁵

Data analyses demonstrated that the new item and modified close custody scale differentiated predatory from vulnerable inmates. The data also suggested that the new item was appropriate for both male and female inmates. Comparison of the types of predatory behaviors committed by female versus male inmates indicated that the most common predatory behavior among females was fighting. Among male inmates, there were nearly equal numbers of reports for fighting, assault, and threats. When considering a “predatory behavior” item for female inmates, it was critical to consider the specific details of the fights to ensure that only incidents involving serious injury to the victim were classified as predatory. To avoid overclassification, shouting matches and bickering, for example, were not included in this item.

With the inclusion of the new close custody item, analyses of the cut points for the close custody scale and total classification score were in order. Based on these analyses, four modifications to the MT DOC classification system were recommended:

- ◆ Adopt, with minor modifications, the initial and reclassification instruments pilot tested in December 1997.
- ◆ Set new cut points for the close custody scale to identify medium restricted, close, and maximum custody inmates.

When considering a “predatory behavior” item for female inmates, it was critical to consider the specific details of the fights to ensure that only incidents involving serious injury to the victim were classified as predatory.

Chapter 3

- ◆ Modify the cut points of the classification scale to correct for the under- and overclassification of inmates.
- ◆ Consolidate the classification process into a separate classification unit to increase the consistency and objectivity in the scoring of initial and reclassification instruments.

These modifications to the MT DOC system were implemented in April 1999, with the exception of creation of a separate classification unit. Fiscal restrictions were cited for delaying the implementation of this recommendation. Followup reports indicate that the system is operating well throughout the prison system. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has approved the classification system and indicated that it meets the standards of the agreement under *U.S. v. Montana*. Furthermore, DOJ has requested permission to use the system as an example for objectively assigning and removing inmates from maximum custody.

Oregon Department of Corrections

Classification Issues and Revalidation Tasks

The Oregon Department of Corrections (OR DOC) has been operating an objective prison classification system since the late 1980s. This system has served the department quite well for managing its inmate populations, planning for new facilities, and developing new inmate programs. Yet, in the past few years, several sentencing reforms were instituted that have altered the number and type of offenders sentenced to OR DOC and, more importantly, have increased their sentences and expected lengths of stay. In particular, Ballot Measure 11, a truth-in-sentencing initiative, was projected to have a major impact on an inmate's length of stay. It was anticipated that the population characteristics would shift toward older inmates serving long sentences for violent offenses.

This trend concerned OR DOC because its classification system relied heavily on the inmate's expected time to serve. They anticipated that the system would overclassify its inmate population. Furthermore, the size of the inmate population was projected to double during the next decade. These concerns prompted OR DOC to request technical assistance from NIC. In March 1997, a preliminary assessment of the system concluded the following:

- ◆ The classification scoring criteria needed to be refined to avoid overclassifying the inmate population.
- ◆ The department should consider developing a separate classification system for its female offenders.
- ◆ The classification unit was insufficiently staffed to carry out its work in a timely and professional manner.

- ◆ The projected effects of Ballot Measure 11 needed to be carefully monitored.

OR DOC's external classification instrument incorporates numerically weighted public and institutional risk criteria and a scoring matrix to determine the inmate's appropriate custody level. Public risk criteria include crime severity (current offense), extent of violence, use of weapons, history of violence, escape history, time left to serve, and felony detainers. Institutional risk criteria include frequency of institutional misconduct, severity of institutional misconduct, primary program compliance, gang affiliation, substance abuse, and age. Based on these criteria, inmates are classified into one of four custody levels: maximum, close, medium, or minimum.

An inmate's custody level is reviewed every 6 months, at a minimum, using the same instrument and matrix used at intake. A classification review is completed more frequently under certain conditions, including the request of the inmate, major rule violations, return from parole, transitional leave, new felony conviction(s), and/or board of parole or postprison supervision actions affecting the inmate's custody.

An override of the proposed custody level based on the classification score was approved for approximately 12 percent of the cases. The most common reasons for increasing the custody level included psychological problems, time remaining to serve, and special management concerns. Conversely, the most frequently cited reasons for reducing a custody level were to allow inmates access to prerelease programming or participation in a work or treatment program, or to allow inmates to remain in minimum custody because they were not apparent risks to public or institutional safety.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

The classification and transfer unit developed a series of alternative classification scoring criteria for minimizing the negative impact of the TIS initiative, felony detainers, or Immigration and Naturalization Service holds. An electronic data file for testing alternative scoring criteria for male and female inmates was requested from the department. The file included 750 cases—500 males and 250 females. Five computer simulations tested the impact of potential changes to the classification instruments and matrix. Separate simulations by gender were computed to assess the validity of the respective matrices for both the male and female populations. The impact of the potential changes on the distribution of inmates per custody level and the predictive power of each matrix were presented to the department.

The department developed a plan to pilot test the modifications using data within its management information system (MIS). As a result of this validation effort, minor revisions to the instruments were implemented May 1, 1998. (Exhibits A.7 and A.8 are the revised Oregon institutional risk and public risk instruments; Exhibit A.9 is the classification matrix.)

Oklahoma Department of Corrections

Revalidation Issues and Tasks

In 1997, Oklahoma adopted a comprehensive TIS reform package that dramatically limited, but did not eliminate, discretionary release by the parole board as of July 1, 1998. The new law was crafted by a joint legislative committee on criminal justice sentencing without the input of the courts or prosecutors. The lack of such input was anticipated to have significant consequences for the implementation of the law. The law, for example, was anticipated to increase the average length of stay, increase the percentages of violent inmates within the population, and increase the number of inmates in close and medium custody levels.

The TIS provisions require offenders convicted of violent crimes to serve 85 percent of the sentence imposed by the court before parole eligibility. Inmates convicted of nonviolent crimes must serve 75 percent of their prison terms before being eligible for parole. A unique aspect of the law allows for inmates 60 years or older who were convicted of any crime and have served 50 percent of their terms to be eligible for parole. Sentencing guidelines are to be used by the court to determine the sanction (probation versus prison) and sentence length. The court can depart from the guidelines only with consent from the prosecutor and public defender. The law was applied retroactively, meaning that the parole board had to set all parole eligibility dates consistent with the new provisions as of August 1, 1997, regardless of when the crime occurred or when the inmate was sentenced.

Although the TIS provisions will increase the proportion of the sentence served, Oklahoma Department of Corrections (OK DOC) projected that the provisions will not increase the prison population beyond the 1997 population projections because significant numbers of nonviolent offenders, drug offenders, and drunk drivers who now serve short periods of imprisonment will be diverted from prison and placed on probation under the new sentencing guidelines. These offenders will be assigned to intensive supervision and enhanced program services.

In 1995, OK DOC requested technical assistance from NIC to modify its nearly 15-year-old classification system. Although Oklahoma uses an objective inmate classification system modeled after the NIC prison classification system, many modifications had been made to the system for the primary purpose of placing more inmates in minimum security beds. Unfortunately, these changes were not based on any scientific data. The new system was pilot tested in 1996 and implementation began in early 1997.

The current revalidation effort grew out of the need to determine how well the updated system functioned, assess the potential impact of the TIS legislation, and determine whether a separate system for female inmates was needed. An advisory group was established to undertake the following tasks:

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

- ◆ Task 1: Finalize the proposed revisions to male classification instruments and finalize the female classification instruments.
- ◆ Task 2: Conduct a rigorous pilot test using 750 cases, with a subsample of 250 women.
- ◆ Task 3: Present findings to the classification advisory group.
- ◆ Task 4: Incorporate new classification estimates into OK DOC population projections.
- ◆ Task 5: Initiate implementation efforts including updating MIS, training staff, using the new system for new admissions and reclassifications, and monitoring the implementation effort.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

OK DOC staff compiled data for a sample of 1,232 initial classifications and 312 custody reassessments completed between February and May 1998. Analyses of these assessments suggested that, overall, the current initial classification and custody assessment instruments were valid for female inmates. Both instruments identified distinct groups of maximum, medium, and minimum custody male and female inmates. However, minor modifications to the instruments appeared to improve significantly the validity of the instruments for determining the custody level for female inmates. These modifications affected how the women's criminal history and institutional conduct were scored. In addition, revised custody scale cut points were recommended to maximize the differences among the three custody levels and to differentiate between predatory and nonpredatory inmates. Exhibits A.10 and A.11 are the revised Oklahoma initial classification and custody assessment instruments.

Unfortunately, these analyses did not address all of the questions raised by the advisory group. The remaining questions included:

- ◆ What age groupings are most appropriate for female offenders? The current instrument split the population between those aged 39 years or younger and those aged 40 or older. The advisory group suggested that these categories should be subdivided.
- ◆ Should participation in recommended institutional programs be included as a reclassification item? If so, how should it be coded?
- ◆ Should the circumstances of the current and/or prior convictions be considered to determine the severity rating of the offense?

Because the data required to test these questions were not readily available, a second pilot test of the revised instruments was recommended. In the spring of 2000, Oklahoma collected the information required to address the remaining questions.

Minor modifications to the instruments appeared to improve significantly the validity of the instruments for determining the custody level for female inmates.

The advisory group also reexamined the criminal and escape history items, paying special attention to the circumstances of the crime (i.e., the woman's role, codefendants, relationship to the victim(s), and the involvement with alcohol and/or illicit drugs).

Data were collected on a random sample of 379 female inmates using the revised Oklahoma initial classification and custody assessment instruments (Exhibits A.10 and A.11).⁶ The data analyses provided some interesting findings regarding the circumstances of the offense. The first question considered was whether women incarcerated for crimes involving domestic violence were less likely to be violent and aggressive in the institution than women whose offenses involved strangers. The data suggested that the women whose victims included a spouse, a partner, or a child had slightly higher rates of institutional infractions than women incarcerated for crimes against strangers. Yet, the type of victim (child, familiar adult, acquaintance, or stranger) was *not statistically* related to the women's rate of institutional infractions. Women incarcerated for victimless crimes (e.g., drug-related, property) had, on average, the lowest rates of institutional infractions. Therefore, for the purposes of the classification instrument, the severity of the current offense was not modified according to the victim of the offense.

A second analysis examined the role of the women during the offense. Crimes were differentiated according to whether the women had an accomplice and, if so, his or her identity. The data indicated that, although women who were involved with a male codefendant or family member had the highest rates of institutional infractions, the differences were not statistically different than the rates of institutional infractions among women who had no accomplice or whose accomplices were a female family member or male nonfamily members. This finding suggested that women who are involved with negative peers in the community are likely to be more aggressive and disruptive within the institution. The trend, however, was not statistically strong enough to support modification of the objective classification instrument to account for accomplice information.

A common sentiment among correctional staff who work with female inmates is that mental health, medical problems, emotional stability, and substance abuse are key factors in women's institutional adjustment. To assess this relationship, a risk factor was created that considered these needs. The data suggested that "stability" is an important factor in women's initial adjustment to a facility, but that it is not statistically correlated with long-term institutional adjustment. This finding was somewhat contrary to expectations based on the observations of correctional staff. The low correlation with long-term adjustment can be explained by several factors. Once a woman's needs are identified and addressed by institutional services and programs, stability is no longer an issue. It was recommended that OK DOC track the women identified as having multiple severe needs to see if institutional infractions continued throughout their incarceration. It was also recommended that the stability item be substituted for the current alcohol and drug abuse item on both the initial and reclassification instruments because it better differentiates among women than does consideration of substance abuse alone. However, before including

Women whose victims included a spouse, a partner, or a child had slightly higher rates of institutional infractions than women incarcerated for crimes against strangers.

this item on either the initial or custody adjustment review, the department would need to consider the availability of its services and programs because women's unmet needs should not become a barrier preventing them from moving to the least restrictive custody level.

In addition to considering the circumstances of the offense and stability factors, the current age risk factor was refined to better reflect the institutional adjustment among OK DOC female inmates in that statistically distinct age categories were developed (i.e., low-20.99; 21-30.99; 31-38.99; and 39 and older). The scale cut points were also adjusted to create statistically distinct custody levels. OK DOC is currently developing a plan to implement the revised instruments.

Texas Department of Criminal Justice

Revalidation Issues and Trends

In late 1997, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) Institutional Division requested technical assistance from NIC for a review of its administrative segregation operations.⁷ Because of the extent of the technical assistance required, TDCJ contributed both financial and staff resources to complete this classification initiative. This project was a followup to an assessment of TDCJ's classification system and administrative segregation policies conducted in July 1994. This previous assessment report was funded by NIC and was prepared in response to an audit completed by the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts.

Administrative segregation at TDCJ is a nonpunitive status involving separation of an inmate from the general population for the purpose of maintaining safety, security, and order. All administrative segregation inmates are housed in single cells pursuant to the *Ruiz* consent decree⁸ and state law. Within the administrative segregation population, an inmate can be classified into one of four categories: security detention, prehearing detention, protective custody, and temporary detention.

Inmates classified for security detention constituted nearly 99 percent of the nearly 8,000 inmates assigned to administrative segregation as of May 1998.⁹ The security detention population is further separated into three levels based on disciplinary behavior, adjustment, and threat to the security of the institution. Level I offenders are inmates who have adjusted well to segregation and confinement and are not viewed as assaultive. Level II offenders are chronic rule violators but do not show a recent (within 3 months) history of in-prison assaultive or aggressive behavior. Level III offenders are chronic rule violators; are assaultive or have a recent history of institutional violence, inmate assaults with weapons, assaults or attempted assaults on staff, fighting with a weapon, or history of escape; or represent a high potential threat to institutional security. If inmates regress from Level I to Level II to Level III custody status, additional privileges (commissary privileges, cell belongings, and number of noncontact visits) are removed from the offender.

Chapter 3

TDCJ sought assistance from NIC to review its administrative segregation policies, procedures, and operations to address four major questions:

1. Can current administrative segregation policies be revised using objectively defined disciplinary history violation data to decrease the administrative segregation population without jeopardizing the safety of inmates and correctional staff?
2. Can Level I inmates without a recent history of serious disciplinary infractions, particularly confirmed security threat group (STG) members (gang members), be double-celled?
3. Based on the answers to questions 1 and 2, what is the projected administrative segregation prison population?
4. What type of high-security, close-custody facility is required to safely and securely accommodate the double-celling of those inmates now in administrative segregation who could be placed in an alternative facility?

A number of data sources and reports were used to determine how inmates were being placed in and released from the various administrative segregation units operated by TDCJ. The major sources of information were—

- ◆ Review of previous national, NIC, and TDCJ reports;
- ◆ National comparisons of administrative segregation populations;
- ◆ Statistical analysis of TDCJ aggregate trends;
- ◆ Statistical analysis of inmates in administrative segregation status as of March 1998;
- ◆ Site visits to seven selected administrative segregation units (Coffield, Eastham, Estelle, Ferguson, Michael, Terrel, and Wynne);
- ◆ Case studies and audits of 125 inmates in Level I status from the sampled units; and
- ◆ Interviews with staff and inmates at selected units.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

Data analyses, interviews, and reports suggested a rapid expansion of the TDCJ inmate population, facilities, and staffing levels between 1993 and 1998. A substantial increase in major disciplinary violations accompanied this rapid system expansion, although the rates of inmate homicides, suicides, and escapes had not increased. The proportion of the TDCJ population within administrative and disciplinary segregation was comparable to the national average among state correctional agencies (5.6 percent).¹⁰

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

During the past 5 years, there has been a significant increase in the number of inmates classified as STG members who were placed in administrative segregation status. The largest rate of growth was among inmates assigned to Level I. Although the vast majority of inmates were properly classified for administrative segregation status, it was determined that a significant number (650 to 800) of inmates who were associated with an STG, but who had no recent disciplinary incidents or management problems, should be considered for alternative placement.

Based on these findings, it was recommended that the department should—

- ◆ Continue to single-cell inmates in administrative segregation;
- ◆ Release from administrative segregation inmates who were labeled as STG inmates, yet meet the following criteria (unless the administration has independently confirmed data that would indicate that the inmate's release from administrative segregation would pose a threat to the security of staff and inmates):
 - Must not have any major disciplinary infractions for a 2-year period (those inmates who committed a violent offense or crime against persons while incarcerated should be free of major disciplinary infractions for 3 years);
 - Must not have more than three minor disciplinary infractions for the previous 2-year period;
 - Must have been assigned to Level I custody for a minimum of 1 year;
 - Must not have active involvement in gang activities;
 - Must denounce gang membership; and
 - Must voluntarily request a return to the general prison population.
- ◆ Establish an experimental antigang housing unit program for Level I STG inmates; and
- ◆ Enhance TDCJ MIS capabilities to generate management reports to regularly monitor and evaluate its administrative segregation policies.

These recommendations only required changes to TDCJ policies and procedures because the formal classification instruments are not used to place or remove inmates from administrative segregation.

In addition to the analyses of the administrative segregation populations, a 4-year population projection that assumed implementation of the study's recommendations was computed. This projection suggested that the administrative segregation population would peak and stabilize at 7,752 by August 1999. The previous TDCJ projections had estimated the administrative segregation population would reach

8,897 inmates within the same time period, which means the revised projections saved approximately 1,145 beds. Based on current plans to increase the administrative segregation bed capacity and to maintain a 5-percent population peaking factor, even if TDCJ implemented the study's recommendations, it was estimated that the department would need to increase its overall administrative segregation capacity by 1,127 beds.

Based on this work, the department has modified its policies to allow administrative segregation inmates to be released on a selective basis to certain units. The preliminary observations suggest that implementation of the new policy has reduced average length of stay in administrative segregation with minimal impact on institutional violence.

Wyoming Department of Corrections

Revalidation Effort and Issues

During 1993, the Wyoming Department of Corrections (WY DOC) developed and implemented an objective inmate classification system modeled after the NIC system.¹¹ To ensure that the classification system was implemented as designed, assistance was provided in staff training and documentation of the system. Organizational and/or procedural changes necessary for efficient and effective implementation were identified.

As part of a master planning process to estimate future bed needs, an effort to validate and refine the classification system was undertaken in 1995.¹² This validation effort was prompted primarily by the need to project the number and type of beds required for the system. The department was also experiencing crowding in its close security units while having numerous vacancies in its minimum security facilities. This validation effort also assessed the validity of the instruments for the WY DOC female population.

The 1995 validation effort resulted in several recommendations for fine-tuning the original classification system.¹³ Although approved by the department, these recommendations were never implemented because of competing demands on departmental staff and resources.

The fact that WY DOC experienced a need to revise its classification system, underwent a comprehensive validation effort, yet failed to implement the recommended changes is not unusual or surprising. The day-to-day pressures of operating even a relatively small correctional system are demanding. In addition to the daily operational demands, WY DOC was at a disadvantage because it does not have a centralized classification unit to monitor the system or undertake the responsibility of implementing the modifications.¹⁴ Classification is an add-on duty for the administrative, case management, and security staff. Although the department did not follow through on the modifications recommended in 1995, the value of a

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

second revalidation effort was not negated. Recognizing the importance of resolving ongoing concerns with the classification system, the department indicated its intention to undertake a comprehensive redesign of its classification system, including but not limited to revalidation of the instruments, revision of the manual and classification policy, and implementation of the recommended revisions. Toward this end, the department sought technical assistance from NIC and contracted with the Institute to design and implement a central classification unit with ongoing monitoring and auditing responsibilities.

Similar to the previous classification design/validation efforts, the 1999 revalidation effort included 10 tasks:

- ◆ Task 1: Reconvene the classification committee.
- ◆ Task 2: Review the classification instruments and manuals.
- ◆ Task 3: Revise and revalidate the system.
- ◆ Task 4: Design and implement a central classification unit.
- ◆ Task 5: Review and revise WY DOC classification policies for consistency with findings from the revalidation pilot test, classification unit structure, and classification procedures.
- ◆ Task 6: Train staff on revised policies and instruments.
- ◆ Task 7: Test the reliability of the scoring of classification instruments.
- ◆ Task 8: Implement revised classification system.
- ◆ Task 9: Design and implement an ongoing monitoring process.
- ◆ Task 10: Design and implement classification auditing process.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

The classification committee, consisting of representatives from the various WY DOC facilities and administrative divisions, was reconvened to identify problems, misunderstandings, and/or discrepancies in the classification practices within and across institutions. One beneficial aspect of this revalidation effort was that the committee included many of the same staff members who had participated in previous classification initiatives. The issues, resolutions, and revised instruments from the 1995 validation effort were distributed to facilitate discussion.

Through a consensus building process, at least one strategy was generated to resolve each issue identified by the committee. These resolutions provided the framework for revising the classification instruments, updating the classification manual, and planning for the pilot test. Multiple data sources were tapped for

Chapter 3

pilot-testing the revised instruments. To minimize the data collection costs, time, and workload, an electronic file containing criminal history and institutional adjustment data was downloaded from the WY DOC computer system. In addition, the revised initial and reclassification instruments and a supplemental data form were completed for a stratified random sample of male inmates. Data were collected and coded for a total of 609 cases—160 initial and 449 reclassifications. This revalidation sample was composed of 479 male and 130 female inmates. The data for the female inmates represented the entire female population.

The pilot test of the instruments focused primarily on two tasks:

- ◆ Assessment of the predictive power of the scale and adjustment of the scale cut points to more accurately identify distinct custody levels among WY DOC inmates.
- ◆ Refinement of the classification process to improve WY DOC's ability to identify predatory inmates (i.e., inmates who should be classified as maximum custody as opposed to close-restricted or general population).

Although item-by-item analyses were conducted, the combined effects of all proposed changes to the instrument items and the custody scale were also tested. This ensured that the recommended scale and the mechanism for identifying predatory inmates accurately reflected the revised classification instruments and process. The recommendations for revising the WY DOC classification process included the following:

- ◆ Modify the initial and reclassification items to maximize their predictive power.
- ◆ Update the offense severity scale to include any new, missing, or reclassified crimes.
- ◆ Designate and weight accordingly a subset of institutional infractions as predatory. (Exhibit 1 is a copy of the WY DOC disciplinary code used for the classification process.)
- ◆ Modify the cut points on the classification scale to correct for the under- and overclassifying of inmates.
- ◆ Consolidate the classification process into a separate classification unit to increase the consistency and objectivity in scoring initial and reclassification instruments.

