

106191

305

106191

INFORMATION BULLETIN

DISCIPLINARY REPORTS ISSUED IN THE  
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION,  
1984

Prepared By:

Linda K. Holt

Manager of Operations Research

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by  
Massachusetts Department of  
Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

106191

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Michael V. Fair

Commissioner

February 1987

NCJRS

JUL 24 1987

ACQUISITIONS

PUBLICATION #: 14769-27-250-3-24-87C.R.  
Approved By Daniel Carter, State Purchasing Agent

### Abstract

During 1984 there were 15,291 disciplinary reports written involving 3,949 different individuals. This bulletin contains a statistical description of these disciplinary reports including: reporting institution, offense, finding, sanction and characteristics of the offenders incurring the reports. Some highlights of the findings in this bulletin are:

- The number of disciplinary reports written in 1984 ranged from 26 at the Medfield Prison Project to 5,741 at Cedar Junction. Three facilities, (Cedar Junction, Norfolk and Framingham) accounted for 69 percent of all reports.
- Over half of the individuals in the DOC during 1984 incurred one or more disciplinary reports. The number of disciplinary reports incurred ranged from one to seventy-seven. The median number of reports incurred (for offenders with at least one disciplinary report) was two.
- Seventy-one percent of the disciplinary reports were classified as major and 29 percent as minor.
- Of the 31 offenses involved in disciplinary reports, the three most frequently cited were: number 2, violating rules; number 1, disobeying, lying or insolence; and number 8, disrupting order.
- Seventy percent of all disciplinary reports resulted in a guilty finding.
- The most common sanctions imposed were isolation time, extra work and room restriction.
- Eighty-four percent of all sanctions were invoked, 15 percent were suspended and 1 percent were handled in another way.
- Nine percent of all disciplinary report findings were appealed.

## Table of Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Abstract	i
Tables of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Number of Disciplinary Reports	2
Characteristics of Disciplinary Reports	8
Characteristics of Offenders Receiving Disciplinary Reports	19
Summary	21
Appendix A. Disciplinary Offenses	22

### List of Tables

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Table 1.	Reporting Institution	3
Table 2.	Number of Disciplinary Reports Received by Individual	4
Table 3.	Number of Individuals Receiving Disciplinary Reports	6
Table 4.	Month In Which Disciplinary Report Issued	7
Table 5.	Type of Disciplinary Report by Reporting Institution	9
Table 6.	Disciplinary Offenses	11
Table 7.	Disciplinary Report Findings	12
Table 8.	Disciplinary Report Sanctions	14
Table 9.	Disciplinary Sanction by Administrative Action	15
Table 10.	Number of Isolation Days Imposed By Administrative Action	16
Table 11.	Recommended Number of Good Conduct