The above modifications to the classification system were implemented on September 13, 1999, after an intensive 2-day training of all case managers and their supervisors. (Exhibits A.12 and A.13 are the revised WY DOC classification instruments.) The training also included reliability testing for approximately 40 cases.

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level

Code	Violation Description
Minor Violations	
M1	Purchasing, selling, trading, giving, receiving, or possessing any unregistered item with a value of less than \$50.
M2	Roughhouse or horseplay.
M3	Failure to keep one's person or assigned area neat and clean.
M4	Failure to perform work as instructed or a failure to attend work, school, or other assignment.
M5	Unauthorized use of institutional supplies, tools, equipment, or machinery.
M6	Smoking in an unauthorized area.
M7	An attempt or conspiracy to commit a minor violation.
M8	Failure to produce inmate identification card upon request by a correctional employee.
M9	Excessive loud noise by radio, TV, stereo, shouting, or other disorderly behavior.
M10	Other minor community center violations as posted for community center residents.
General Violations	
GN1	Disobedience of an order from any staff member or anyone who has the authority to supervise inmates in work or other special assignments.
GN2	Unauthorized contact with any off-duty correctional employee or member of the employee's family; or unwanted contact with any private citizen, not amounting to harassment or threats.
GN3	Participating in any gambling game or betting pool, or possessing any equipment used for gambling or betting purposes.
GN4	Intentionally destroying, altering, or damaging property of another or state property that has a replacement value less than \$50.
GN5	Self-mutilation.

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level (continued)

Code	Violation Description
GN6	Being involved in spontaneous fighting (with another inmate), not amounting to battery. Challenging another to fight.
GN7	Issuing a money transfer with knowledge that it is not covered by sufficient funds.
GN8	Possession of another inmate's identification card.
GN9	Abusive language or actions toward another person.
GN10	Tampering with evidence or influencing a witness involved in any disciplinary process, not amounting to threats.
GN11	Failure to appear at the proper time and place for count or interfering with the count.
GN12	Cutting into line.
GN13	Failure to follow posted rules and regulations.
GN14	Presence in areas identified as off limits to inmates by posted regulations or signs that identify the area, not amounting to an attempted escape.
GN15	Delaying, hindering, or interfering with a correctional employee in the performance of his/her duties.
GN16	Possession of a custodial or correctional employee's uniform or parts thereof.
GN17	Preparing, soliciting, or giving false or misleading information to or about a staff member and representing the statement as fact. Providing information known to be false to a government official, the media, or a court.
GN18	Possession of gang-related materials including, but not limited to, jewelry, stationery, emblems, and patches.
GN19	Possession of prescribed medication that is not a controlled substance without the approval of the proper authority.
GN20	Purchasing, selling, trading, giving, receiving, or possessing any unregistered (not on property list) item with a value more than \$50.
GN21	Indecent exposure.

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level (continued)

Code	Violation Description
GN22	Attempt or conspiracy to commit a general violation.
GN23	The commission of three or more minor violations within a 6-month period.
GN24	Other general violations unique to a community center and as posted for community center residents.
Community Status	
COM1	Failure to comply with travel arrangements outside the institution.
COM2	Failure to report to the work assignment contract in the community as specified and agreed to in the release plan.
COM3	Failure to remain in the particular area designated in the release plan.
COM4	Operation of a motor vehicle without authorization.
COM5	Failure to return to the institution on or before the time specified in the schedule of the release plan. This includes leaving or hiding from supervision or custody.
COM6	Failure to report an incident that delays the inmate's return to the institution.
COM7	Performing work for private persons that is not authorized by the DOC.
COM8	An attempt or conspiracy to commit a community release violation.
COM9	Any violation or attempt to violate rules or conditions of the contract agreement, i.e., work program or community corrections agreement.
COM10	Possession of coin, currency, checks, money orders, or other negotiable instruments in excess of the amount authorized by regulation.
Major Violations	
MJ1	Adulteration of any food or drink.
MJ5	Being in hiding on the prison grounds or hiding at a place of assignment or classification, as if to escape or disrupt count.

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level (continued)

Code	Violation Description
MJ6	Bribery. Giving or offering a bribe to any person.
MJ7	Burglary. Entering of a building, structure, or vehicle with the intent to commit a crime therein.
MJ8	Charging or collecting a fee or favors for services as a counsel-substitute, legal assistant, or “writ-writer.”
MJ9	Counterfeiting, forging, or making an unauthorized reproduction of any document.
MJ10	Destroying, damaging, or altering (intentionally) the property of another or state property with a replacement value of \$50 or more.
MJ11	Embezzlement. Fraudulent taking for one’s own use the property entrusted to an inmate’s care.
MJ15	False pretenses. Representation of some fact or circumstance that is not true and is calculated to mislead, deceive, or defraud another.
MJ16	Failure to submit to a drug and/or alcohol screening or intentionally altering a urine specimen.
MJ18	Organizing or operating any gambling game or possessing any equipment used for gambling or betting purposes.
MJ21	Larceny. The trespassory taking and carrying away of personal property of another with intent to steal it.
MJ22	Larceny by trick. Obtaining possession of another’s property by falsehood with the intent to convert it for his or her own use.
MJ26	Organizing, encouraging, or participating in a work stoppage and/or other disruptive demonstration or practice.
MJ28	Possession of contraband, including ingestion of items considered contraband.
MJ29	Possession, introduction, sales, or use of any narcotic, drug, an alcohol or other intoxicant, or possession of materials suitable for such manufacture.
MJ30	Propelling any substance toward any person.

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level (continued)

Code	Violation Description
MJ31	Receiving stolen property. Having possession of stolen property, knowing it is stolen, and intending to deprive the owner.
MJ34	Running from a correctional employee when ordered to halt.
MJ36	Sexually stimulating activities, including but not limited to caressing, kissing, or fondling, except as authorized by visitation regulations.
MJ37	Tattooing oneself or another or possession of tattooing equipment.
MJ38	Theft. The taking of property without the owner's consent.
MJ39	Tampering with any locking device.
MJ40	Threats. Issuing a threat, either verbally, by gesture, or in written statement to or about any person.
MJ41	Trading, bartering, lending, or otherwise engaging in any personal transaction with any employee when such transaction has not been specifically authorized.
MJ42	Unauthorized use of telephone or mail.
MJ43	Unauthorized contact with, including harassment of, any off-duty correctional employee or other private citizen.
MJ45	The third or subsequent general violation committed within a 6-month period may be treated as a major violation.
MJ46	Violation of any state or federal law not specifically listed here.
Predatory Violations	
MJ2	Arson. Setting fire with the potential of causing damage or injury to persons or property.
MJ3	Assault. Unlawful attempt and ability to commit a violent injury on the person of another.
MJ4	Battery. Any willful use of force or violence upon the person of another.

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level (continued)

Code	Violation Description
MJ12	Escape. The departure or absence from custody of a person who is imprisoned, before he/she is entitled to his/her liberty by the process of law. Walkaways from minimum or community custody where no weapons, force, or injury to others was involved. Aiding, abetting, or encouraging inmates to escape.
MJ13	Extortion, blackmail. The obtaining of property or money from another by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear.
MJ14	False imprisonment. The unlawful violation of the personal liberty of another that consists of confinement or detention without sufficient legal authority.
MJ17	Gang activities. Organizing or being a member of a gang that engages in criminal activities, threatens the order and security of the institution, and/or promotes racism.
MJ19	Gathering around, blocking, or impeding any DOC employee or visitor, in a threatening or intimidating manner and exhibiting conduct that could reasonably cause the person to fear for his/her safety.
MJ20	Kidnaping. The unlawful taking and carrying away of a human being by force or against his/her will.
MJ23	Manslaughter. The unlawful killing of another human being without malice, either expressed or implied. It may be either voluntarily, in the heat of passion, or involuntarily.
MJ24	Mayhem. The infliction of an injury that disfigures, disables, or dismembers another.
MJ25	Murder. The unlawful killing of another human being with malice aforethought, either expressed or implied, and all lesser included offenses.
MJ27	Possession or manufacture of a deadly weapon or explosive device.
MJ32	Rioting or inciting others to riot.
MJ33	Robbery. A larceny where the taking of the property is from the person of the victim or in his/her presence and the taking is by means of violence or intimidation.

Exhibit 1. Institutional Disciplinary Code by Severity Level (continued)

Code	Violation Description
MJ35	Sexual assault. Subjecting another person to sexual penetration against the victim's will and/or understanding. Forcing another person to perform any sexual act against his/her will.
MJ44	An attempt or conspiracy to commit a predatory violation.

With the development of a comprehensive classification policy, the department implemented a quality control process that requires independent auditors to review periodically a random sample of the classification instruments for accuracy and completeness. Audits have been completed at the four facilities. The audit reports indicate that error rates for most of the classification risk factors were less than 10 percent. For most items, 96 to 98 percent of the cases were accurately scored. Position descriptions have been written and approved for development of a centralized classification unit. The central office and facility-based positions have been filled and the quality control procedures implemented.

Wisconsin Department of Corrections

Revalidation Effort and Issues

The Wisconsin Department of Corrections (WI DOC) has had an objective external prison classification system in place for more than 15 years. In the early 1980s, it adopted the NIC prison classification system. This system consisted of an additive point system with separate initial and reclassification scoring forms, as well as a separate needs assessment form. After using this system for approximately 8 years, WI DOC's disenchantment with the NIC model grew as the number of overrides escalated. Although the source(s) of the high rate of overrides was not fully identified, the current classification system was developed and implemented.

In 1998, WI DOC requested that NIC assist the department to assess the current classification system. During the first orientation with WI DOC, then-Secretary Michael Sullivan observed that because the current system had been in place for many years without any subsequent evaluations, there was concern that it no longer functioned as well as it should and might require modification.¹⁵

Wisconsin currently uses a unique classification process. An initial risk assessment with eight scoring items separates inmates according to three risk levels (high, moderate, and low). If an inmate receives a rating of "high" on any one of these eight items, the inmate is considered a high risk. Similarly, if the inmate receives a rating of "moderate" on any of the eight items (and no high ratings), the inmate is

considered a moderate risk. Thus, to be designated as a low risk, the inmate can have no moderate or high ratings on any item. The reclassification process is similar to the initial custody process with the exception that the current offense and offense history are excluded from the reassessment process. However, sentence structure, which is strongly correlated with current offense, is retained.

This system entails complex rules for scoring instruments that are difficult for persons outside the classification system to fully understand. It also allows for broad discretion by the raters. Thus, one issue that prompted this revalidation analysis was the reliability of the system—were the rules applied consistently and correctly across the raters for all types of inmates?

One issue that prompted this revalidation analysis was the reliability of the system—were the rules applied consistently and correctly across the raters for all types of inmates?

These questions led to the second set of concerns. Because of the complexity of the scoring process and because the MIS data are stored as text rather than numerical scores, fundamental tracking and monitoring data are not readily available. This revalidation effort sought to answer the following questions:

- ◆ What is the reliability of the instrument scoring across raters within and across correctional facilities?
- ◆ Are the custody assessments valid estimates of inmates' potential risk and management requirements?
- ◆ What are the rate of and reasons for discretionary overrides?
- ◆ Does racial bias operate in the risk or custody designation process?
- ◆ Are the classification procedures followed? For example, how frequently are inmates assessed and are overrides appropriate and systematically reviewed?

To address these questions, the following tasks were completed:

- ◆ Task 1: Conduct an inter-rater reliability assessment.
- ◆ Task 2: Conduct a descriptive analysis of the classification system using electronic files of WI DOC inmates as of November 1998.
- ◆ Task 3: Manually collect disciplinary data for a random sample of approximately 750 cases.
- ◆ Task 4: Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the system.
- ◆ Task 5: Provide recommendations for addressing any noted problems.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

Overall, approximately 80 percent of the inmate population scored as either close (44 percent) or moderate (38 percent) risk under the current classification system. A smaller proportion of the female population was designated as high (36 percent) or moderate (36 percent) risk. Thus, the number of inmates scored and assigned to maximum custody (37 percent) was relatively high compared with other state prison systems.

There were significant differences between the scored risk level and the assigned custody level. Half of the inmates had an assigned custody level that departed from their risk level. For example, 633 inmates (approximately 10 percent) were classified as high risk but were assigned to minimum custody. These data suggest an extremely high rate of discretionary overrides. It also appeared that the scored risk level had little, if any, consistent impact on inmates' housing assignments.

Two items—offense severity and sentence structure—dominated the initial and reclassification risk assessment process, yet were uncorrelated with institutional adjustment, escape history, or mental health. There appeared to be no racial bias in the risk or custody designation process; equal proportions of black and white inmates were assigned to the various risk and custody designations.

Based on these findings, the major recommendations to the department included the following:

- ◆ Adjust the reclassification process and scoring criteria to place greater emphasis on objective factors correlated with institutional conduct (both positive and negative behavioral indicators, such as age);
- ◆ Incorporate objective override categories in the classification summary form to provide for consistent application and monitoring;
- ◆ Complete a comprehensive rater reliability study that includes training for all classification staff;
- ◆ Instruct classification staff that if any key documents are missing, the classification decision must be delayed until such data are secured and verified;
- ◆ Provide quality training for all classification staff on how to complete the classification process accurately; and
- ◆ Develop quality control mechanisms for ensuring that an inmate's custody level is not altered based on the number and type of beds available.

The findings and recommendations were presented to WI DOC in early January 2000. Providing comprehensive training, conducting reliability testing, and conducting a detailed review of all classification policies and procedures were emphasized as vital steps for reduction of the high error rates and the overclassification of offenders. The department is currently planning its next steps and alternatives.

Delaware Department of Correction

Classification Issues and Validation Tasks

At the outset of this classification initiative (May 1999), the Delaware Department of Correction (DE DOC) used an informal external classification system. Although the information gathering process, priority assigned to factors, and process for implementing the decisions differed by facility, an inmate's institutional assignment, custody level, housing unit, and cell designation were linear processes. The numerical rating system used to guide preliminary housing, program, and custody assignments was based on a multidisciplinary team's (MDT's) review of offenders' potential risk to public safety balanced with their program or special needs. (The MDT was composed of a classification officer, correctional lieutenant, counselor, and, as available, mental health worker.) The MDT was responsible for the initial classification and reclassification recommendations regarding inmates' custody levels and program plans. These recommendations were reviewed by the Central Institution Classification Committee, which included representatives from each correctional facility.

As part of its master plan, DE DOC undertook several initiatives to standardize and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its classification process. These included the following:

- ◆ Establishing a central reception and diagnostic unit at the Sussex Correctional Institution.
- ◆ Developing objective risk and needs instruments that are appropriate for all offenders and that are clear and concise, efficient, and standard across all DE DOC facilities. The classification system needed to be flexible to adapt to the changing behavior/status of the offenders and to provide quality data for short- and long-term planning.
- ◆ Implementing the Addiction Severity Index for assessing substance abuse and addictions among the inmate populations.

To accomplish the second initiative, DE DOC sought technical assistance from NIC to ensure that the objective classification system accomplished the following goals:

- ◆ Improving efficiency of the classification process and ensuring that the system neither overclassified nor underclassified offenders.

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

- ◆ Optimizing control of the offender population by identifying appropriate security and custody levels to reduce fear, violence, escapes, abuse, and litigation.
- ◆ Updating the classification policies and procedures to ensure that DE DOC is on the cutting edge of current trends and technology.

The design and validation efforts coordinated by ICJC involved three primary tasks:¹⁶

- ◆ Task 1: Refine the preliminary classification system.
- ◆ Task 2: Develop the preliminary instruments and manual.
- ◆ Task 3: Pilot test the preliminary instruments and manual.

Validation Effort and Key Results

Before requesting assistance from NIC, a classification steering committee had developed and pilot tested a preliminary initial classification instrument. With the assistance of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Corrections, this instrument was refined based on the findings from DE DOC's pilot test and current classification literature. A preliminary reclassification instrument was then developed using a consensus-building process. The steering committee identified factors associated with institutional misconduct and security concerns that could be explicitly defined and evaluated by the classification staff using readily available, reliable information. The committee considered format, risk factors, factor weights, scale cutoff points, and override factors.

As previously indicated, this initiative validated the preliminary instruments. For the initial classification sample, data were collected for 266 male offenders sentenced to 1 year or more who were admitted between April 1 and September 30, 1999. Because of the relatively small number of female offenders within the Delaware correctional system (approximately 175 offenders), an initial classification form was completed for the 46 women sentenced to 1 year or more who were admitted between April 1 and September 30, 1999. In addition, an initial classification form was completed for a random sample of 105 sentenced females admitted before April 1, 1999, to ensure sufficient sample size for the pilot test. To generate a sample of reclassifications, a random sample of approximately 12 percent of the male population incarcerated before April 1, 1999, was identified (271 males). A reclassification form was completed for a random sample of 109 female offenders who were incarcerated before April 1, 1999.

Data suggested that the basic objective classification factors—current offense, other offense/bail status, escape history, current age, severity of criminal history, time to serve, and institutional program performance—combined to create a statistically strong instrument for identifying the risk that the offender posed to the safety and security of the Delaware correctional system. Perhaps the most interesting finding was that different age groupings were required for male and female inmates at

The steering committee identified factors associated with institutional misconduct and security concerns that could be explicitly defined and evaluated by the classification staff using readily available, reliable information. The committee considered format, risk factors, factor weights, scale cutoff points, and override factors.

Chapter 3

initial classification. In contrast, at reclassification, separate age categories by gender were not required. The current age categories by gender were redefined, as shown in Exhibit 2.

Exhibits A.14 through A.16 represent the instruments recommended for DE DOC. The instruments were automated and built into the department's new information system. However, full implementation has been delayed pending activation of the information system. In the interim, DE DOC has initiated training and implementation.

Exhibit 2. Age Categories by Gender in Delaware

Initial Classification			
Male Age Categories	Score	Female Age Categories	Score
Low-19 years	1	Low-21	1
20-27	3	22-30	3
28-37	2	31-45	2
38+	0	46+	0

Reclassification			
Male Age Categories	Score	Female Age Categories	Score
Low-23 years	1	Low-23	1
24-27	3	24-27	3
28-38	2	28-38	2
39+	0	39+	0

Rhode Island Department of Corrections

Classification Issues and Revalidation Tasks

In 1992, Rhode Island Department of Corrections (RI DOC) began work on the design and validation of an objective classification system modeled on the NIC system. This effort was completed in 1995, with full implementation of the department's classification policy. Rhode Island has a unified correctional system under which all pretrial detainees, misdemeanants, and felons are committed to the custody and supervision of RI DOC. The objective classification system is used for adult offenders convicted of a felony offense and sentenced to at least 1 year in prison; pretrial detainees and offenders sentenced to less than 6 months are not classified under the current system. Minor modifications to the instruments have been made over the years to emphasize escape history as a risk factor, eliminate

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

community custody placements, and incorporate additional mandatory overrides. These changes were based not on statistical analyses but on policy or observation. Use of the classification instruments for the female population was discontinued gradually because it appeared that the system overclassified women offenders. Currently, custody, housing, and program decisions for female inmates are made by a classification board based on a subjective assessment of the women's risk and needs.

The RI DOC classification process is unique in that it provides for individuals with sentences of less than 6 months to be transferred administratively to minimum custody without completing the objective instruments or a review by a classification board. Currently, the intake services coordinator is responsible for administrative transfers of male inmates. One of RI DOC's key classification goals for the current initiative was to develop a systematic, objective process for conducting and documenting administrative transfers.

In June 1999, the department requested short-term technical assistance from NIC to assess its prison classification system and to provide recommendations for immediate strategies to facilitate the safe movement of male inmates from medium to minimum custody. A vacancy rate of 70 to 100 beds in its minimum security facility and crowding in its medium security facilities prompted the department's request for technical assistance. The department also requested the design of a systematic screening instrument to document the administrative review process used to move offenders with sentences of less than 6 months to the minimum security facility.

In addition, systemic problems with the classification system had been previously identified during an attempt to generate classification-based population projections for the department.¹⁷ These included the following:

- ◆ Low reliability among classification scores.
- ◆ Very high override rates (46.8 percent at initial classification and 41.7 percent at reclassification).
- ◆ Highly subjective administrative decisionmaking process for inmates with sentences of less than 6 months.
- ◆ High number of cases without completed custody assessment instruments that documented the decisionmaking process.

Based on previous reports and the observations and recommendations gleaned from a short-term technical assistance effort, it was clear that RI DOC had been struggling with its classification system for some time and that both long- and short-term strategies were required to address the problems.¹⁸ RI DOC was particularly interested in assessing the predictive power of the instruments for its women offenders. In addition, RI DOC requested assistance in designing and testing an administrative

review process for offenders with sentences of less than 6 months. The primary goals of this project were to revalidate and fine-tune the objective classification system to ensure that it was appropriate for both male and female inmates and to design a systematic administrative review process to document the transfer to minimum custody of inmates with sentences of less than 6 months.

The technical assistance provided by ICJC for accomplishing these goals involved three primary tasks:

- ◆ Task 1: Review and refine the objective classification system.
- ◆ Task 2: Develop the preliminary instruments and manuals.
- ◆ Task 3: Pilot test the preliminary instruments and manual.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

The committee's first task was to review the current classification processes to identify problems through an item-by-item analysis of the classification factors. Through a consensus-building process, the committee developed practical solutions to each identified problem. Sampling frames, which included all cases admitted to RI DOC during fiscal year 1999 and the RI DOC stock population as of June 30, 1999, were readily available. Initial classification data were collected for a random sample of 109 male and 85 female offenders. Reclassification data were collected for 292 male and 75 female offenders. To test the preliminary administrative screening process, a preliminary screening instrument was completed for 145 male inmates with sentences of less than 6 months who were admitted to RI DOC during December 1999.¹⁹

Based on the statistical analyses and observations of the RI DOC classification process, two levels of recommendations were provided.²⁰ The first level focused on specific modifications to the preliminary custody assessment instruments as suggested by the pilot test results. The second level focused on classification system issues highlighted by this revalidation process.

One of the first recommendations was to create a subset of predatory institutional infractions to identify aggressive inmates while avoiding the overclassification of nonpredatory inmates who were cited for Class 1 bookings. Development of specific operational definitions to identify predatory bookings would control for inconsistencies in the disciplinary process across facilities. In addition, development of an offense severity index that focused on institutional risk rather than public safety or moral censure was key to ensuring the integrity of the custody assessment process. Minor modifications to the custody scale cut points were recommended based on an analysis of the relationship of the total score to the number of institutional infractions. The revised custody scale created statistically distinct custody levels for both male and female inmates. (See Exhibits A.17 and A.18 for the final classification instruments developed for RI DOC.)

Development of an offense severity index that focused on institutional risk rather than public safety or moral censure was key to ensuring the integrity of the custody assessment process.

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

Analyses of the administrative screening instrument data suggested that 72 percent of inmates screened were eligible for immediate transfer to minimum custody based on the criteria defined by the classification committee.²¹ In contrast, only about half (49.3 percent) of the cases were deemed eligible for administrative transfer by staff. With only minor modifications, the administrative screening instrument would serve as an objective, yet simple mechanism for identifying cases appropriate for minimum custody (see Exhibit A.19 for the administrative screening instrument developed for RI DOC).

Several issues that arose during the classification revalidation process required high-level attention by the department to ensure the integrity and validity of the RI DOC classification system. Some of these issues had been noted previously as critical issues; however, before implementing any approved modification to the instruments, the following systemic issues had to be addressed:

- ◆ Revise the RI DOC disciplinary code;
- ◆ Develop a public safety screening instrument for determining an inmate's appropriateness for work release and community housing;
- ◆ Discontinue regular custody reassessments for minimum custody inmates;
- ◆ Restrict discretionary overrides;
- ◆ Provide intensive, ongoing training to all classification staff;
- ◆ Implement the administrative screening instrument and develop a standardized process for completing and reviewing the instruments;
- ◆ Develop a strong, centralized classification unit; and
- ◆ Upgrade the automated information system to reflect modifications to the classification system.

RI DOC was not alone in its struggle with system-level issues that affect the integrity of the classification system. As with other states, it was imperative that RI DOC first address systemic classification issues, as failure to do so would have negated improvements in the custody assessment instruments identified through this revalidation effort. For example, development of a strong, centralized process for ongoing training, monitoring, and auditing of the system was critical to ensure implementation of the approved modifications and the long-term integrity of the system. Centralization would standardize the classification process across all facilities, ensuring consistent and accurate application of the classification policies and procedures for all inmates. With this revalidation, RI DOC made great strides toward development of a valid classification system. However, statistically valid instruments are only one step. The department recognized that it must first address the systemic recommendations, particularly those associated with revising the disciplinary code, centralizing the classification process, and upgrading its information

Development of a strong, centralized process for ongoing training, monitoring, and auditing of the system was critical to ensure implementation of the approved modifications and the long-term integrity of the system.

system (INFACTS). The department, for example, has incorporated the administrative screening instrument in INFACTS and developed a work group to review the institutional disciplinary code and offense severity index. The revised classification system for both male and female inmates will be fully implemented once the systemic issues have been addressed and incorporated into INFACTS.

Tennessee Department of Correction

Classification Issues and Revalidation Tasks

The Tennessee Department of Correction (TN DOC) operates a classification system based on the NIC external classification model that was designed and implemented in 1983. Subsequent to the “Grubbs case,”²² the department sought technical assistance from classification experts to refine and fully implement an objective system that had both integrity and the confidence of staff. The department provided intensive training for institutional staff and created specific positions to oversee the classification process within each of the 21 TN DOC facilities. In 1991, TN DOC asked the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to assess the system. NCCD found that the system had been implemented as designed and was compatible with national standards, though it had not been statistically validated for TN DOC populations.

Despite the NCCD findings, TN DOC was concerned about the large number of inmates classified as close custody. This concern was compounded by the high vacancy rate within minimum security facilities. The classification system was modified in 1997 to address these issues. The initial custody assessment was discontinued because it appeared to overclassify inmates. More than 90 percent of inmates who scored as close custody at reception dropped to minimum custody within 4 months, at their first reclassification assessment. The disparity between the initial and reassessment ratings appeared to be driven by the weight and operational definitions of the offenders’ current offenses and prior assaultive felony convictions on the initial classification instrument. Problems with the classification system were compounded by a lack of resources to update the classification instruments within the TN DOC computer system. It was more cost efficient to discontinue use of the initial custody assessment form than to revise it and update the computer software.

Before undertaking this validation effort, TN DOC participated in a multistate classification seminar sponsored by NIC to assess the current status of its objective classification system and to develop a work plan to address identified problems.²³ The following objectives were included in the work plan:

- ◆ Assess the reliability of the custody assessment form (CAF) scoring by the institutional classification coordinators;
- ◆ Assess the validity of the CAF for TN DOC populations; and

Description of the Ten States' External Classification Initiatives

- ◆ Update the classification policies and classification screens within Tennessee Offender Management Information System.

NIC contracted with the Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections to assist TN DOC with the validation of its classification system and to complete the following tasks:

- ◆ Task 1: Assess the current classification system.
- ◆ Task 2: Revise the custody assessment forms and develop a supplemental data collection instrument.
- ◆ Task 3: Assess the validity of the modified custody assessment forms.

Revalidation Effort and Key Results

As previously indicated, the primary question raised by TN DOC was whether the current classification system was valid. Of particular concern was the appropriateness of the decision to discontinue use of the initial custody assessment form. The classification steering committee developed preliminary initial and reclassification forms and planned to assess the predictive power of each form to estimate an inmate's institutional adjustment during the first 6 months of incarceration. These preliminary instruments also provided the opportunity to test new risk factors and revisions to the operational definitions of the current factors. Data were collected for a random sample of 1,210 inmates (605 male and 605 female offenders). Separate analyses were conducted by gender and type of classification assessment (initial and reclassification) to ensure that the instruments were appropriate across time and gender.

The data suggested that although the current custody reclassification instrument is statistically correlated with institutional adjustment at initial and reassessment stages it does not create statistically distinct custody levels for either male or female inmates.²⁴ For example, the analysis of variance indicated that although minimum custody represented a distinct custody level, substantial overlap existed among medium, close, and maximum custody levels. This was true for the scores as well as the final custody levels at both initial and reclassification for males and females. Although the custody reassessment instrument did a better job differentiating among inmates at reclassification than at initial assessment, there was still substantial overlap across the custody levels.²⁵

These results prompted the question of whether the modified custody assessment instrument developed by the classification steering committee was an improvement over the current system and, if so, what refinements would be required to enhance its predictive power. Further analyses indicated that the modified custody assessment forms were more powerful instruments for identifying distinct custody levels for TN DOC male and female inmates at initial and reclassification assessments. However, minor adjustments to the preliminary instruments were recommended. These included but were not limited to the following:

Chapter 3

- ◆ Adopt a specific operational definition of “institutional predatory behavior” and substitute the risk factor, “number of institutional predatory behaviors,” for the risk factor, “did the assault occur within the past 6 months?”
- ◆ Set a time limit of 10 years for consideration of prior assault convictions.
- ◆ Substitute “severity of prior felony convictions” for “number of prior felony convictions.”
- ◆ Include the current age risk factor on both initial and reclassification instruments.

Exhibits A.20 and A.21 represent the final initial and reclassification instruments recommended for TN DOC. TN DOC undertook a second pilot test to simulate the impact of implementation of the modified custody assessment instruments on the distribution of inmates across the respective custody levels. Data analyses from this period pilot test indicated that the revised classification was valid for the TN DOC inmate populations. Implementation of the revised system is planned for 2001.

four

CHAPTER

Recommended Methodology for Testing, Implementing, and Monitoring Classification Reforms

An important component of the NCCD/Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections cooperative agreement with NIC was to refine and test a model for assessing, implementing, and monitoring classification reforms that would guide the work of correctional administrators when revalidating or refining their objective classification systems. Although the model suggests that an outside consultant may be used to facilitate or lead the local task force, many states have the local resources and expertise to complete the revalidation effort independently. Regardless of whether an expert consultant is retained, the project leader should be task oriented; well respected by custody, administrative, and classification staff; and knowledgeable about both classification and custody issues.

As suggested by previous descriptions of work with the 10 states, minor modifications to the basic methodology to address the specific local questions, trends, and/or data systems may be required. The following basic tasks were critical for revalidating and updating classification systems (Exhibit 3 is a time-task chart summarizing these basic tasks).

Task 1: Determine the Department’s Commitment and Readiness for Reform

The jurisdiction’s readiness and commitment to undertake an assessment of its classification system is critical to any revalidation effort. This task is critical even if analyses of only a single part of the process, such as that undertaken by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, have been proposed. Revalidation tasks are time consuming and may require substantial departmental resources for data collection, revisions to the automated information system (MIS), and other tasks. If the department, for example, has sufficient resources and/or staff to participate in the planning and manual data collection tasks, but lacks the commitment of the commissioner and/or facility administration to change policies and procedures, the revalidation effort should not proceed. If an effort was undertaken and then shelved for lack of commitment to act on recommendations, it would be a waste of limited departmental resources and would have negative impacts on staff morale and willingness to participate in future classification projects. Although development of

The project leader should be task oriented; well respected by custody, administrative, and classification staff; and knowledgeable about both classification and custody issues.

Exhibit 3. Revalidation Time-Task Chart

Task	Month												Responsible Party	Product
Obtain agency commitment and readiness for reform													Project leader	Commitment
Establish revalidation task force													Project leader	Task force
Conduct assessment of current system													Task force	
Develop assessment plan													Task force	Time-task plan
Conduct onsite assessment tasks: task force meeting, interviews, observation, and exit meeting with task force													Task force	Preliminary data
Prepare and submit draft assessment report													Project leader	Draft report
Review and finalize report													Project leader	Written report
Revalidate classification system														
Develop preliminary classification system													Task force	Revised system
Design prototype instruments and manual													Task force	Test instruments
Pilot test instruments and manual														
1. Draw random sample of inmates													MIS/research	Sample list
2. Collect data													Data team	Data files
3. Analyze data													Researcher	Tables, findings
Present findings and recommendations to task force/director													Researcher	Recommendations
Plan for implementation													Task force	Time-task plan
Train staff, develop materials, test cases, test reliability													Researcher	Staff training
Prepare agency: inform staff and inmates of start date													Task force	Marketing plan
Develop monitoring and evaluation plans													Task force	Evaluation plan
Write detailed report to document revalidation effort													Project leader	Revalidation report

departmental commitment is the first task of the revalidation effort, it is also important to nurture this commitment throughout the initiative.

Active participation of research and management information system staff also is critical because revisions to the classification system frequently entail modifications to the classification MIS screens and/or monitoring reports. Participation by research and MIS staff in the classification committee generally facilitates the implementation of this type of change.

Task 2: Establish a Classification Task Force

As part of the application and selection process necessary to receive technical assistance from NIC under this cooperative agreement, each state is required to establish a classification task force. The purpose of the task force is to—

- ◆ Analyze current practices to identify issues, trends, and questions relating to the classification process.
- ◆ Develop practical resolutions to address current issues and trends.
- ◆ Draft new policies and develop preliminary classification instruments (as needed) that reflect any resolutions.
- ◆ Pilot test the proposed policies and instruments.
- ◆ Develop an implementation and evaluation plan.

The task force must consist of staff representing all major operational areas of the agency, including security, programs, classification, research and planning, information systems, budget, training, and legal counsel. Furthermore, each state must designate a project leader who will be responsible for completion of all tasks associated with the project. The project leader must also have the full support of the agency's director and access to all agency resources necessary for design, pilot testing, and implementation activities.

If an outside consultant is retained, the task force must be established before any onsite work and must be available for the first onsite visit. A central purpose of the first onsite visit is to complete the first two tasks of the committee: problem and issue identification and resolution. The project leader's first tasks should be to identify the appropriate task force members, solicit their commitment, and identify their respective roles.

The task force must consist of staff representing all major operational areas of the agency, including security, programs, classification, research and planning, information systems, budget, training, and legal counsel.

Task 3: Conduct an Assessment of the Current Classification System

Once the task force has been established, the state's current classification procedures and practices should be assessed. The assessment should be carefully planned as it will lay the foundation for the revalidation process. In completing the assessment, the task force should address the following questions: What current classification policies, practices, and issues may affect the classification system? What trends are associated with these policies and practices? What outcomes are desired by the task force?

The assessment may include site visits to correctional facilities and/or the central research and MIS units to examine current classification practices, issues, data, resources, and limitations. The purpose and itinerary for any onsite subtasks must be tailored to the state's correctional system and the issues prompting the revalidation process. The site visits provide opportunities to identify data sources; initiate the data collection; and catalog and analyze current policies, procedures, and practices. The central purpose of an onsite visit to the main intake and reception center, for example, may be to analyze and diagnose current initial classification practices.

The following lists subtasks to be completed as part of the assessment:

Subtask 3.1: Develop an Assessment Plan

To ensure that the assessment generates sufficient, high-quality information, it will be necessary to develop a structured assessment plan with specific assignments for each participant. If automated data are centralized at the state level, it may be necessary to spend time at the central office reviewing available information and resources. In addition, time should be spent at the central intake facility to learn about the institutional processes and data requirements.

During the early stages of the assessment, the following information should be compiled:

- ◆ All relevant written classification policies and procedures;
- ◆ Agency annual reports;
- ◆ Current classification assessment instruments;
- ◆ Information about the MIS system and relevant statistics;
- ◆ Agency staffing and budget; and
- ◆ Any recently enacted or pending legislation or administrative policies that have affected or may affect classification practices.

What current classification policies, practices, or issues may affect the classification system? What trends are associated with these policies and practices? What outcomes are desired by the task force?

Subtask 3.2: Conduct a Classification System Assessment

Although the specific tasks associated with the assessment of the classification system cannot be fully articulated in this report because of variations in departmental structure and presenting issues, the activities described below should be completed during this phase of the work:

Hold an organizational meeting for the classification task force. The assessment should begin with a meeting whose purpose would be to bring the members of the task force together, to introduce members from other facilities/offices, review the overall objectives and tasks of the revalidation process, explain the purpose of any proposed onsite assessments, and to identify the key issues the task force will address. A time-task chart (see Exhibit 3) should be developed to reflect the specific goals and activities required to complete the revalidation.

The task force should determine whether local site visits are necessary and, if so, the purpose and structure of the site visit(s) should be identified, along with each task force member's roles and responsibilities.

Conduct interviews with central office and facility level classification staff. Depending on the department's decision to work with an outside consultant and/or the project leader's knowledge of the state's classification system, interviews with key supervisory and line classification staff concerning their classification tasks and concerns should be conducted. The purpose of these interviews is to clarify the state's current approach to classification policies, procedures, and instrumentation and to better ascertain the pragmatic issues that are of concern to line staff. It will not be possible to interview all or even a majority of the staff in large states; thus it will be necessary to carefully sample staff to ensure that a broad range of perspectives is captured during the assessment.

Observe the external classification process. As necessary, staff interviews may be augmented by a review of recently completed classification instruments and the data available for scoring the instruments. Task force members should have access to case files and should observe the process and criteria for making custody decisions. This work, coupled with staff interviews, should provide preliminary data on the quality and availability of the data required to score the instruments, the degree of discretion that exists in making classification decisions, and the reliability of the classification scores. These preliminary observations will ensure a more complete understanding of both formal and informal current policies and procedures.

Since staff time for interviews, observations, and file reviews is always limited by the demands of everyday work pressures, preparation for the assessment is very important. The project leader should identify the days that classification assessments and reviews are typically conducted and make advance arrangements for staff to access the completed instruments and case files. To ensure that the cases reviewed are representative of the inmate population, files should be randomly selected by the researcher, MIS, project leader, or outside consultant, if applicable.

Reconvene the task force. When completed, the preliminary findings should be presented to the full task force and the DOC commissioner or director. During this meeting, issues can be clarified and consensus reached on the project tasks, respective responsibilities of the task force members, and the consultant (if applicable). The project's time-task chart should be updated accordingly.

Subtask 3.3: Prepare and Submit Draft Assessment Report

Within 2 weeks of completing the assessment, a draft report documenting the findings from the classification assessment should be prepared by the consultant and/or project leader and submitted to the task force and DOC commissioner/director for review. The report should describe the agency's current practices, identify the classification issues, and document the agreed-on project time-task chart.

Subtask 3.4: Review and Finalize the Assessment Report

The consultant (if applicable) or project manager should poll the task force members and meet with the commissioner/director to identify questions raised by or corrections to the assessment report. Based on these discussions, the report should be finalized.

Task 4: Revalidate the Classification System

The specific tasks undertaken at this stage will vary depending on the current status of the state's revalidation efforts. Regardless of the current status or issues to be addressed, the subtasks described below should be completed.

Subtask 4.1: Develop a Preliminary Classification System

Once the assessment of the current classification system has been completed and the task force is fully versed on the process, trends, and issues, it must determine the changes to the classification system required to address current issues and trends.

For the classification process—

- ◆ Instruments: What instruments are used (initial classification, needs assessment, and reclassification)?
- ◆ Schedule: When are the instruments completed?
- ◆ Staffing: Who completes the respective instruments?
- ◆ Quality control: Who reviews overrides, conducts reliability checks, and performs other quality control reviews?
- ◆ MIS: When and how are classification data entered into the computer system?

- ◆ Strengths: What are the strengths of the current classification process?
- ◆ Weaknesses: What are the weaknesses of the current classification process?

For the preliminary classification instrument content and format—

- ◆ Risk factors: What factors need to be redefined, added, or deleted?
- ◆ Risk criteria: Do the categories within factors need to be redefined, added, or deleted?
- ◆ Offense severity scale: Is the offense severity scale complete and/or is the severity rating appropriate for all offenses?
- ◆ Institutional misconduct: Does the institutional disciplinary code meet classification needs? For example, does the task force need to identify predatory major infractions; are the disciplinary codes too global to differentiate among predatory, disruptive, and nuisance behaviors?
- ◆ Factor weights: Are the scores assigned to the respective risk factors and criteria appropriate?
- ◆ Scale cut points: Are the close/maximum custody (if applicable) and total scale cut points appropriate?
- ◆ Overrides: Are the appropriate mandatory and discretionary factors for overriding the scored custody level identified and defined?

A consensus-based decisionmaking process in which all members participate equally in the development of practical resolutions is recommended. If an impasse is encountered, pilot testing the alternative items provides the opportunity for rational decisionmaking while maintaining a cohesive work group. This consensus-building process is critical for generating a commitment to the revised system.

Subtask 4.2: Design Prototype Instruments and Manuals

Preliminary instruments and a training manual to document the revised system must be developed based on the resolutions of the task force. The operational definitions and instructions for each classification item should be specified. In addition, scales for ranking the severity of offenses and rating institutional misconduct may be modified as necessary. These scales should be included in the classification manual.

Preliminary revised classification instruments and the manual should be distributed to the task force to ensure all members' comments were accurately captured in the revised instruments and/or manual. At this point, final adjustments and corrections should be solicited.

A consensus-based decisionmaking process in which all members participate equally in the development of practical resolutions is recommended. If an impasse is encountered, pilot testing the alternative items provides the opportunity for rational decisionmaking while maintaining a cohesive work group.

Subtask 4.3: Pilot Test of the Preliminary Forms and Training Manual

A key subtask in the validation of a classification system is a scientific pilot test. This pilot test includes several steps, discussed below.

Draw a random sample of inmates. The specific sampling procedures should be tailored to the institutional populations of the agency or state, considering the average daily population, rate of admissions, and average length of stay separated by gender. In addition, stratification or oversampling of special subpopulations may be necessary, depending on the specific problems or issues prompting the revalidation effort. For example, if the state is considering the impact of truth-in-sentencing legislation, it may need to oversample inmates sentenced under the law.

The size of the samples required for the data analyses should be adjusted to the average daily population of the state. At a minimum, 300 reclassification instruments and 150 initial classification instruments should be completed. If the female population is small (less than 300 inmates), both initial and reclassification data should be completed for the entire female population to generate a sufficient number of cases for reliable statistical analyses.

Develop a supplemental data collection instrument and corresponding coding instructions. Supplemental data may be needed to record the detailed data required to verify the revised item definitions, weights, rankings, and scale cutoff points. If the department is testing an item based on the number and type of prior felony convictions, for example, data on the exact number, date, and type of prior convictions may be necessary. If available, these data can be retrieved from the state's MIS. If electronic data are not available or reliable, data will need to be manually collected from the appropriate case files and/or prison logs.

Collect data. Depending on the sophistication and reliability of the state's MIS, an electronic data file with the variables required to simulate the proposed changes to the classification instruments will need to be generated by MIS or research staff. For any manual data collection effort, it is recommended that members of the task force serve on the data collection team so they will be familiar with the preliminary classification and supplemental data collection instruments. Participation in the data collection effort will also facilitate their understanding of the results from the data analyses and ensuing recommendations.

To minimize the time required for data collection and entry and to ensure the quality of the data, the face validity and integrity of the data should be checked prior to data entry. For example, review of the data on preliminary classification instruments by an independent coder while the case file is readily available reduces time lost when data have to be clarified and/or recoded. This review also minimizes missing and inconsistent data.

Analyze data. Data generated by the preliminary instruments should be considered in detail to determine if they are valid and reliable factors for identifying inmates

To minimize the time required for data collection and entry and to ensure the quality of the data, the face validity and integrity of the data should be checked prior to data entry.

who pose a threat to the safety and security of the facilities. At this point in the process, the expertise of an outside consultant is most useful.

Appendix B provides a series of tables that illustrate the basic analyses to be conducted. For these examples, the dependent variable used was total institutional misconduct reports (minor and major). Selection of the specific dependent variable(s) should depend on the specific behavior(s) that the instruments are intended to predict. The department may, for example, want to examine the inmate's propensity for predatory behavior, escape, and/or overall institutional adjustment (minor and major misconduct reports) within a specified length of time. Separate analyses should be computed by gender to ensure that the final instruments are appropriate for both male and female inmates. At a minimum, a statistician will need to generate several key statistical reports:

- ◆ **Demographic and offense characteristics of the sample and, if available, the DOC inmate population.** These data describe the sample and allow for comparisons with the total inmate populations to ensure that the sample is representative of the total population. (See Exhibits B.1 and B.2.)
- ◆ **Frequency distribution and mean number of misconduct reports per category for the initial and reclassification risk factors by gender.** These tables provide insight as to the number and percentage of inmates who fall within each category of the respective risk factors. The mean number of institutional misconduct reports per risk factor category helps to identify risk factors/categories that do not create distinct groups of inmates, and also shows where further refinement of the risk factors may be necessary. (See Exhibits B.3 and B.4.)
- ◆ **Preliminary classification results.** In addition to the item-by-item analyses, the use of mandatory and discretionary override factors, as well as the preliminary and recommended custody level of the inmates, must be examined. (See Exhibit B.5.)
- ◆ **Stepwise multiple regression and correlation coefficients among the risk factors, institutional misconduct, escape, and total score.** A stepwise regression analysis will provide insight into the contribution of the respective risk factors to the total score. Factors that are not statistically related to the total score and/or institutional adjustment should be further refined or deleted from the instrument. It is useful to compare the contribution of the original classification instrument items with any items modified by the task force, and/or additional refinements suggested by the previous analyses, to ensure that all modifications improve the predictive power of the instrument.

A correlation matrix is critical for learning the strength and direction of the relationship between risk factors and the dependent variable(s). Special attention should be paid to the relationships among risk factors to determine if factors are duplicating or offsetting the impact of another factor. (See Exhibits B.6 and B.7.)

- ◆ **Determination of classification scale cut points.** Determination of the scale cut points is a multistep process. An elementary first step is to examine the distribution and mean number of institutional misconduct reports per total score. This will help to identify natural breaks in the distribution of inmates. A sudden increase in the number of institutional misconduct reports, for example, would suggest a shift from minimum to medium custody. These natural cut points should be further examined with an analysis of variance to determine if they create statistically distinct groups of inmates. (See Exhibits B.8. and B.9.)

Subtask 4.4: Present Findings and Recommendations

The statistical results and preliminary recommendations should be presented to the task force and commissioner/director for the department. This meeting(s) provides an opportunity for feedback and clarification of the findings and may highlight the need for additional analysis. Based on these discussions, the instruments, policies, and manual should be revised.

Task 5: Plan for Implementation

Careful planning before implementing the revisions is critical to ensure the success of the classification reforms. The first step is the development of a comprehensive plan for implementing the revised system that identifies each step of the process, specifies who is responsible for completing the step, and sets the timeline for completion of the steps.

Staffing

What new hires or reallocation of positions are required to complete the required tasks within the time schedule outlined by the policy and procedures?

Training of Staff

What will be the time schedule, location(s), identification of the trainer(s), agenda, materials needed, and practice cases prepared for the orientation session for all staff, as well as indepth training for the classification unit?

Implementation Timing

Will the implementation occur simultaneously across the department or will it be gradually implemented by facility, gender, and/or type of classification? Will non-DOC entities be affected by the modifications? If so, what changes are required in the information linkages?

Preparation of Materials

Who will be responsible for updating and printing the revised instruments, manuals, and/or policies? Who will be responsible for revising computerized classification instruments, rewriting the automated scoring programs, and updating the

system that tracks reclassifications and reassessments? When will these modifications be completed?

Impact Evaluation Planning

What data are required to assess the impact of the revised classification system (i.e., did the modifications accomplish the desired goals and objectives)?

Estimate of Costs

What are the estimated fiscal and staffing costs required to complete each element of the implementation plan?

Frequently, a key role for an outside consultant is to train staff to use the revised external classification process. Based on experiences with the 10 states and during other classification implementation efforts, a 2-day training session for the classification staff (supervisory and line staff), institution administrators, research, and MIS staff was required. This training session should cover all changes in the classification system, including but not limited to item definitions, weights, scale cut points, overrides, timing of reclassifications and assessments, changes in offense or misconduct severity scales, data sources, and MIS procedures/screens. Hands-on practice with a random sample of actual cases is also recommended. The training should also provide for reliability testing to ensure consistency across raters.

In addition to training staff, consultants are often sought to assist with such MIS issues as database design, development of management reports, and planning of quality control and audit procedures. A critical aspect of the implementation planning is the identification of MIS procedures and data requirements for monitoring the process and assessing the impact of the revisions on the correctional system. MIS reports must be simple and user friendly, yet informative, to track the integrity of the classification system. As part of the assessment of the department's commitment to reform, the department must be prepared to make changes to its MIS, recordkeeping systems, and other system components. Also imperative is the development of ongoing mechanisms for tracking legislative, fiscal, and population trends that may affect the classification system in the future.

The department will also need to develop an evaluation design to monitor the long-term impacts of revisions to the system. For each objective, the plan should outline the evaluation tasks, data to be collected, data analysis strategy, and time-task chart for impact assessment.

Task 6: Prepare a Detailed Report to Document the Revalidation Effort and Modifications

If “document, document, document” are the three most important commands when scoring an objective classification instrument, they are even more critical to completing the revalidation effort. At the close of the project, a written report that

Hands-on practice with a random sample of actual cases is recommended. The training should also provide for reliability testing to ensure consistency across raters.

If “document, document, document” are the three most important commands when scoring an objective classification instrument, they are even more critical to completing the revalidation effort.

Chapter 4

documents each stage of the revalidation process is critical. The report should be written in nontechnical language and should be distributed to administrative, facility-based officials and classification, supervisory, and line staff. Copies of the report should also be made available to inmate populations through the library.

Such a report should provide the history of the development and evolution of the classification system. It should also provide baseline data for tracking modifications to the system and for assessing their impact. Suggested sections and subsections are listed below:

- ◆ History of the DOC classification system
- ◆ Development of the DOC classification system
- ◆ Problems and strategies for improving the DOC classification system:
 - Problems with the existing classification system
 - Methodology for the revalidation of the classification system
- ◆ Revision of the classification system: issues and resolutions
- ◆ Profile of the inmate population by gender
- ◆ Refinement of the instruments and manual
 - Analyses of the issues identified by the classification task force
 - Predictive power of the classification system
- ◆ Classification system modification recommendations
- ◆ Conclusion
- ◆ Appendixes detailing revalidation preliminary initial and reclassification instruments, correlation coefficients (classification items and institutional misconduct), and inmate code of conduct and offense severity index.

five

CHAPTER

Common Issues, Problems and Solutions, and Next Steps

Common Issues

The revalidation initiatives completed by these 10 states all varied as to the set of issues, revalidation methodology, and recommendations for refining or revising the system. Let it never be said that the development and revalidation of classification systems are boring or repetitive, for although each state undertook the same basic tasks, the complexity of the correctional systems in which the classification system operated created a special set of issues, problems, and solutions for each state system. Hence, it is imperative that the classification system be validated for the correctional population to which it would be applied.

Certain common themes across states prompted the agencies to pursue revalidation of their classification systems, including the need to assess the potential impact of recent truth-in-sentencing and three-strikes legislation, validate the classification instruments for female populations, and better differentiate among aggressive inmates to refine and update administrative segregation and maximum custody populations.

These issues reflect current crime control policies and U.S. correctional practices. It is anticipated that other states will be faced with the management of inmates with lengthy sentences, mandatory sentences, and/or declining parole rates. They also will have to contend with such issues as the validity of classification systems for female and geriatric inmates and inmates with HIV/AIDS. Classification systems are living systems that require ongoing monitoring and refinement.

The issues that may prompt a revalidation of the classification are as varied as the correctional systems in which the classification instruments are used. This should not be interpreted to mean, however, that an agency should revalidate its system with the passage of every new piece of legislation. A well-designed system should be sufficiently robust to withstand the influences of minor modifications in legislation or departmental policies. In general, the instruments should be revalidated every 2 or 3 years, on the passage of legislation that prompts major shifts in the inmate populations, or before implementing any changes to the classification instruments or process.

A well-designed system should be sufficiently robust to withstand the influences of minor modifications in legislation or departmental policies.

Situations that might prompt the need for a revalidation effort include—

- ◆ Legislation that affects admissions or time served by various offender subpopulations;
- ◆ Development of community-based programs or housing that requires the identification of inmates appropriate for placement in the community (i.e., those who are at low risk for recidivism or walkaway);
- ◆ Development or elimination of institution-based program opportunities;
- ◆ Settlement of a major court case or memorandum of agreement that requires specific modifications to the classification system;
- ◆ Observation of offender trends that suggest the current inmate population differs from that on which the classification system was originally validated;
- ◆ Observation of such classification system trends as inflation of override rates or distribution of offenders across the custody levels that suggests the system is not operating efficiently or effectively; and/or
- ◆ Modification of such departmental policies as the disciplinary code, the internal classification process, or the services available for inmates with mental health, medical, and/or geriatric needs.

Frequent Problems and Possible Solutions

Delays, Delays, and More Delays

The universal problem or barrier encountered by the 10 states that participated in this NIC initiative was the difficulty of meeting the deadlines set in the project time-task chart. Delays were generated from many sources, including competition for staff time, attention to daily operational responsibilities, legislative demands, other departmental projects, data collection and/or entry, and staff turnover. Although each delay was legitimate, a key role of the project leader was to exert pressure on the task force members and/or the commissioner—after encountering continued delays or setbacks—to renew or fulfill their commitment to the revalidation effort. The project leader frequently had to prompt the task force members about their roles and remind them of the due dates for their tasks. The fortitude of the project leader was critical to managing the project time-task chart. An important role of the outside consultant, as well, is to prompt the department to move forward; often he or she is influential in getting stalled tasks back on track.

Data Collection Nightmares

A second common problem encountered was difficulty compiling the detailed data required to refine classification items. All, or a significant proportion of, the required data had to be collected manually in 8 of the 10 states. In some instances,

The universal problem or barrier encountered by the 10 states...was the difficulty of meeting the deadlines set in the project time-task chart.

Common Issues, Problems and Solutions, and Next Steps

data were collected on several hundred cases. These paper data collection instruments had to be converted to electronic files and merged with other electronic files. Each step was time consuming and costly. On the other hand, electronic data files were often of poor quality and difficult to manage. These problems, however, should not discourage an agency from undertaking a revalidation of its classification system. Frequently, there were unanticipated benefits from the data collection efforts, such as—

- ◆ Identification of new solutions to the classification issues;
- ◆ Identification of previously undetected MIS or system data sources;
- ◆ Development of staff morale and commitment to the changes;
- ◆ Higher confidence in and understanding of the statistical results and support for recommended modifications; and/or
- ◆ Opportunity for checking the accuracy and reliability of data prior to analyses.

The most efficient and effective strategy for collecting manual data was to designate a task force subcommittee to serve as a data collection team. Because the task force members were already familiar with the revalidation issues and preliminary instruments, it was easy to train them for data collection. Task force members were generally highly committed to the revalidation effort and did not perceive the data collection to be a tedious task that was unrelated to their current responsibilities. Such a team should receive detailed training on the preliminary classification instruments and any supplemental data collection forms.

The data collection effort should be scheduled for a 1- or 2-week period during which randomly selected cases are pulled and brought to central or regional locations. The data collection team should be relieved of their daily responsibilities and assigned the task of coding the instruments for all cases. Before returning the files to the record room, the completed data collection instruments should be reviewed for face validity and completion. Cases with missing or contradictory data should be immediately returned to the coder for correction.

It is also recommended that a small sample of cases be coded twice to check for accuracy and consistency among coders. This process ensures that the data collectors were properly trained, the data are complete and accurate, and the data are collected quickly and efficiently.

This strategy creates stress for the agency during the data collection effort in terms of travel costs for the data collection team, temporary staff reassignments, and the need to transport the files to the central or regional data collection site(s). However, the resulting data are generally collected much faster and with greater accuracy than long-term efforts. If temporary workers are recruited or data collection is an addition to current responsibilities, for example, there are almost always repeated delays and high rates of missing and erroneous data.

Electronic data files were often of poor quality and difficult to manage. These problems should not discourage an agency from undertaking a revalidation of its system.

Offender Profile Data to be Collected**I. Identification Data**

Name
 Prison identification number
 Date of birth
 Gender
 Marital status
 Race
 Ethnicity
 DOC admission date
 DOC admission type—
 new commitment, parole
 violation, inter-state
 transfer, federal, etc.

II. Criminal History Data

Current convictions
 Total prison sentence
 Type of sentence—
 truth-in-sentencing,
 parole eligibility, etc.
 Projected release date
 Presence and type of
 warrants or detainers
 Prior convictions—type
 and number
 Prior commitments—type
 and number
 Escape history—type and
 date of escape and/or
 walkaway

III. Classification Data

All classification scoring
 items—score and actual
 behavior scored
 Close custody score (if
 applicable)
 Total classification score
 Preliminary custody level
 Mandatory override factors
 Discretionary override
 factors
 Recommended classification
 level
 Date of classification
 assessment
 Classification officer
 Supervisor, if override
 recommended
 Final classification level

IV. Housing Data

Facility assignment
 Current facility
 Current housing assignment
 (special management,
 close, medium, minimum)
 Housing unit
 Date of transfer to current
 location

V. Disciplinary Data

Type of infraction or incident
 Date of infraction
 Disposition of disciplinary
 hearing
 Location of infraction
 Officer reporting the incident

Navigating the System to Create Change

There will always be unanticipated crises or conflicts that arise during the revalidation process. Thus, the third frequently encountered problem was the difficulty of navigating the sociopolitical environment of the correctional system to create change. Competition within the agency for staff time and resources and priority for the revalidation process were among many pressures encountered by the revalidation task forces. One state, for example, had an inmate escape from a secure facility, during the course of the pilot test, which received extensive press coverage. This created pressures to modify the preliminary instruments and collect additional data required to validate the specific modifications. In addition, mandatory override factors were imposed on the classification process. Another state experienced budget cuts by the legislature and a third state had to regroup to consider the impact of proposed sentencing legislation.

The ability to complete required tasks successfully and implement recommended changes depends on the quality of the assessment completed at the onset of the project. A superficial or incomplete assessment increases the likelihood that another issue or problem will be detected midway through or, even worse, at the end of the revalidation project. To anticipate such issues or delayed questions, a department should compile complete criminal history, demographic, and needs assessment data on its inmate populations, in addition to the comprehensive system assessment. (See sidebar for a list of offender profile data to be collected.) When collecting these data, the department should avoid collapsing data across categories to prevent blurring across subpopulations. For example, the exact number of prior convictions should be counted and recorded, rather than categories such as “zero,” “one to three,” and “four or more.” These raw data will provide for alternative items and/or categories within items.

The composition of the task force is also critical for navigating the sociopolitical environment. Representation from all major operational areas will help to ensure that competition for agency resources and/or priorities can be resolved as part of revalidation and implementation planning. Selection of task force members who are well respected, knowledgeable, and creative will make for much smoother sailing.

An important element of the implementation plan is to develop departmental and inmate buy-in for the modifications. There are many strategies for creating support or buy-in for the classification initiative, such as distributing copies of the revalidation report or its executive summary; hosting “brown-bag lunches” to discuss the changes; or presenting a brief review of the changes and the rationale for making them at the custody staff briefings. The marketing strategies are limited only by the creativity of the task force.

Implications and Future Steps

As suggested by the rather lengthy list of reasons for undertaking a revalidation study, this work will continue to evolve. NIC remains committed to supporting state and local correctional agencies in their efforts to upgrade and fine-tune their classification systems through cooperative agreements and technical assistance contracts that provide agencies access to consultants experienced in the development and revalidation of classification systems.

Current and future initiatives include regional and national objective classification training opportunities. The issues addressed by these 10 states also have prompted NIC to focus more attention on the classification of such special inmate populations as female offenders, administrative segregation/maximum custody inmates, geriatric populations, and inmates serving life or lengthy sentences.

Participating states repeatedly identified the need to develop an objective, systematic *internal* classification system to guide housing, program, and work assignment decisions at the institutional level to promote better inmate management as a critical next step upon completion of the revalidation effort.²⁶ Furthermore, the need to develop comprehensive classification systems that require the expenditure of fewer resources to link the intake assessment processes, external classification, internal classification, and inmate supervision and programs becomes more critical with each new admission. Future technical assistance efforts must focus on assisting states to develop systems that are practical given these harsh realities.

Participating states repeatedly identified as critical the need to develop an objective *internal* classification system to guide housing, program, and work assignment decisions at the institutional level.

APPENDIX A

External Classification Instruments Validated by Select States

Exhibit A.1. Virginia Department of Corrections Initial Inmate Classification Score Sheet

Inmate Name. _____ **Number.** _____ **Date.** _____

1. HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE (Jail or prison, score most serious within last 5 years.)

- None0 _____
- Assault not involving use of a weapon and not resulting in serious injury8
- Assault involving use of a weapon and/or resulting in serious injury or death20

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

- Low0 _____
- Low moderate1
- Moderate3
- High8
- Highest15

3. PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY SEVERITY (Refer to the Severity of Offense Scale. Score most serious felony conviction in inmate’s history.)

- None0 _____
- Low or low moderate1
- Moderate2
- High7
- Highest10

4. ESCAPE HISTORY (Last 5 years)

- None0 _____
- An escape or attempt from outside security perimeter4
- An escape or attempt from within security perimeter and/or from custody or direct supervision8

5. LENGTH OF TIME REMAINING TO SERVE

- 5 years or less2 _____
- 5 years 1 day – 10 years4
- 10 years 1 day – 20 years10
- 20 years 1 day – 80 years15
- 80 years 1 day – LIFE/LIFE +20

6. CURRENT DETAINER

- None0 _____
- Felony and/or INS detainer10

7. CURRENT AGE

- Under age 212 _____
- 21–260
- 27–34-4
- 36 and above-6

8. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS

- None0 _____
- One2
- Two or more4

9. OTHER STABILITY FACTORS (Score all appropriate factors.)

- High school diploma or GED.-1 _____
- Employed or attending school (full- or part-time) for 6 months or longer-1
- Prior successful confinement in Security Level I-2

TOTAL POINTS _____

Exhibit A.2. Virginia Department of Corrections Inmate Reclassification Score Sheet

INMATE NAME: _____ **NUMBER:** _____ **DATE:** _____

LAST DATE RECEIVED: _____ **(DRC OR RFP):** _____

1. HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE (Jail or prison, score most serious within last 5 years.)

- None 0 _____
- Assault not involving use of a weapon and not resulting in serious injury 8
- Assault involving use of a weapon and/or resulting in serious injury or death 20

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

- Low 0 _____
- Low moderate 1
- Moderate 2
- High 5
- Highest 10

3. PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY SEVERITY (Refer to the Severity of Offense Scale. Score most serious felony conviction in inmate’s history.)

- None 0 _____
- Low or low moderate 1
- Moderate 2
- High 5
- Highest 7

4. ESCAPE HISTORY (Last 5 years)

- None 0 _____
- An escape or attempt from outside security perimeter 4
- An escape or attempt from within security perimeter and/or from custody or direct supervision 8

5. LENGTH OF TIME REMAINING TO SERVE

- 5 years or less 2 _____
- 5 years 1 day – 10 years 4
- 10 years 1 day – 20 years 10
- 20 years 1 day – 80 years 15
- 80 years 1 day – LIFE/LIFE + 20

6. CURRENT DETAINER

- None 0 _____
- Felony and/or INS detainer 10

7. CURRENT AGE

- Under age 21 2 _____
- 21–26 0
- 27–34 -4
- 36 and above -6

8. INSTITUTIONAL DISCIPLINARY RECORD (Last 24 months)

- None in the last 24 months -6 _____
- None in the last 12 months -2
- None in the last 6 months -1
- One in the last 6 months 2
- Two in the last 6 months 6
- Three in the last 6 months 12

Exhibit A.2. Virginia Department of Corrections Inmate Reclassification Score Sheet (continued)

9. SEVERITY OF MOST SERIOUS REPORT (Last 24 months)

None	0	_____
Low moderate	2	
Moderate	4	
High	10	
Highest	20	

10. CLASS LEVEL ASSIGNMENT

EFFECTIVE DATE: _____

GCA/ESC LEVEL I (L-1 or V-1) -4	GCA/ESC LEVEL III	0	_____
GSA/ESC LEVEL II (L-2 or V-2) -2	GCA/ESC LEVEL IV	4	

Exhibit A.3. Virginia Department of Corrections Classification Summary Report

INMATE NAME: _____ NUMBER: _____ UNIT: _____
DATE: _____ CIRC: _____ MED. LOC: _____ MH: _____
ANNUAL REVIEW: _____ ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW: _____ TOTAL SCORE: _____

SCORED SECURITY LEVEL

to +6 pts.....LEVEL 1 14 – 20 pts.....LEVEL 3 28 – 33pts.....LEVEL 5
7 – 13 ptsLEVEL 2 21 – 27 pts.....LEVEL 4 34+ pts.....LEVEL 6

MANDATORY RESTRICTORS

- R1 More than 20 years remaining to serve (must be assigned to Level III or higher)
- R2 Current violent sex offense (must be assigned to Level III or higher)
- R3 1st degree murder (must be assigned to Level II or higher)
- R4 Enemy at scored level

DISCRETIONARY OVERRIDES

High — Increases Security Level

- H1 Assaultive prior institutional conduct
- H2 Serious prior criminal record indicates caution
- H3 Severity of current offense
- H4 Serious escape history/risk
- H5 Recent pattern of poor institutional adjustment
- H6 Needs to establish stable adjustment
- H7 Other _____

Low — Decreases Security Level

- L1 Exceptional institutional conduct
- L2 Singular nature of incident
- L3 Prior success at lower level
- L4 Other _____

ICA RECOMMENDATIONS

TOTAL SCORE: _____ RESTRICTOR: _____ OVERRIDE: _____ RECOMMENDED LEVEL: _____
PRIMARY TREATMENT(S) NEEDED: _____
RECOMMENDED ASSIGNMENTS: _____ COMMENTS: _____
SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

WARDEN/SUPERINTENDENT ACTION

APPROVE ICA DISAPPROVE ICA RESTRICTOR _____ OVERRIDE _____ SECURITY LEVEL _____
ASSIGNMENTS: _____ COMMENTS: _____
SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

CENTRAL CLASSIFICATION BOARD

APPROVE DISAPPROVE RESTRICTOR: _____ OVERRIDE: _____ SECURITY LEVEL: _____
COMMENTS: _____
SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

Exhibit A.4. Virginia Department of Corrections — Security Levels

Levels	Restrictions
Level 1 — Low	No Murder I or II, robbery, sex-related crime, kidnap/abduction, felonious assault (current or prior), flight/escape, carjacking, malicious wounding, and assault/flight/FTA pattern, no escape risks, no felony detainers, and no disruptive behaviors.
Level 1 — High	No Murder I or II, sex-related crime, kidnap/abduction, and flight/escape history, and no disruptive behaviors in last 24 months.
Level 2	For Initial Assignment only: No escape history within past 5 years. Single life sentences must have reached parole eligibility date. No disruptive behavior in last 24 months prior to consideration for a transfer to any less secure facility.
Level 3	Single, multiple, and life+ sentences—must have served 20 consecutive years of sentence. No disruptive behavior in last 24 months prior to consideration for a transfer to any less secure facility.
Level 4	Long Term: Single, multiple, and life+ sentences. No disruptive behavior in last 24 months prior to consideration for a transfer to any less secure facility.
Level 5	Long Term: Single, multiple, and life+ sentences. No disruptive behavior in last 24 months prior to consideration for a transfer to any less secure facility.
Level 6	Long Term: Single, multiple, and life+ sentences. Profile: Disruptive, assaultive, severe behavior problems, predatory-type behavior, and/or escape risk. No disruptive behavior in last 24 months prior to consideration for a transfer to any less secure facility.

Exhibit A.5. Montana Department of Corrections Initial Custody Classification Instrument

Name: _____ AO#: _____
 (Last) (First) (M)

Facility: MSP TSCTC Pre-release Ctr Other _____ Date of Birth: ____/____/____

Sex: 1 = Male 2 = Female Race: 1 = Nat. Am. 2 = White 3 = Hispanic 4 = Black 5 = Other: _____

1. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CONVICTION, DETAINER, OR WARRANT

Highest severity7	
High severity5	
Moderate severity3	
Low severity1	_____
		Score

2. SEVERITY OF INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR (Rate the last 3 years.)

Category I report(s) (see appendix B)7	
Category II report(s) (see appendix B)5	
3+ Severe reports (not classified as Category I or II report)2	
No violations within last 3 years0	_____
		Score

3. ESCAPE HISTORY (Rate the last 3 years.)

Escape or attempted escape from a secure facility (Work dorm classified as secure facility)7	
Escape/walkaway from prerelease, TSCTC4	
Walkaway from work release or monitoring program2	
None within last 3 years0	_____
		Score

4. SEVERITY OF FELONY CONVICTIONS DURING 7 YEARS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION (Do not include current conviction.)

1+ Highest severity or 3+ High severity6	
1-2 High severity4	
0 Highest/high severity with 1+ moderate severity2	
0 Highest/high/moderate severity with only low severity0	_____
		Score

5. NUMBER OF CATEGORY I OR II RULE VIOLATIONS. PREDATORY/ASSAULTIVE BEHAVIOR (Rate last 3 years.)

3+ Category I or II reports (see appendix B)4	
1-2 Category I or II reports (see appendix B)2	
0 No Category I or II reports0	_____
		Score

CUSTODY SCORE BASED ON ITEMS 1-5; 7-9 Medium I/restricted; 10-13 Close; 14+ Maximum _____
 Score

6. FELONY CONVICTIONS DURING 3 YEARS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION

4+4	
2-32	
0-10	_____
		Score

Exhibit A.5. Montana Department of Corrections Initial Custody Classification Instrument (continued)

7. SENTENCE LENGTH (Total of all consecutive sentences - Use sentence commencement date.)
 (Score consecutive pre-4/95 and post-4/95 sentences as a post-4/95 sentence.)

* Sentenced prior to April 12, 1995 ()

30+ year sentence/life Sentence2
11-29 year sentence/total of consecutive1
1-10 year sentence/total of consecutive0

* If designated as "Dangerous Offender," multiply by 2.

* Sentenced after April 12, 1995 ()

30+ year sentence/life sentence5
11-29 year sentence/total of consecutive1
1-10 year sentence/total of consecutive0

Score

8. FORMAL VIOLATIONS WHILE ON PAROLE/PROBATION DURING PAST 3 YEARS

3+2
1-21
00

Score

9. AGE AT FIRST FELONY CONVICTION

Age 16 or less3
Age 17-212
Age 22-251
Age 26 or more0

Score

TOTAL SCORE

Custody Scale based on Items 1-5:

Medium I/restricted	=	7-9
Close	=	10-13
Maximum	=	14+

TOTAL POINTS SCALE

Minimum/unrestricted	=	0-3 Total score
Minimum/restricted	=	4-8 Total score
Medium/unrestricted	=	9-11 Total score
Medium/restricted	=	12-16 Total score
Close	=	17-22 Total score
Maximum	=	23+ points OR death penalty case

PRELIMINARY CUSTODY LEVEL (Circle Highest Custody based on Items 1-5 or Total Score.)

1 = Minimum/unrestricted	4 = Medium/restricted
2 = Minimum/restricted	5 = Close
3 = Medium/unrestricted	6 = Maximum

OVERRIDE FACTORS (Circle the appropriate reason(s):

1 = Special management	7 = Institutional need: _____
2 = Psychiatric/suicide risk	8 = Adjustment problem/violence threat
3 = Medical	9 = Inmate need: _____
4 = Escape threat	10 = Exemplary institutional adjustment
5 = Detainer	11 = Court ordered
6 = Investigation pending	

Exhibit A.5. Montana Department of Corrections Initial Custody Classification Instrument (continued)

RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL (Circle appropriate level.)

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 = Minimum/unrestricted | 4 = Medium/restricted |
| 2 = Minimum/restricted | 5 = Close |
| 3 = Medium/unrestricted | 6 = Maximum |
| | 7 = Administrative segregation |

Classification Clerk

Date

Comments (explain overrides in detail):

Final Custody Level (Circle appropriate level.)

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 = Minimum/unrestricted | 4 = Medium/restricted |
| 2 = Minimum/restricted | 5 = Close |
| 3 = Medium/unrestricted | 6 = Maximum |
| | 7 = Administrative segregation |

Classification Clerk

Date

Comments:

White – File

Canary – Counselor

Pink – BOP

Exhibit A.6. Montana Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument

Name: _____ AO#: _____
 (Last) (First) (M)

Facility: MSP TSCTC Pre-release Ctr Other _____ Date of Birth: ____/____/____

Custody: 1 = Min-Unres 2 = Min-Res 3 = Med-Unres 4 = Med-Res 5 = Close 6 = Maximum 7 = Disp.Seg.

Prior Classification Date: ____/____/____ Current Date: ____/____/____

1. SEVERITY OF INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR (Rate the last 3 years.)

- Category I report(s) (see appendix B)6
 - Category II report(s) (see appendix B)3
 - 3+ severe reports (not classified as Category I or II report)1
 - No violations within last 3 years0
- _____ Score

2. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CONVICTION, DETAINER, OR WARRANT

- Highest severity6
 - High severity5
 - Moderate severity1
 - Low severity0
- _____ Score

3. ESCAPE HISTORY (Rate the last 3 years.)

- Escape or attempted escape from a secure facility (Work dorm classified as secure facility)6
 - Escape/walkaway from prerelease, TSCTC4
 - Walkaway from work release or monitoring program2
 - No violations within last 3 years0
- _____ Score

4. SEVERITY OF FELONY CONVICTIONS DURING 7 YEARS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION (Do not include current conviction.)

- 1+ Highest severity or 3+ high severity4
 - 1-2 High severity3
 - 0 Highest/high severity with 1+ moderate severity1
 - 0 Highest/high/moderate severity with only low severity0
- _____ Score

5. NUMBER OF CLASS I OR II RULE VIOLATIONS, PREDATORY/ASSAULTIVE BEHAVIORS (Rate last 3 years.)

- 3+ Category I or II reports4
 - 1-2 Category I or II reports2
 - 0 No Category I or II reports0
- _____ Score

CUSTODY SCORE BASED ON ITEMS 1-5: 7-9 Medium I/restricted; 10-13 Close; 14+ Maximum _____
 Score

Exhibit A.6. Montana Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument (continued)

6. NUMBER OF MAJOR/SEVERE REPORTS (Rate the last 6 months.)

3+ Reports or return from prerelease/TSCTC for disciplinary reasons4	
1-2 Reports2	
00	_____
		Score

7. PERFORMANCE IN RECOMMENDED TREATMENT/EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Noncompliant4	
Waiting for treatment slot or currently enrolled in program(s)0	
All recommended programs completed	-.1	_____
		Score

8. INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT/WORK PERFORMANCE (Rate the last 6 months.)

Poor ratings from both work and housing unit team2	
1 poor rating from either work or housing unit team1	
Positive ratings from both work and housing unit team0	
Positive ratings from both work and housing unit team for 3 years	-.1	_____
		Score

White – File
Canary – Counselor
Pink – Inmate

Exhibit A.6. Montana Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument (continued)

9. SENTENCE REMAINING (Total of all consecutive sentences.)

(Score consecutive pre-4/95 and post-4/95 sentences as a post-4/95 sentence.)

* Sentenced prior to April 12, 1995 ()	Time Remaining: _____
30+ years/life sentence2
11–29 years1
1–10 years0
* If designated as “Dangerous Offender,” multiply by 2.	
* Sentenced after April 12, 1995 ()	
30+ year sentence/life sentence5
11–29 year sentence/total of consecutive1
1–10 year sentence/total of consecutive0

_____ Score

TOTAL SCORE _____

Custody Scale based on Items 1–5:

Medium I/restricted	=	7–9
Close	=	10–13
Maximum	=	14+

TOTAL POINTS SCALE

Minimum/unrestricted	=	0–3 Total score
Minimum/restricted	=	4–8 Total score
Medium/unrestricted	=	9–11 Total score
Medium/restricted	=	12–16 Total score
Close	=	17–22 Total score
Maximum	=	23+ points OR death penalty case

PRELIMINARY CUSTODY LEVEL (Circle Highest Custody based on Items 1–5 or Total Score.)

1 = Minimum/unrestricted	4 = Medium/restricted
2 = Minimum/restricted	5 = Close
3 = Medium/unrestricted	6 = Maximum

OVERRIDE FACTORS (Circle the appropriate reason(s).):

1 = Special management	7 = Institutional need: _____
2 = Psychiatric/suicide risk	8 = Adjustment problem/violence threat
3 = Medical	9 = Inmate need: _____
4 = Escape threat	10 = Exemplary institutional adjustment
5 = Detainer	11 = Court ordered
6 = Investigation pending	

RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL (Circle appropriate level.)

1 = Minimum/unrestricted	4 = Medium/restricted
2 = Minimum/restricted	5 = Close
3 = Medium/unrestricted	6 = Maximum
	7 = Administrative segregation

Classification Clerk: _____

Comments (explain overrides in detail):

Exhibit A.6. Montana Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument (continued)

Final Custody Level (circle appropriate level):

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 = Minimum/unrestricted | 4 = Medium/restricted |
| 2 = Minimum/restricted | 5 = Close |
| 3 = Medium/unrestricted | 6 = Maximum |
| | 7 = Administrative segregation |

Unit Manager: _____

Comments:

White – File

Canary – Counselor

Pink – Inmate

Exhibit A.7. Oregon Department of Corrections Classification Worksheet

INMATE NAME: _____ SID#: _____

INSTITUTIONAL RISK

I1 INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT

- A NONE _____ / _____ / _____ DATE OF LAST DR
- B UP TO 3 IN LAST 12 MONTHS _____ Number in last 12 months (count by case #)
- C 4 TO 6 IN LAST 12 MONTHS
- D MORE THAN 6 IN LAST 12 MONTHS

I2 SEVERITY OF INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT

- A NO HIGH OR MODERATE FORMAL SANCTION IN LAST 12 MONTHS
 - B 1 OR MORE LOW FORMAL SANCTIONS IN LAST 6 MONTHS _____ # DR's Rule # _____
 - C 1 OR MORE MODERATE OR HIGH FORMAL SANCTIONS IN LAST 12 MONTHS
WHICH DO NOT PRESENT SERIOUS MANAGEMENT CONCERNS _____ # DR's Rule # _____
 - D 1 OR MORE HIGH FORMAL SANCTIONS (NO TIME LIMIT) WHICH
DO PRESENT SERIOUS MANAGEMENT CONCERNS _____ # DR's Rule # _____
- _____ / _____ / _____ Date of DR used in this question DR case # _____

I3 COMPLIANCE WITH PRIMARY PROGRAM

- A FULL COMPLIANCE WITH PRIMARY PROGRAM
 - B NON COMPLIANCE WITH PRIMARY PROGRAM..... _____ Work _____ Program
- SOURCE: _____ Incident/Performance Report
 _____ Program Evaluation
 _____ Program Plan–Earned Time Credits

I4 GANG AFFILIATION _____

SOURCE:

- A NOT A CONFIRMED ACTIVE GANG AFFILIATE _____ GET Team/Officer Safety Alert
- B CONFIRMED ACTIVE GANG AFFILIATE BUT NO DEMONSTRATED
GANG BEHAVIORS CAUSING MANAGEMENT CONCERNS _____ CCH/PPDS
- C CONFIRMED ACTIVE GANG AFFILIATE AND HAS DEMONSTRATED
GANG BEHAVIORS THAT PRESENT SERIOUS MANAGEMENT
CONCERNS _____ PSI/PSR/Rev. report
 _____ Misconduct record
 _____ Inmate self-report
 _____ CMI Chrono

I5 SUBSTANCE ABUSE

SOURCE:

- A NONE _____ # Convictions last 5 years _____ Institution Face Sheet/Detainer
- B 1 IN LAST 5 YEARS _____ # DR sanctions last 5 years _____ Sentence Order/CMI court orders
- C 2 OR MORE IN LAST 5 YEARS _____ # Parole/Probation sanctions _____ CCH/FBI/PPDS/DMV
- _____ # Positive UAs _____ PSI/PSR/Revocation report
- _____ # Structured sanction/violations _____ Misconduct record
- _____ CMI Chrono/UA log
- _____ Inmate self-report
- _____ Structured sanction screen

I6 AGE

THIS QUESTION IS SCORED AUTOMATICALLY BY THE COMPUTER PROGRAM. VERIFY THE INMATE'S DATE OF BIRTH AS ENTERED IN THE DOC400!

COUNSELOR NAME: _____ DATE: _____

INTERVIEW DETAILS:

CLASSWORK.SHT (5/97)

Exhibit A.8. Oregon Department of Corrections Classification Worksheet

Scored according to Rule #104 (Tab #69), Classification (Inmate), dated 10/01/94

INMATE NAME: _____ SID#: _____

PUBLIC RISK

P1 SEVERITY OF OFFENSE

FBI: _____ PPDS: YES NO

- A CLASS C FELONY CRIME CLASSIFIED _____ SCF: _____
- B CLASS B FELONY
- C CLASS A FELONY NEEDS: A__B__C__D__E__F__G__H__
- D AGGRAVATED MURDER, MURDER, OR ATTEMPT

P2 EXTENT OF VIOLENCE

SOURCE:

- A NONE
- B THREAT OF INJURY OR MINOR INJURY
- C SERIOUS INJURY
- D DEATH — NOT AGGRAVATED MURDER OR MURDER
- E DEATH — AGGRAVATED MURDER OR MURDER

- ___ Not a person-to-person offense
- ___ Crime is person-to-person (minimum score B)
- ___ Medical/counseling costs over \$500
Medical amount _____
- ___ CCH/PPDS/FBI ___ Inmate self-report ___ PVrpt
- ___ PSI/PSR/Police rpt/Indictment/sentence order
- ___ CMI Chrono

P3 WEAPON USED

SOURCE:

- A NONE _____ No Weapon Used
- B YES _____ Weapon Used
Weapon Type _____
_____ Death of Victim

- ___ PSI/PSR/BAF/Police report/Indictment/
Sentence Order
- ___ CCH/PPDS/PPDS Case Summary
- ___ XCON poss./Weapon poss.
- ___ Inmate self-report
- ___ Codefendant in possession of weapon

P4 HISTORY OF VIOLENCE

- A NO PRIOR PERSON-TO-PERSON ARREST OR CONVICTION
- B ONE PRIOR FELONY PERSON-TO-PERSON CONVICTION W/IN LAST 10 YEARS DATE ____/____/____
- C ONE OR MORE INCIDENTS IN LAST 12 MONTHS # DRs _____ # Arrests/Convictions _____
- D MULTIPLE PERSON-TO-PERSON
FELONY CONVICTIONS (NO TIME LIMITS) Crime(s) of Conviction _____

- SOURCE: _____ BAF/PSI/PSR/Revo. rpt _____ CCH/FBI/PPDS _____ Misconduct record
 _____ Detainer _____ CM Court Orders/Inst. Facesheet
 (EXPIRED)
 _____ Inmate self-report _____ CMI Chrono

Exhibit A.8. Oregon Department of Corrections Classification Worksheet (continued)

P5 PRIOR ESCAPES (MUST MEET ESCAPE DEFINITION!)

- A NO ESCAPES/ATTEMPTS LAST 36 MONTHS
- B RETURNED FROM ESCAPE/ATTEMPT LAST 36 MTHS
- C ANY ESCAPE/ATTEMPT INVOLVING VIOLENCE—
(NO TIME LIMIT AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED)

SOURCE:

- ___ CMI Court Orders/CMI Housing Hist./ Assign rec.
- ___ CCH/PPDS/PSI/Rev. Rec.
- ___ DR/Unusual Incident Report
- ___ Inmate self-report Unauth. Departure_____
- DATE OF RETURN TO CUSTODY ___/___/___

P6 TIME REMAINING (Use Projected Release Date)

- A LESS THAN 13 MONTHS # of months remaining ___ PDH/PRD/GTD date ___/___/___
- B 13 THRU 24 MONTHS Minimum sentence ___ SB1145 date ___/___/___
- C 25 THRU 36 MONTHS SGL sentence ___ Proj Rel date ___/___/___
- D MORE THAN 36 MONTHS Matrix range _____to_____

P7 FELONY DETAINER

- A NO DETAINER ON FILE
- B CLASS C FELONY DETAINER
- C CLASS A OR B DETAINER, ANY FELONY
PERSON-TO-PERSON DETAINER, INS DETAINER

SOURCE:

- ___ Misdemeanor detainer only in file
- ___ U.S. immigration detainer (use OCIC requests)
- ___ Verified felony detainer (Agency contacted)___
- ___ Person-to-person crime detainer_____

Exhibit A.9. State of Oregon Department of Corrections Classification Custody Matrix

INSTITUTIONAL RISK

		Up to 47	48–52	53–58	59–82	83 or More
P U B L I C R I S K	UP TO 92	MIN	MIN	MED	MED	MAX
	93–101	MIN	MIN	MED	MED	MAX
	102–126	MED	MED	MED	CLOSE	MAX
	127–153	MED	MED	CLOSE	CLOSE	MAX
	154 OR MORE	CLOSE	CLOSE	CLOSE	CLOSE	MAX

Exhibit A.10. Oklahoma Department of Corrections Initial Custody Assessment

A. IDENTIFICATION

Date: ____/____/____

Inmate Name (Last, First, Middle): _____ Inmate DOC #: _____

Reception Date: _____ Race/Sex: _____ Date of Birth: _____

B. CUSTODY EVALUATION

Score _____

1. SEVERITY OF CURRENT CONVICTION

(Use Offense Severity Scale in Attachment A: Rate most serious current charge/conviction, including any CC, CS cases, detainers/warrants.)

- Low = 0 pts.
- High = 5 pts.
- Moderate = 2 pts.
- Highest = 6 pts.

2. SERIOUS OFFENSE HISTORY (Excluding Current Offense:

Use Offense Severity Scale in Attachment A.)

- None or Low (past 5 yrs) = 0 pts.
- High (past 10 yrs) = 4 pts.
- Moderate (past 5 yrs) = 1 pt.
- Highest (past 10 yrs) = 6 pts.

3. ESCAPE HISTORY

- No escapes or attempts = 0 pts.
- Absconding P&P, AWOL, bail jumping, within past 1 year = 1 pt.
- Escape from community supervision, juvenile AWOL, within past 2 years = 1 pt.
- Escape from community corrections within past 3 years = 2 pts.
- Escape or attempted escape from minimum security, juvenile detention center/institution within past 5 years = 6 pts.
- Two or more escapes or attempted escapes from minimum security, community corrections, community supervision, juvenile detention center, institution or juvenile AWOL within past 10 years = 6 pts.
- Escape or attempted escape from medium or maximum security within past 10 years = 7 pts.

MAXIMUM CUSTODY SCORE (Add items 1, 2, and 3)

Subtotal: _____

SCORE 7 OR HIGHER, ASSIGN TO MAXIMUM CUSTODY:

(Complete remaining items, but do not total score if inmate has already been assigned to maximum custody.)

4. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (Past 10 years, excluding current charges)

- 0-1 = 0 pts.
- 2-3 = 2 pts.
- 4+ = 4 pts.

5. DISCIPLINARY HISTORY

- None = 0 pts.
- Three or more Class B disciplinary convictions, past 1 year = 1 pt.
- One or more Class A disciplinary convictions, past 2 years = 2 pts.
- One or more Class X disciplinary convictions, past 2 years = 3 pts.
- One or more Class X 01-4, 04-1, 04-3 (6-89 to 9-89), 04-8 during current inc. or within past 10 yrs. = 3 pts.

Exhibit A.10. Oklahoma Department of Corrections Initial Custody Assessment (continued)

6. ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE (Within past 5 years)

- No social, economic or legal problems related to abuse = 0 pts.
- Abuse resulting in social, economic or legal problems = 1 pt.
- Abuse resulting in assaultive behavior = 3 pts.

7. CURRENT AGE (Deduct indicated points)

- Age 39 or younger = 0 pts.
- Age 40 or older = - 1 pt.

COMPREHENSIVE CUSTODY SCORE

Add Items 1 – 7

Total Score:

C. SCALE SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CUSTODY LEVEL INDICATED BY SCALE

- 3 or fewer points on items 1 – 7 = Minimum
- 4 to 6 points on items 1 – 7 = Medium
- 7 or more points on items 1 – 7 = Maximum

2. MANDATORY OVERRIDES (No lower than medium security)

- Murder I or II
- Time left to serve (highest crime category)
- Life without parole
- INS detainer for deportation

3. DISCRETIONARY OVERRIDES FOR HIGHER SECURITY LEVEL

- Circumstances of the offense
- History of violence
- Gang affiliation
- Other (specify): _____
- Management problem
- Escapes
- Felony detainer

4. DISCRETIONARY OVERRIDES FOR LOWER SECURITY LEVEL

- Circumstances of the offense
- Time left to serve
- Prior outstanding conduct
- Other (specify): _____

5. INMATE PROGRAM NEEDS

- Physical health
- Academic skills
- Other (specify): _____
- Emotional stability
- Substance abuse
- Reintegration
- Vocational

6. RECOMMENDED SECURITY LEVEL

- Minimum
- Medium
- Maximum

7. RECOMMENDED FACILITY: _____ **CODE:** _____

Exhibit A.10. Oklahoma Department of Corrections Initial Custody Assessment (continued)

Case Manager's Signature: _____ Code: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Inmate's Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Routine: Classification Chair _____ Date: ____/____/____

D. REVIEW AUTHORITY

SECURITY LEVEL: Concur Do Not Concur Changed to: Max Med Min

FACILITY ASSIGNMENT: Concur Do Not Concur Changed to: _____

Reason for Change: _____

Routine: Case Manager Supervisor: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Non-Routine: Facility Classification Coordinator: _____ Date: ____/____/____

(If Security Level Changed) Inmate Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Date Transferred: ____/____/____

Exhibit A.11. Oklahoma Department of Corrections Custody Assessment Scale

A. IDENTIFICATION

Date: ____/____/____

Inmate Name (Last, First, Middle): _____ Inmate DOC #: _____

Reception Date: _____ Race/Sex: _____ Date of Birth: _____

B. CUSTODY EVALUATION

Score

1. SEVERITY OF CURRENT CONVICTION

(Use Offense Severity Scale in Attachment A: Rate most serious current charge/conviction, including any CC, CS cases, detainers/warrants.)

- Low = 0 pts.
- Moderate = 2 pts.
- High = 5 pts.
- Highest = 6 pts.

2. SERIOUS OFFENSE HISTORY (Exclude current charges; Use Offense Severity Scale in Attachment A.)

- None or Low (past 5 yrs) = 0 pts.
- Moderate (past 5 yrs) = 1 pt.
- High (past 10 yrs) = 4 pts.
- Highest (past 10 yrs) = 6 pts.

3. ESCAPE HISTORY

- No escapes or attempts = 0 pts.
- Absconding P&P, AWOL, bail jumping, within past 1 year = 1 pt.
- Escape from community supervision, juvenile AWOL, within past 2 years = 1 pt.
- Escape from community corrections within past 3 years = 2 pts.
- Escape or attempted escape from minimum security, juvenile institution/detention center, past 5 years = 6 pts.
- Two or more escapes or attempted escapes from minimum, community corrections, juvenile institution/detention center, juvenile AWOL, or community supervision within past 10 years = 6 pts.
- Escape or attempted escape from medium or maximum security within past 10 years = 7 pts.

MAXIMUM CUSTODY SCORE (Add items 1, 2, and 3)

Subtotal:

SCORE 7 OR HIGHER, ASSIGN TO MAXIMUM CUSTODY: (Complete remaining items, but do not total score if inmate has already been assigned to maximum custody.)

4. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (Past 10 years, excluding current charges)

- Zero – One = 0 pts.
- Two – Three = 1 pt.
- Four or more = 2 pts.

5. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY CONVICTIONS (Class A & B—last 12 months, Class X—last 2 years)

- Zero = 0 pts.
- One = 1 pt.
- Two – Three = 2 pts.
- Four or more = 4 pts.

Exhibit A.11. Oklahoma Department of Corrections Custody Assessment Scale (continued)

6. MOST SERIOUS DISCIPLINARY CONVICTION (within last 12 months) _____

No expiration on current incarceration or w/in 10 years of current incarceration for:
01-4, 04-1, 04-3 (June 1989-September 1989), and 04-8

- None = 0 pts.
- Class A = 2 pts.
- Class B = 1 pt.
- Class X = 4 pts.

7. ASSIGNED PROGRAM PARTICIPATION (Since last classification) _____

- None, waiting list, enrolled, participating = 0 pts.
- Refused to participate in recommended program = 1 pt.
- Completed all recommended and available programs = -1 pt.

8. ADJUSTMENT _____

- Level 4 previous 12 months = -1 pt.
- Level 2 or 3 = 0 pts.
- Level 1 = 1 pt.

9. CURRENT AGE _____

- Age 39 or younger = 0 pts.
- Age 40 or older = - 1 pt.

COMPREHENSIVE CUSTODY SCORE (Add Items 1-9)

Total Score: _____

C. SCALE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CUSTODY LEVEL INDICATED BY SCALE

- 3 or fewer points on items 1-9 = Minimum
- 4 to 6 points on items 1-9 = Medium
- 7 or more points on items 1-9 = Maximum

2. MANDATORY OVERRIDES (*No lower than medium security*)

- Murder I or II
- Life without parole
- Time left to serve (highest crime category)
- INS detainer for deportation

3. DISCRETIONARY OVERRIDES FOR HIGHER SECURITY LEVEL

- Circumstances of the offense
- Management problem
- History of violence
- Escapes
- Gang affiliation
- Felony detainer
- Other (specify): _____

4. DISCRETIONARY OVERRIDES FOR LOWER SECURITY LEVEL

- Circumstances of the offense
- Outstanding conduct
- Time left to serve
- Other (specify): _____

5. RECOMMENDED SECURITY LEVEL

- Minimum
- Medium
- Maximum

Exhibit A.11. Oklahoma Department of Corrections Custody Assessment Scale (continued)

Preparer's Signature: _____ Code: _____ Date: ____/____/____
Committee Member: _____ Date: ____/____/____
Committee Chair: _____ Date: ____/____/____
Inmate Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/____

D. REVIEW AUTHORITY: Concur Do Not Concur Changed to: Max Med Min

Reason for change: _____

Routine: Case Manager Supervisor: _____ Date: ____/____/____
 Non-Routine: Facility Classification Coordinator: _____ Date: ____/____/____
(If Changed) Inmate Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/____

E. POPULATION OFFICE: Concur Do Not Concur Changed to: Max Med Min

Reason for change: _____

Population Coordinator: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Distribution: White - Population Office (Send back to receiving office for field file.)
Pink - Population Office
Canary - Field file before approval
Goldenrod - Inmate before transfer

Exhibit A.12. Wyoming Department of Corrections Initial Classification Instrument

Name: _____ WDOC#: _____

Facility: (Last) WSP (First) WHF (MI) WHCC Date of Birth: _____
 WWC

Gender: Male Female Race: Nat-Am White Hispanic Black Other: _____

Current Date: _____ Next Classification Date: _____

1. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CONVICTION (Consider all consecutive sentences.)

Actual Offense: _____

- Highest severity7
- High severity5
- Moderate severity3
- Low severity1

_____ Score

2. PAST INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR (during last 3 calendar years)

Actual Violation: _____

- Predatory violation7
- Major violation5
- General or community status violation2
- Minor violation1
- None or no violation(s) within last 3 years0

_____ Score

3. ESCAPE HISTORY (during last 3 calendar years)

Escape during last 5 Years: _____

- Escape or attempted escape with violence7
- Escape or attempted escape without violence5
- Walkaway from nonsecure facility2
- None or no escape(s) within last 3 calendar years0

_____ Score

4. MOST SERIOUS PRIOR CONVICTION (during last 3 calendar years)

Actual Prior Offense: _____

- Highest severity6
- High severity4
- Moderate severity2
- Low severity0

_____ Score

CLOSE CUSTODY SCORE (Add items 1 through 4. If score is between 7 and 13, the inmate should be assigned to Close/GP. If score is 14 or higher, assign to Close/Restricted. Remaining items MUST be scored.)

CLOSE CUSTODY SCORE _____

5. NUMBER OF PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (during last 3 calendar years)

Actual Number: _____

- Three or more4
- One or Two2
- None0

_____ Score

Exhibit A.12. Wyoming Department of Corrections Initial Classification Instrument (continued)

6. TOTAL TIME TO MINIMUM RELEASE DATE (Consider all consecutive sentences.)

Actual Sentence: _____

10 or more years	4	
5 to 9.99 years	3	
2 to 4.99 years	2	
0 to 1.99 years	0	_____

Score

7. NUMBER OF PRIOR INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENTS (of 30 days or more; felony convictions only)

Actual Number: _____

Two or more	4	
One	2	
None	0	_____

Score

8. AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION

Actual Age at First Conviction: _____

Age 19.99 or younger	3	
Age 20 to 27.99	2	
Age 28 or older	0	_____

Score

Add items 5 through 8 to the Close Custody Score **TOTAL SCORE** _____

Using Total Score, determine the custody assignment according to the scale below.

Scale: Minimum	0 to 4 points
Medium	5 to 14 points
Close/GP	15 to 19 points OR between 7 and 13 points on Close Custody Scale
Close/Restricted	20 to 23 points OR 14 or more points on Close Custody Scale
Maximum	24 to 42 points OR Death penalty case

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.)

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/Restricted Maximum

Override Factors: (Circle the appropriate reason(s).)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 = Protective custody/witness | 6 = Sex offender |
| 2 = Psychiatric/suicide risk | 7 = Adjustment problem/violent |
| 3 = Medical | 8 = Program need |
| 4 = Escape threat/absconder | 9 = High profile/notoriety |
| 5 = Detainer | 10 = Court ordered |
| | 11 = Other: _____ |

Recommended Custody Level (Circle recommended custody level.)

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/Restricted Maximum

Exhibit A.12. Wyoming Department of Corrections Initial Classification Instrument (continued)

Classification Officer: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Final Custody Level (Circle appropriate custody level.)

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/Restricted Maximum

Classification Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Housing Assignment:

I have reviewed this classification instrument and the reasons for my custody level have been explained to me.

Inmate Signature: _____ Date: _____

Revised 03/03/99

Exhibit A.13. Wyoming Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument

Name: _____ WDOC#: _____
 (Last) (First) (MI)

Facility: WSP WWC WHF WHCC Date of Birth: _____

Gender: Male Female Race: Nat-Am White Hispanic Black Other: _____

Current Custody Level:

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/Restricted Maximum Special Management

Current Date: _____ Prior Classification Date: _____ Next Classification Date: _____

1. INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE (Consider all violations in the last 3 calendar years.)

Actual Violation: _____

Predatory violation within last 12 months7	
Predatory violation more than 12 months ago, but within 24 months5	
Predatory violation more than 24 months ago, but within 36 months3	
Major violation within last 12 months5	
Major violation more than 12 months ago, but within 36 months3	
General or community status violation within last 12 months2	
No violations (or all minor violations) in past 3 calendar years0	

		Score

2. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT OFFENSE (Consider all consecutive and current charges.)

Actual Offense: _____

Highest severity6	
High severity4	
Moderate severity2	
Low severity0	

		Score

3. MOST SERIOUS PRIOR CONVICTION (last 3 calendar years)

Actual Prior Conviction: _____

Highest severity5	
High severity3	
Moderate severity1	
Low severity0	

		Score

4. NUMBER OF PREDATORY VIOLATIONS (during last 6 months)

Actual Number: _____

Three or more5	
One or Two3	
None0	

		Score

CLOSE CUSTODY SCORE (Add items 1 through 4. If score is between 7 and 13, the inmate should be assigned to Close/GP custody. If score is 14 or more, the inmate should be assigned to Close/Restricted custody. The remaining items MUST be scored.)

CLOSE CUSTODY SCORE

5. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS (during last 6 months)

Actual Number: _____

Four or more6	
Two or Three4	
One2	
None0	

		Score

Exhibit A.13. Wyoming Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument (continued)

6. PERFORMANCE IN RECOMMENDED TREATMENT PROGRAMS (during last 6 months)

Performance: _____

Refused to work/program3
Selective compliance2
Waiting for treatment/work slot0
Satisfactory compliance0
Exemplary	-.2

Score

7. TOTAL TIME TO MINIMUM RELEASE DATE

Actual Time to Serve: _____

10 or more years4
Between 5 and 9.99 years3
Between 2 and 4.99 years2
Between 0 and 1.99 years0

Score

Add items 5 through 7 to the Close Custody Score.

TOTAL SCORE

Using Total Score, determine the custody assignment according to the scale below.

Scale:	Minimum	0 to 4 points
	Medium	5 to 14 points
	Close/GP	15 to 19 points OR between 7 and 13 points on Close Custody Scale
	Close/restricted	20 to 23 points OR 14 or more points on Close Custody Scale
	Maximum	24 to 36 points OR Death penalty case

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.)

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/restricted Maximum

Override Factors: (Circle the appropriate reason(s).)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 = Protective custody/witness | 6 = Sex offender |
| 2 = Psychiatric/suicide risk | 7 = Adjustment problem/violent |
| 3 = Medical | 8 = Program need |
| 4 = Escape threat/absconder | 9 = High profile/notoriety |
| 5 = Detainer | 10 = Court ordered |
| | 11 = Other: _____ |

Recommended Custody Level (Circle recommended custody level.)

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/restricted Maximum

Classification Officer: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Exhibit A.13. Wyoming Department of Corrections Reclassification Instrument (continued)

Final Custody Level (Circle appropriate custody level.)

Minimum Medium Close/GP Close/restricted Maximum

Classification Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Housing Assignment:

I have reviewed this classification instrument and the reasons for my custody level have been explained to me.

Inmate Signature: _____ Date: _____

Revised 03/04/99

Exhibit A.14. Delaware Department of Correction Initial Classification Form for Men

OFFENDER NAME: _____ DOB: _____

LAST FIRST MIDDLE

AKA: _____ SBI#: _____ SS#: _____

CURRENT/LEAD OFFENSE: _____ TOTAL # CHARGES: _____

SENTENCE LENGTH: ____/____/____ EFFECTIVE DATE: ____/____/____
 Years - Months - Days

RELEASE DATE: ____/____/____ P.E.D.: ____/____/____

RISK ASSESSMENT

SEVERITY OF CURRENT OFFENSE

Actual Offense: _____

- Misdemeanor, civil offenses or Class F and G0
- Low severity (Class D and E)1
- Moderate severity (Class C)3
- High severity (Class B and felony escape)5
- Highest severity (Class A)7

OTHER OFFENSES/BAIL STATUS

Other Offense/Status: _____

- None0
- Pending probation violation; misdemeanor charges, or bail below \$5,0001
- Pending federal or state warrant, or charge with bail of \$5,000 to \$50,0003
- Pending charges without bail or bail of \$50,001 or more5

ESCAPE/ABSCOND/BAIL JUMP HISTORY

Escape History: _____

- None0
- One or more incidents of bail jumping or AWOL1
- Walkoff from work release, furlough, community and/or outside job assignment
 within the past 3 years2
- Attempted escape from a secure facility within the past 5 years or escape from
 secure facility 10+ years ago3
- Escape from a secure institution within the past 10 years7

CURRENT AGE

Current Age: _____

- 38+0
- Age 19 years or less/juvenile convicted as an adult1
- Age 28-372
- Age 20-273

PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS

Number Prior Convictions: _____

- No prior felony convictions or only misdemeanor convictions0
- 1 prior felony conviction1
- 2-3 prior felony convictions2
- 4+ prior felony convictions3

Exhibit A.14. Delaware Department of Correction Initial Classification Form for Men (continued)

SEVERITY OF CRIMINAL HISTORY DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS

Most Serious Prior Conviction: _____

- No prior felony convictions, or only misdemeanor, civil, or Class F and G convictions0
- Low severity felony conviction (Class D and E)1
- Moderate severity felony conviction (Class C)3
- High severity felony conviction (Class B and felony escape)5
- Highest severity conviction (Class A)7 _____

INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT HISTORY (Consider institutional reports during last 5 years.)

- First incarceration or no prior Major/Class I institutional reports0
 - Major/Class I—Non-predatory institutional misconduct report5
 - Major/Class I—Predatory/assaultive institutional misconduct report7 _____
- Most serious institutional misconduct report: _____

TIME REMAINING ON SENTENCE

Actual Time Remaining to Serve: _____

- Less than 12 months remaining (up to 11.99 months)0
- 12.0–23.99 months remaining on sentence1
- 24.0–59.99 months remaining on sentence2
- 60.0–119.99 months remaining on sentence3
- 120 months remaining or more4
- Life without benefit of parole or death sentence6 _____

RISK ASSESSMENT SCORE:

RISK ASSESSMENT SCALE:	01–04 Minimum/low/community	13–16 Medium/high
	05–08 Minimum/high	17–23 Maximum/close
	09–12 Medium/low	24+ Maximum/high

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Override Factors: (Check all that apply.)

- _____ Protective custody or need for separation from general population: _____
- _____ Documented membership in security threat group
- _____ Pending institutional reports under investigation
- _____ Notorious/high profile case
- _____ Mental health: _____
- _____ Physical/medical limitations that could affect housing placement: _____
- _____ Program need: _____
- _____ Court order: _____
- _____ Time to serve: _____
- _____ Sentenced to death
- _____ Other (specify): _____

Exhibit A.14. Delaware Department of Correction Initial Classification Form for Men (continued)

Recommended Custody level (Circle recommended custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Correctional Worker: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Final Custody Recommendation (Circle appropriate custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Counselor Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

NOTE: Counselor Supervisor's signature required for overrides. Optional for other decisions.

Comments: _____

Housing Assignment: _____ Next Classification Date: ____/____/____

*Program Assignment(s): _____

*Work Assignment: _____

*Changes: _____

Exhibit A.15. Delaware Department of Correction Initial Classification Form for Women (continued)

SEVERITY OF CRIMINAL HISTORY DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS

Most Serious Prior Conviction: _____

- No prior felony convictions, or only misdemeanor, civil, or Class F and G convictions0
- Low severity felony conviction (Class D and E)1
- Moderate severity felony conviction (Class C)3
- High severity felony conviction (Class B and felony escape)5
- Highest severity conviction (Class A)7

INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT HISTORY (Consider institutional reports during last 5 years.)

- First incarceration or no prior Major/Class I institutional reports0
 - Major/Class I—Non-predatory institutional misconduct report5
 - Major/Class I—Predatory/assaultive institutional misconduct report7
- Most serious institutional misconduct report: _____

TIME REMAINING ON SENTENCE

Actual Time Remaining to Serve: _____

- Less than 12 months remaining (up to 11.99 months)0
- 12.0–23.99 months remaining on sentence1
- 24.0–59.99 months remaining on sentence2
- 60.0–119.99 months remaining on sentence3
- 120 months remaining or more4
- Life without benefit of parole or death sentence6

RISK ASSESSMENT SCORE:

RISK ASSESSMENT SCALE:	01–04 Minimum/low/community	13–16 Medium/high
	05–08 Minimum/high	17–23 Maximum/close
	09–12 Medium/low	24+ Maximum/high

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Override Factors: (Check all that apply.)

- _____ Protective custody or need for separation from general population: _____
- _____ Documented membership in security threat group
- _____ Pending institutional reports under investigation
- _____ Notorious/high profile case
- _____ Mental health: _____
- _____ Physical/medical limitations that could affect housing placement: _____
- _____ Program need: _____
- _____ Court order: _____
- _____ Time to serve: _____
- _____ Sentenced to death
- _____ Other (specify): _____

Exhibit A.15. Delaware Department of Correction Initial Classification Form for Women (continued)

Recommended Custody Level (Circle recommended custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Correctional Worker: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Final Custody Recommendation (Circle appropriate custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Counselor Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

NOTE: Counselor Supervisor's signature required for overrides. Optional for other decisions.

Comments: _____

Housing Assignment: _____ Next Classification Date: ____/____/____

*Program Assignment(s): _____

*Work Assignment: _____

*Changes: _____

Exhibit A.16. Delaware Department of Correction Reclassification Form (continued)

NUMBER OF CLASS I/MAJOR DISCIPLINARY FINDINGS OF GUILT

(since initial or last regular reclassification)

None0	
1 Disciplinary finding of guilt2	
2 – 3 Disciplinary findings of guilt3	
4+ Disciplinary findings of guilt5	_____
Actual number of Class I disciplinary findings:_____			

INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT HISTORY (Consider institutional reports during last 5 years.)

First incarceration or No prior Major/Class I institutional reports0	
Major/Class I—Non predatory institutional misconduct report ≥ 37 months1	
Major/Class I—Non predatory institutional misconduct rpt in last 36 months or			
Class I/assaultive ≥ 37 months3	
Major/Class I—Predatory/assaultive institutional misconduct report within 13 – 36 months5	
Major/Class I—Predatory/assaultive institutional misconduct report within past 12 months7	_____
Most serious institutional misconduct report:_____			

PERFORMANCE IN TREATMENT PROGRAMS/WORK ASSIGNMENTS

Program Status:_____

Successful1	
Active0	
Waiting for program1	
Unsuccessful2	_____

RISK REASSESSMENT SCORE:

RISK ASSESSMENT SCALE:	01–04 Minimum/low/community	13–16 Medium/high
	05–08 Minimum/high	17–23 Maximum/close
	09–12 Medium/low	24+ Maximum/high

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Override Factors: (Check all that apply.)

- Protective custody or need for separation from general population:_____
- Documented membership in security threat group
- Pending institutional reports under investigation
- Notorious/high profile case
- Mental health:_____
- Physical/medical limitations that could affect housing placement:_____
- Program need:_____
- Court order:_____
- Time to serve:_____
- Sentenced to death
- Other (specify):_____

Exhibit A.16. Delaware Department of Correction Reclassification Form (continued)

Recommended Custody Level (Circle recommended custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Correctional Worker: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

Final Custody Recommendation (Circle appropriate custody level.)

Minimum/low/community	Medium/low	Maximum/close
Minimum/high	Medium/high	Maximum/high

Counselor Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

NOTE: Counselor Supervisor's signature required for overrides. Optional for other decisions.

Comments: _____

Housing Assignment: _____ Next Classification Date: ____/____/____

*Program Assignment(s): _____

*Work Assignment: _____

*Changes: _____

Exhibit A.17. Rhode Island Department of Corrections Initial Inmate Classification Custody Scoring Form

NAME: _____

Last First M.I. I.D. Date of Birth

SENTENCED TO: _____ AS OF: _____

COUNSELOR: _____ DATE: _____

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION LEVEL: _____ FACILITY: _____

GENDER: Male Female RACE: White Black Hispanic Asian Native Am. Other

1. TIME REMAINING ON SENTENCE - (Score category A or B.)

A. Non-Lifers

- 0–12.00 months0
- 12.01–36.00 months1
- 36.01–60.00 months2
- 60.01–120.00 months3
- 120.01–240.00 months5
- 240.01 months or more7

_____ A Score

B. Lifers

OR

- Parole eligible by statute with less than 12 months to hearing/parole release date0
- Parole eligible with release or hearing date within 12 to 24.00 months2
- Parole eligible with release or hearing date within 24+ months3
- Not parole eligible by statute for 15 years5
- Not parole eligible by statute for 20 years7

_____ B Score

2. HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR

(Consider most serious booking within last 5 years.)

- None0
- Low moderate severity booking in last 3 years1
- Moderate severity booking in last 3 years2
- High severity booking in last 3 years3
- Highest severity but non-predatory booking in last 5 years5
- Highest severity/predatory booking in last 5 years (assault, extortion, riot/inciting a riot, sexual assault, and/or hostage taking)7

_____ Score

3. SEVERITY OF CURRENT OFFENSE (Refer to the Offense Severity Scale and score the most serious offense if there are multiple convictions.)

- None0
- Low/low moderate1
- Moderate and felony weapon-related offenses2
- Highest/high5

_____ Score

Exhibit A.17. Rhode Island Department of Corrections Initial Inmate Classification Custody Scoring Form (continued)

4. ESCAPE HISTORY (Score category A or B.)

No escapes or attempts (or no prior incarcerations) in last 7 years0	
A. An escape or attempt from minimum or community custody, no actual or threatened violence:		
More than 3 years ago but less than 7 years1	
More than 1 year ago but less than 3 years3	
Within the last year.5	_____
		A Score
B. An escape or attempt from Medium or above custody, or an escape from Minimum or Community Custody with actual or threatened violence: OR		
More than 3 years ago but less than 10 years3	
More than 1 year ago but less than 3 years5	
Within the last year.7	_____
		B Score

Maximum/high custody score (Add Items 1–4) Maximum/high custody score: _____

5. PRIOR ASSAULTIVE CONVICTIONS (Consider the most severe felony conviction within the last 10 years.)

None in the last 5 years0	
Low/low moderate in the last 5 years1	
Moderate or felony weapons-related offense in the last 5 years2	
High in the last 10 years3	
Highest in the last 10 years5	_____
		Score

6. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS

None in last 36 months0	
One in last 36 months1	
Two to four in last 36 months3	
Five or more in last 36 months5	_____
		Score

7. NUMBER OF PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (Score prior felonies within last 5 years, including felony convictions for which the sentence was probation or suspended sentence.)

None0	
One2	
Two or three3	
Four or more4	_____
		Score

8. CURRENT AGE

Age 38 years and over0	
Age 29–37 years1	
Age 23–28 years2	
Age 22 or below3	_____
		Score

Add items 1 through 8 Total Score _____

Classification Scale:	Maximum/high	18 + or Maximum/high custody score = 13+
	Medium custody	10–17 or Maximum/high custody score = 8–12
	Minimum custody	0–9

Exhibit A.17. Rhode Island Department of Corrections Initial Inmate Classification Custody Scoring Form (continued)

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.) Minimum Medium Maximum

Mandatory Override Factors: (Circle the appropriate reason(s).)

- 1 = Court ordered work release or minimum
- 2 = Sentence \geq 5 years—Override to medium
- 3 = Sentence \geq 10 years—Override to maximum

Discretionary Override Factors: (Circle the appropriate reason(s).)

- 1 = Protective custody/witness
- 2 = Mental health
- 3 = Medical
- 4 = Granted advance parole release date
- 5 = Security risk group: _____
- 6 = Current detainer/warrants/pending charges: _____
- 7 = Director: _____

Recommended Custody Level (Circle recommended custody level.) Minimum Medium Maximum

Classification Officer: _____ Date: _____

Final Custody Level (Circle appropriate custody level.) Minimum Medium Maximum

Classification Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Revised May 17, 2001

Exhibit A.18. Rhode Island Department of Corrections Inmate Reclassification Custody Scoring Form (continued)

4. ESCAPE HISTORY (Score category A or B.)

No escapes or attempts (or no prior incarcerations) in last 7 years0	
A. An escape or attempt from Minimum or Community Custody, no actual or threatened violence:		
More than 3 years ago but less than 7 years1	
More than 1 year ago but less than 3 years3	
Within the last year5	A Score
B. An escape or attempt from Medium or above custody, or an escape from Minimum or Community Custody with actual or threatened violence:		OR
More than 3 years ago but less than 10 years3	
More than 1 year ago but less than 3 years5	
Within the last year7	B Score

Maximum/High Custody Score (Add items 1–4.) Maximum/High Custody Score _____

5. PRIOR ASSAULTIVE CONVICTIONS (Consider the most severe felony conviction within the last 10 years.)

None in the last 5 years0	
Low/low moderate in the last 5 years1	
Moderate or felony weapons offense in the last 5 years2	
High in last 10 years3	
Highest in the last 10 years5	Score

6. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS

None in last 12 months0	
One in last 12 months1	
Two to four in last 12 months3	
Five or more in last 12 months5	Score

7. NUMBER OF PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (Score prior felonies within last 5 years, including felony convictions for which the sentence was probation or suspended sentence.)

None0	
One2	
Two or three3	
Four or more4	Score

8. CURRENT AGE

Age 38 years and over0	
Age 29 – 37 years1	
Age 23 – 28 years2	
Age 22 or below3	Score

Add items 1 through 8 Total Score _____

Exhibit A.18. Rhode Island Department of Corrections Inmate Reclassification Custody Scoring Form (continued)

Classification Scale: Maximum/high 18 + or Maximum/high custody Score = 13+
 Medium custody 10–17 or Maximum/high custody Score = 8–12
 Minimum custody 0–9

Preliminary Custody Level (Circle scored custody level.) Minimum Medium Maximum

Mandatory Override Factors: (Circle the appropriate reason(s).)

- 4 = Sentence > 5 years and < 30 years and NOT parole eligible—Ineligible for minimum custody
- 5 = Sentence to life and NOT parole eligible—Ineligible for minimum custody

Discretionary Override Factors: (Circle the appropriate reason(s).)

- 1 = Protective custody/witness
- 2 = Mental health
- 3 = Medical
- 4 = Granted advance parole release date
- 5 = Security risk group: _____
- 6 = Current detainer/warrants/pending charges: _____
- 7 = Director: _____

Recommended Custody Level (Circle recommended custody level.) Minimum Medium Maximum

Classification Officer: _____ Date: _____

Final Custody Level (Circle appropriate custody level.) Minimum Medium Maximum

Classification Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Revised: May 17, 2001

Exhibit A.19. Rhode Island Department of Corrections Administrative Classification Assessment

Inmate: _____ DOB: _____

ID: _____ Charge: _____

Sentence: _____ Date Imposed: _____

The above inmate is **ineligible** for an administrative move to Minimum if any of the items listed below have been checked. Ineligible inmates will be scheduled for a formal Initial Classification Hearing with the A&O Classification Board. Check all that apply:

- Current charge is a highest or high severity offense: _____
- Pending felony: _____
- Outstanding felony warrant from another jurisdiction: _____
- Prior escape in last 10 years
- INS hold
- Recidivism (5 or more prior felony incarcerations within the last 10 years)
- Number of felony incarcerations in last 10 years: _____
- History of institutional behavior - Highest severity institutional booking within last 5 years
- Security risk group documented in prison file
- Waived from family court/training school
- Inmate currently housed in protective custody
- Mental health/medical restrictions: _____

Override Reason(s):

Classification Officer: _____ Date: _____

Exhibit A.20. Tennessee Department of Correction Initial Classification: Custody Assessment Form

OFFENDER LAST NAME: _____ FIRST NAME: _____ MI: _____
OFFENDER NUMBER: _____
INSTITUTION: _____ DATE: _____

1. HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE (during last 5 calendar years)

Actual Violation: _____
Assault—No weapon or serious injury during last 18 months3
Assault—With weapon, no serious injury during last 18 months4
Assault—With or without weapon and serious injury during last 43–60 months5
Assault—With or without weapon and serious injury during last 42 months7
_____ Score

2. INSTITUTIONAL PREDATORY BEHAVIOR (during last 24 months)

Type of predatory behavior: _____
None0
One or two3
Three or more5
_____ Score

3. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CONVICTION

Actual Current Conviction: _____
Low severity0
Moderate severity1
High severity3
Highest severity4
_____ Score

4. PRIOR ASSAULTIVE OFFENSE HISTORY (Rate most serious offense during last 10 years)

Actual Offense: _____
None0
High severity3
Highest severity4
_____ Score

SCHEDULE A SCALE (Add items 1 through 4.) Close 10 – 14 points **CLOSE CUSTODY SCORE:** _____

5. ESCAPE HISTORY (during last 5 years of incarceration)

Type of Escape During Last 5 years: _____
None or no escape(s) within last 5 calendar years2
Escape or attempted escape from minimum custody, no actual or threatened
violence during last 13–60 months0
Escape or attempted escape from minimum custody, no actual or threatened
violence during last 12 months1
Escape or attempted escape from medium or above custody or from minimum
custody with actual or threatened violence:
During last 13–60 months5
During last 12 months7
_____ Score

Exhibit A.20. Tennessee Department of Correction Reclassification: Custody Assessment Form (continued)

6. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS WITH GUILTY DISPOSITIONS

Actual Number of Reports with guilty disposition: _____

None in last 18 months	-4	
None in last 12 months	-2	
None in last 6 months	-1	
One in last 6 months	1	
Two or more in last 6 months	4	

_____ Score:

7. MOST SERIOUS DISCIPLINARY REPORT DURING LAST 5 YEARS

Most serious disciplinary report: _____

Class C	1	
Class B	3	
Class A—nonpredatory	4	
Class A—predatory	7	

_____ Score

8. CURRENT DETAINER/NOTIFICATION/CHARGE PENDING

Type of case/charge pending: _____

Misdemeanor charges/case	1	
Felony charge/case	4	

_____ Score

9. SEVERITY OF PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (during last 10 calendar years prior to TDOC received date)

Actual Number: _____

Low	1	
Moderate	2	
High	3	
Highest	4	

_____ Score

10. CURRENT AGE

Actual Age: _____

Lo-20.99	3	
21-27.99	2	
28-36.99	1	
37-46.99	0	
47+	-1	

_____ Score

Schedule B SCORE (Add items 5 through 9)

Score _____

- Scale: Minimum 0-6 points
 Medium 7-16 points
 Close/GP 17+ points

Total Score: (Schedule A + B Score)

A+B

Counselor: _____ Date: _____

Exhibit A. 21. Tennessee Department of Correction Initial Classification: Custody Assessment Form

OFFENDER LAST NAME: _____ FIRST NAME: _____ MI: _____
 OFFENDER NUMBER: _____

INSTITUTION: _____ DATE: _____

1. HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE (during last 5 calendar years)

Actual Violation: _____

- Assault—No weapon or serious injury during last 18 months3
 - Assault—With weapon, no serious injury during last 18 months4
 - Assault—With or without weapon and serious injury during last 43–60 months5
 - Assault—With or without weapon and serious injury during last 42 months7
- _____ Score

2. MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CONVICTION

Actual Current Conviction: _____

- Low severity0
 - Moderate severity1
 - High severity3
 - Highest severity5
- _____ Score

3. PRIOR ASSAULTIVE OFFENSE HISTORY (Rate most serious offense during last 10 years)

Actual Offense: _____

- None0
 - High severity4
 - Highest severity6
- _____ Score

4. ESCAPE HISTORY (during last 5 calendar years)

Type of Escape During Last 5 years: _____

- None or no escape(s) within last 5 calendar years0
 - Escape or attempted escape from minimum custody, no actual or threatened violence during last 13–60 months1
 - Escape or attempted escape from minimum custody, no actual or threatened violence during last 12 months3
 - Escape or attempted escape from medium or above custody or from minimum custody with actual or threatened violence:
 - During last 13–60 months5
 - During last 12 months7
- _____ Score

SCHEDULE A SCORE (Add items 1 through 4.)

A Score: _____

5. MOST SERIOUS DISCIPLINARY REPORT DURING LAST 5 YEARS

Most Serious Disciplinary Report: _____

- None0
 - Class C1
 - Class B3
 - Class A—nonpredatory4
 - Class A—predatory7
- _____ Score

Exhibit A. 21. Tennessee Department of Correction Initial Classification: Custody Assessment Form (continued)

6. CURRENT DETAINER/NOTIFICATION/CHARGE PENDING

Type of Case/Charge Pending: _____

- None0
- Misdemeanor1
- Felony4

_____ Score

7. CURRENT AGE

Actual Age at Admission: _____

- 47+ years-1
- 37-46.99 years0
- 28-36.99 years1
- 21-27.99 years2
- Lo-20.99 years3

_____ Score

Schedule B SCORE (Add items 5 through 8)

Score _____

- Scale: Minimum 0-6 points
 Medium 7-16 points
 Close/GP 17+ points

Total Score: (Schedule A + B Score)

A+B

Counselor: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B
Statistical Tables

Exhibit B.1. Demographic and Offense Characteristics of Female Inmates

Characteristic	Total		Characteristic	Total	
	Number	%		Number	%
<i>Race</i>			<i>Current offense</i>		
Black	7	5.4	Person	29	22.3
Hispanic	11	8.5	Property	61	46.9
Native American	1	0.8	Drugs/weapons	30	23.1
White	111	85.4	Sexual misconduct	1	0.8
			Other	9	6.9
<i>Facility</i>			<i>Number of major disciplinary infractions</i>		
Women's Correctional Center	76	58.5	0	87	66.9
Women's Penitentiary	55	42.3	1	24	18.5
			2	10	7.7
<i>Age at first conviction</i>			3+	9	6.9
46 +	7	5.4	Mean		0.7
36-45	18	13.8	<i>Number of general disciplinary infractions</i>		
31-35	16	12.3	0	76	58.5
26-30	25	19.2	1	18	13.8
23-25	26	20.0	2	13	10.0
20-22	17	13.1	3+	23	17.7
19 or younger	21	16.2	Mean		1.4
Mean		28.10	<i>Number of minor disciplinary infractions</i>		
<i>Age at admission</i>			0	92	70.8
46 +	15	11.5	1	23	17.7
36-45	31	23.8	2	9	6.9
31-35	20	15.4	3+	6	4.6
26-30	25	19.2	Mean		0.5
23-25	18	13.8	<i>Number of community disciplinary infractions</i>		
20-22	15	11.5	0	130	100.0
19 or younger	6	4.6	Mean		0.0
Mean		32.8			

Exhibit B.2. Demographic and Offense Characteristics of Male Inmates (n = 479)

Characteristic	Total		Characteristic	Total	
	Number	%		Number	%
<i>Race</i>			<i>Current offense</i>		
Black	30	6.3	Person	129	26.9
Hispanic	47	9.9	Property	146	30.5
Native American	26	5.5	Drugs/weapons	81	16.9
White	374	78.4	Sexual misconduct	96	20.0
			Escape	17	3.5
<i>Facility</i>			Other	10	2.1
State Penitentiary	363	75.8			
Honor Camp	47	9.8	<i>Number of major disciplinary infractions</i>		
State Correctional Ctr#1	47	9.8	0	398	84.1
State Correctional Ctr#2	15	3.1	1	38	8.0
Out-of-state	7	1.5	2	24	5.1
			3+	13	2.7
			Mean		0.3
<i>Age at first conviction*</i>			<i>Number of general disciplinary infractions</i>		
46 +	9	6.3	0	350	74.0
36-45	7	4.9	1	71	15.0
31-35	7	4.9	2	24	5.1
26-30	19	13.3	3+	28	5.9
23-25	19	13.3	Mean		0.6
20-22	30	21.0			
19 or younger	52	36.4	<i>Number of minor disciplinary infractions</i>		
Mean		24.4	0	381	80.6
<i>Age at admission</i>			1	60	12.7
46 +	43	9.1	2	21	4.4
36-45	91	19.2	3+	11	2.3
31-35	63	13.3	Mean		0.3
26-30	71	14.9			
23-25	57	12.0	<i>Number of community disciplinary infractions</i>		
20-22	86	18.1	0	469	99.2
19 or younger	64	13.5	1	4	0.8
Mean		30.7	2+	0	0.0
			Mean		0.0

* Data only available for initial classification sample.

Exhibit B.3. Frequency and Mean Number of Institutional Infractions per Initial Classification Risk Factor for Female Offenders (*n* = 130)

Risk Item	Female Offenders			Risk Item	Female Offenders		
	Number	%	Mean		Number	%	Mean
<i>Most serious current conviction</i>				<i>Total time to minimum release date</i>			
Low severity	56	43.1	2.12	0–1.99 years	75	57.7	1.33
Moderate severity	38	29.2	2.10	2–4.99 years	36	27.7	3.50
High severity	17	13.1	1.60	5–9.99 years	6	4.6	3.30
Highest severity	19	14.6	2.30	10+ years	13	10.0	1.80
<i>Past institutional behavior</i>				<i>Number of prior institutional commitments</i>			
No violations within past 3 years	123	94.6	0.00	0	80	61.5	1.80
Minor violation	3	2.3	0.00	1	32	24.6	2.10
General or community status violation	1	0.8	0.50	2+	18	13.8	3.30
Major violation	3	2.3	1.00	<i>Age at first conviction</i>			
Predatory violation	0	0.0	0.00	28+	54	41.5	1.50
<i>Escape history (past 3 years)</i>				20–27.99	53	40.8	2.60
None within past 3 years	124	95.4	2.04	19 or younger	23	17.7	2.10
Walk away from nonsecure facility	4	3.1	0.50	<i>Preliminary custody level</i>			
Escape or attempted escape without violence	2	1.5	7.00	Minimum	29	22.3	1.21
<i>Most serious prior conviction</i>				Medium	74	56.9	2.55
Low severity	119	91.5	2.20	Close/general population	23	17.7	3.78
High severity	1	0.8	0.00	Close/restricted	4	3.1	4.50
Highest severity	0	0.0	0.00	Maximum	0	0.0	0.00
<i>Number of prior felony convictions (past 3 years)</i>				<i>Recommended custody level</i>			
0	104	80.0	2.00	Minimum	26	20.0	1.08
1	22	16.9	1.60	Medium	75	57.7	2.04
2+	4	3.1	6.50	Close/general population	20	15.4	3.40
				Close/restricted	9	6.9	2.33
				Special management/protective custody	0	0.0	0.00
				<i>Current custody assignment</i>			
				Minimum	34	26.2	1.50
				Moderate severity	10	7.7	4.60
				Medium	66	50.8	2.23
				Close/general population	22	16.9	4.05
				Close/restricted	7	5.4	3.86
				Maximum	1	0.8	15.00
				Special management/protective custody	0	0.0	0.00

Exhibit B.4. Frequency and Mean Number of Institutional Infractions per Reclassification Risk Factor for Male Offenders (n = 336)

	Male Offenders				Male Offenders		
Risk Item	Number	%	Mean	Risk Item	Number	%	Mean
<i>Institutional violence</i>				<i>Performance in treatment programs</i>			
No violations (or all minor) in the past 3 years	216	64.3	0.2	Exemplary	57	17.1	0.30
General/community violence within past 12 months	46	13.7	1.5	Satisfactory compliance	138	41.4	0.75
Major violation within past 36 months	24	7.1	3.1	Waiting for treatment/work slot	41	12.3	1.30
Major violation within past 12 months	27	8.0	3.2	Selective compliance	62	18.6	1.90
Predatory violation within past 36 months	6	1.8	3.0	Refused work/program	16	4.8	2.70
Predatory violation within past 24 months	6	1.8	7.7	Not offered	19	5.7	4.00
Predatory violation within past 12 months	11	3.3	6.8	<i>Total time to minimum release date</i>			
<i>Most serious current conviction</i>				0–1.99 years	194	57.7	1.10
Low severity	48	14.3	0.9	2–4.99 years	56	16.7	1.40
Moderate severity	108	32.1	1.0	5–9.99 years	20	6.0	1.30
High severity	49	14.6	1.3	10+ years	66	19.6	1.50
Highest severity	131	39.0	1.5	<i>Current custody level</i>			
<i>Most serious prior conviction</i>				Minimum	85	25.4	0.42
Low severity	322	95.8	1.3	Medium	110	32.8	0.88
Moderate severity	11	3.3	0.0	Close/general population	114	34.0	2.60
High severity	1	0.3	0.0	Close/restricted	3	0.9	5.00
Highest severity	2	0.6	3.0	Maximum	12	3.6	6.58
<i>Number of predatory violations during past 6 months</i>				Special management/protective custody	12	3.6	3.64
0	332	98.8	1.2	<i>Preliminary custody level</i>			
1–2	3	0.9	4.7	Minimum	129	38.4	0.23
3+	1	0.3	10.0	Medium	123	36.6	0.74
<i>Number of disciplinary reports during past 6 months</i>				Close/general population	74	22.0	3.48
0	254	75.6	0.6	Close/restricted	6	1.8	4.67
1	48	14.3	1.6	Maximum	4	1.2	5.00
2–3	28	8.3	5.3	<i>Recommended custody level</i>			
4+	6	1.8	7.0	Minimum	116	34.5	0.23
				Medium	127	37.8	0.72
				Close/general population	66	19.6	2.66
				Close/restricted	8	2.4	4.38
				Maximum	8	2.4	7.38
				Special management/protective custody	11	3.3	3.00

Exhibit B.5. Frequency of Override Factors at Initial Classification by Gender

Override Factor	Females (<i>n</i> = 83)		Males (<i>n</i> = 93)	
	Number	%	Number	%
Mandatory Override	2	2.4	10	10.8
Sex offender	1	1.2	5	5.4
First-degree murder	0	.0	1	1.1
35+ years to serve	1	1.2	2	2.2
Released from administrative segregation	0	0.0	2	2.4
Discretionary: Up	8	9.6	9	9.7
Segregated time—assaultive institutional behavior	0	0.0	0	0.0
Serious prior criminal record	4	4.8	3	3.2
Severity of current offense	3	3.6	4	4.3
Escape history	1	1.2	2	2.2
Gang activity	0	0.0	0	0.0
Discretionary: Down	2	2.4	2	2.2
Exceptional institutional conduct	0	0.0	1	1.1
Prior success at lower custody	1	1.2	1	1.1
Severity of current offense	0	0.0	0	0.0
Low severity of prior offenses	1	1.2	0	0.0

Exhibit B.6. Multiple Regression Initial Classification Items on Total Score

Classification Items	Males		Females	
	Beta	Significance	Beta	Significance
Initial Classification				
Step 1: Severity of prior offenses	.47	.001	.66	.001
Step 2: Severity of current offense	.61	.001	.43	.001
Step 3: Number of prior felony convictions	.37	.001	.32	.001
Step 4: Current age	.30	.001	.35	.001
Step 5: Stability factors	.14	.001	.20	.001
Step 6: Escape history	.14	.001	.06	.001
Step 7: History of institutional violence	.10	.001	.00	.001
Constant	-.29	.10	-.03	.86
Reclassification				
Step 1: Most serious report	.37	.001	.38	.001
Step 2: Severity of current offense	.37	.001	.44	.001
Step 3: Institutional disciplinary record	.37	.001	.39	.001
Step 4: Severity of prior offenses	.34	.001	.24	.001
Step 5: Current age	.20	.001	.18	.001
Step 6: Institutional program compliance	.14	.001	.14	.001
Step 7: History of institutional violence	.15	.001	.14	.001
Step 8: Escape history	.07	.001	.08	.001
Constant	-.06	.55	-.02	.87

Exhibit B.7. Correlation Coefficients: Classification Items and Institutional Misconduct

Classification Item	Males	Females
Initial Classification		
Most serious current conviction	-.100	-.006
Past institutional behavior	.809*	.284**
Escape history	.000	.125
Most serious prior conviction	-.010	.087
Number of prior felony convictions	.066	.110
Time to release	-.162	.168
Number of prior commitments	-.006	.135
Age at first conviction	.095	.102
Age at admission	.245**	.063
Close custody score	.307**	.128
Total custody score	.160	.218*
Preliminary custody level	.098	.194*
Recommended custody level	.071	.152
Modified custody level	.194*	.243**
Reclassification Items		
Institutional violence	.640**	.559**
Most serious current offense	.095	.010
Most serious prior conviction	-.024	.147
Number of predatory offenses within past 6 months	.221*	.034
Number of disciplinary reports within past 6 months	.542**	.583**
Performance in treatment/work	.217**	.366**
Time to release	.064	.031
Close custody score	.472**	.411**
Total custody Score	.526**	.561**
Preliminary custody level	.500**	.447**
Recommended custody level	.498**	.506**
Modified custody level	.532**	.455**

Exhibit B.8. Number of Misconduct Reports by Modified Total Initial Classification Score

Initial Classification Score	Misconduct Reports							Total Cases	Mean
	0		1-2		3+				
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%			
1	2	1.1	2	4.3	0	0.0	4	0.58	
2	7	3.8	7	14.9	2	5.0	16	1.19	
3	17	9.2	3	6.4	0	0.0	20	0.20	
4	23	12.5	4	8.5	3	7.5	30	0.93	
5	18	9.8	2	4.3	4	10.0	24	1.08	
6	16	8.7	6	12.8	8	20.0	30	2.23	
7	20	10.9	4	8.5	4	10.0	28	0.89	
8	11	6.0	4	8.5	1	2.5	16	0.63	
9	10	5.4	4	8.5	2	5.0	16	1.50	
10	8	4.3	1	2.1	5	12.5	14	2.29	
11	14	7.6	2	4.3	0	0.0	16	0.13	
12	11	6.0	2	4.3	3	7.5	16	1.69	
13	14	7.6	2	4.3	3	7.5	19	1.26	
14	3	1.6	1	2.1	2	5.0	6	4.83	
15	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	1.00	
16	6	3.3	1	2.1	1	2.5	8	0.75	
17	2	1.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	3	0.67	
18	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	
19	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	2.5	2	7.50	
20	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.00	
21	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	
22	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	1	3.00	
23	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	1	3.00	
Total	184	100.0*	47	100.0*	40	100.0*	271	1.28	

* Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Exhibit B.9. Number of Misconduct Reports by Total Reclassification Score

Total Reclassification Score	Misconduct Reports						Total Cases	Mean
	0		1–2		3+			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
-2	7	3.4	3	2.2	0	0.0	10	0.30
-1	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.00
0	37	18.2	6	4.4	1	0.9	44	0.23
1	3	1.5	1	0.7	1	0.9	5	1.00
2	42	20.7	20	14.7	3	2.8	65	0.55
3	6	3.0	1	0.7	2	1.9	9	1.33
4	26	12.8	16	11.8	4	3.8	46	0.78
5	6	3.0	4	2.9	3	2.8	13	1.69
6	12	5.9	11	8.1	7	6.6	30	1.37
7	7	3.4	8	5.9	5	4.7	20	1.80
8	18	8.9	13	9.6	4	3.8	35	1.11
9	3	1.5	13	9.6	15	14.2	31	3.61
10	28	13.8	8	5.9	11	10.4	47	1.55
11	0	0.0	4	2.9	7	6.6	11	4.64
12	5	2.5	12	8.8	2	1.9	19	2.58
13	2	1.0	5	3.7	9	8.5	16	4.00
14	0	0.0	2	1.5	4	3.8	6	4.50
15	0	0.0	3	2.2	13	12.3	16	7.00
16	0	0.0	3	2.2	3	2.8	6	4.50
17	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.8	4	8.25
18	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.9	2	8.00
19	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.9	3	8.67
20	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
21	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.9	2	9.00
22	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	2.00
23	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	16.00
24	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	9.00
25	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
26	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	10.00
Total	203	100.0*	136	100.0*	106	100.0*	445	1.99

* Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Notes

1. Stephan, James. 1999. *State Prison Expenditures, 1996*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ 172211.
2. Additional information on recent developments is available in two other NIC publications: *Classification of Women Offenders: A National Assessment of Current Practices* (August 2001) and *National Institute of Corrections Prison Classification Peer Training and Strategy Session: What's Happening With Prison Classification Systems?* (September 6–7, 2000), Proceedings.
3. Hardyman, Patricia L. 1993. *Design and Validation of an Objective Classification System for the Montana State Prison System: Final Report*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Grant 92P0IGHR4.
4. Hardyman, Patricia L. 1997. *Montana Department of Corrections Objective Classification System: Revalidation and Recommendations*. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Technical Assistance Contract 97PI025.
5. Hardyman, Patricia L. 1998. *Montana Department of Corrections Objective Classification System: Revalidation and Recommendations*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 97P09G1F7.
6. Hardyman, Patricia L., and Owan C. Tulloch. 2000. *Validation of the Oklahoma Department of Correction Objective Classification System for the Female Inmate Population: Final Report*. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.
7. Austin, James, Stan Repko, Robert Harris, Ken McGinnis, and Susan Plant. 1998. *Evaluation of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Administrative Segregation Population*. Washington, DC: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 98P09GII2.
8. *Ruiz v. Estelle*, 503 F. Supp. 1265 (S.D. Tex. 1980); *Ruiz v. McCotter*, 661 F. Supp. 112 (1986).
9. Austin et al., p. 4., 1998
10. In 1997, the average proportion of the U.S. adult correctional population in administrative segregation was 5.6 percent. See C.M. Camp and G.M. Camp. 1998. *The Corrections Yearbook 1997*. Middletown, CT: Criminal Justice Institute, Inc.
11. Hardyman, Patricia L. 1993. *Design and Validation of an Objective Classification System for the Wyoming State Prison System: Final Report*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Notes

12. Hardyman, Patricia L. 1995. *Revalidation of the Objective Classification System for the Wyoming State Prison System: Final Report*. Report prepared under Technical Assistance Grants 95P1127 and 95P9015 from the National Institute of Corrections. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperating Agreement P09GII2.

13. Ibid, pp. 41–44.

14. The Wyoming correctional system includes four state-operated facilities: Wyoming State Penitentiary (WSP), Wyoming Honor Farm (WHF), Wyoming Honor Conservation Camp (WHCC), and Wyoming Women’s Center (WWC). The Department also contracts with county jails and the Correctional Services Corporation for medium-security beds at the private facility in Crowley, Colorado. The total institutional population as of April 1, 1999, was 1,464 inmates (1,342 males and 122 females).

15. Austin, James. 2000. *Assessment of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections Inmate Classification System*. Washington, DC: Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections.

16. Hardyman, Patricia L., and Owan C. Tulloch. 2000. *Design and Validation of the Delaware Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Final Report*. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.

17. Naro, Wendy. 1999. “Rhode Island Department of Corrections Custody Classification Analysis and Forecasts.” Alexandria, VA: CompuQuest, Inc.

18. Hardyman, Patricia L. 1999. “Rhode Island Department of Corrections Prison Classification System: Observations and Strategies for Identifying Minimum Custody Inmates.” New York: Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.

19. A prospective sample was necessary because the dates when detainees are lodged and then removed are not systematically stored in either INFACIS (RI DOC’s automated information system) or the hardcopy case file.

20. Hardyman, Patricia L., and Owan C. Tulloch. 2000. *Revalidation of the Rhode Island Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Final Report*. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.

21. For the purposes of this pilot test, if an inmate had any one of the following indicators within his record, he was *not* eligible for an administrative transfer: current charge of highest or high severity, pending felony; outstanding felony warrant from another jurisdiction, INS hold, recidivism (5 or more prior felony convictions within the past 10 years); Class 1 institutional booking within the past 5 years; security

risk group membership documented in file; waived from family court/training school; currently housed in protective custody; or mental health/medical restrictions.

22. *Grubbs v. Bradley*, 552 F. Supp. 1052 (M.D. Tenn. 1982). *Grubbs* specified the requirements for the care, custody, and control of TN DOC inmates. The department agreed to a review of their classification system experts and complied with all classification-related recommendations.

23. The NIC objective classification training was provided by the Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections and hosted by the Tennessee Department of Corrections in Nashville on May 4–5, 1999.

24. Hardyman, Patricia L., and Owan C. Tulloch. 2000. *Validation of the Tennessee Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Final Report*. Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.

25. The option of modifying the cut points on the current custody assessment form was tested. While this option slightly improved the ability of the current instrument to identify distinct custody levels at reclassification, the modified cut points did not provide for statistically distinct custody levels at initial classification.

26. Further discussion of internal classification can be found in another NIC publication, Patricia L. Hardyman et al., *Internal Prison Classification Systems: Case Studies in Their Development and Implementation*. (Forthcoming.) Report funded by National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreements 93P045HV5, 97P06GIE8, and 98P06GII0.

References

Austin, J. 1997. *Assessment of the Oregon Department of Corrections Classification System*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Technical Assistance Contract 97P1019.

———. 2000a. *Assessment of the Virginia Department of Corrections Inmate Classification System*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections, Technical Assistance Contract 97P1066.

———. 2000b. *Assessment of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections Inmate Classification System*. Washington, DC: Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 98P09GII2.

Austin, J., S. Repko, R. Harris, K. McGinnis, and S. Plant. 1998. *Evaluation of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Administrative Segregation Population*. Washington, DC: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 98P09GII2.

Camp, C.M., and G.M. Camp. 1998. *The Corrections Yearbook 1997*. Middletown, CT: Criminal Justice Institute, Inc.

Hardyman, P.L. 1993. *Design and Validation of an Objective Classification System for the Montana State Prison System: Final Report*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections 92P0IGHR4.

———. 1993. *Design and Validation of an Objective Classification System for the Wyoming State Prison System: Final Report*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

———. 1995. *Revalidation of the Objective Classification System for the Wyoming State Prison System: Final Report*. Prepared under Technical Assistance Grants 95P1127 and 95P9015 from the National Institute of Corrections.

———. 1997. *Montana Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Revalidation and Recommendations*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Technical Assistance Contract 97PI025.

———. 1998. *Montana Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Revalidation and Recommendations*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 97P09GIF7.

———. 1999. *Rhode Island Department of Corrections Prison Classification System: Observations and Strategies for Identifying Minimum Custody Inmates*. New York: Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.

References

- . 1999. *Wyoming Department of Corrections Prison Objective Classification System: Final Report on the 1999 Revalidation Effort*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 98P09GIJ7.
- Hardyman, P.L. and O.C. Tulloch. 2000. *Design and Validation of the Delaware Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Final Report*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.
- . 2000. *Revalidation of the Rhode Island Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Final Report*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.
- . 2000. *Validation of the Oklahoma Department of Correction Objective Classification System for the Female Inmate Population: Final Report*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.
- . 2000. *Validation of the Tennessee Department of Correction Objective Classification System: Final Report*. Report funded by the National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 99P04GIJ7.
- Naro, W. 1999. *Rhode Island Department of Corrections Custody Classification Analysis and Forecasts*. Alexandria, VA: CompuQuest, Inc.
- Stephan, J. 1999. *State Prison Expenditures, 1996*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ 172211.

Suggested Readings

Alexander, J. 1986. "Classification Objectives and Practices." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 323–338.

Austin, J. 1986. "Evaluating How Well Your Classification System Is Operating: A Practical Approach." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 302–322.

———. 1998. *Objective Jail Classification Systems: A Guide for Jail Administrators*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Grant 97J2303.

Austin, J., D. Holien, L. Chan, and C. Baird. 1989. *Reducing Prison Violence by More Effective Inmate Management: An Experimental Field Test of the Prisoner Management Classification (PMC) System*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Beck, A., and C. Mumola. 1999. *Prisoners in 1998*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ 175687.

Buchanan, R., K. Whitlow, and J. Austin. 1986. "National Evaluation of Objective Prison Classification Systems: The Current State of the Art." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 272–290.

Clements, C. 1982. "The Relationship of Offender Classification to the Problems of Prison Overcrowding." *Crime & Delinquency* 28 (1): 72–81.

Cowden, J. Summary, 1984. *Development and Validation of Risk Prediction and Needs Assessment Scales for Juvenile Offenders in Wisconsin*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Corrections.

Cowden, J., and G. Durkin. Summary, 1984. *Development and Validation of Differential Risk Prediction Scales: An Enhancement of the Original Wisconsin Risk/Needs Classification System*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Corrections.

Criminal Justice Sentencing Policy Statement. April 1992. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Deemer, W., and A. Conine. 1984. "An Institutional Programming Model for the Adult Developmentally Disabled Offender." *Corrections Today* (June 1984): 30–31.

Evatt, P., S. Brown, and L. Fowler. 1989. "Offender Classification: Don't Overlook This Important Security Strategy." *Corrections Today* (July 1989): 34–37.

Hardyman, P., J. Austin, J. Alexander, K. Dedel, and O. Tulloch. 2000. "Internal Prison Classification Systems: Case Studies in Their Development and Implementation." Washington, DC: The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections. Report submitted to the National Institute of Corrections.

Suggested Readings

- Hepburn, J., and L. Goodstein. 1986. "Organizational Imperatives and Sentencing Reform Implementation: The Impact of Prison Practices and Priorities on the Attainment of the Objective of Determinate Sentencing." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 339–365.
- Herrick, E. 1989. "The Surprising Direction of Violence in Prison." *Corrections Compendium* 14 (6): 1–9.
- Jacobsen, V. 1983. "Industrial Unit Management." *Corrections Today* (August 1983): 88–91, 108.
- Kane, T. 1986. "The Validity of Prison Classification: An Introduction to Practical Consideration and Research Issues." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 367–390.
- Lansing, D., J. Bogan, and L. Karacki. 1977. "Unit Management: Implementing a Different Correctional Approach." *Federal Probation* 41 (1): 43–49.
- Leeke, W., and H. Mohn. 1986. "Violent Offenders." *Corrections Today* (May 1986): 22–24.
- Lerner, K., G. Arling, and S.C. Baird. 1986. "Client Management Classification Strategies for Case Supervision." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 254–271.
- Levinson, R. 1988. "Developments in the Classification Process: Quay's AIMS Approach." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 15 (1): 24–38.
- Levinson, R., and J.D. Williams. 1980. "Inmate Classification: Security/Custody Considerations." *Federal Probation* 43 (1): 37–43.
- Levinson, R., and R. Gerard. 1986. "Classifying Institutions." *Crime & Delinquency* 32 (3): 291–301.
- Megargee, E.I., and M.J. Bohn, Jr., with J. Meyer, Jr., and F. Sink. 1979. *Classifying Criminal Offenders: A New System Based on the MMPI*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morris, N., and D. Rothman, eds. 1995. *Oxford History of the Prison: The Practice of Punishment in Western Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- National Council on Crime and Delinquency. James Austin, ed. 1986. *Crime & Delinquency. Special Edition: Prison Classification Systems* 32 (3).
- Quay, H. 1981. *An Empirical Approach to the Differential Behavioral Assessment of the Adult Offender*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

———. 1984. *Managing Adult Inmates: Classification for Housing and Program Assignments*. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association.

Quay, H., and C. Love. 1989. *Behavioral Classification for Female Offenders in the South Carolina Department of Corrections*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Grant 88P01GHA4.

Shutt, R. 1983. *Behavioral Classification System of Adult Offenders in the South Carolina Department of Corrections*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections Grant #FG-3.

Smith, W.A., and C.E. Fenton. 1978. "Unit Management in a Penitentiary: A Practical Experience." *Federal Probation* 42 (3): 40-46.

Solomon, L. 1980. "Developing an Empirically Based Model for Classification Decision-Making." *Prison Law Monitor* 2 (9): 234-237.

Toch, H. 1992. *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival*, rev. ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

VanVoorhis, P. 1994. *Psychological Classification of the Adult Male Prison Inmate*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wright, K.N. 1991. "A Study of Individual, Environmental, and Interactive Effects in Explaining Adjustment to Prison." *Justice Quarterly* 8 (2): 217-242.

User Feedback Form

Please complete and return this form to assist the National Institute of Corrections in assessing the value and utility of its publications. Detach from the document and mail to:

Publications Feedback
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20534

1. What is your general reaction to this document?

Excellent Good Average Poor Useless

2. To what extent do you see the document as being useful in terms of: _____

3. Do you believe that more should be done in this subject area? If so, please specify the types of assistance needed. _____

4. In what ways could this document be improved? _____

5. How did this document come to your attention? _____

6. How are you planning to use the information contained in this document? _____

7. Please check one item that best describes your affiliation with corrections or criminal justice.

If a governmental program, please also indicate the level of government.

Citizen group

Legislative body

College/university

Parole

Community corrections

Police

Court

Probation

Department of corrections or prison

Professional organization

Jail

Other government agency

Juvenile justice

Other (please specify)

8. Optional:

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

Washington, DC 20534

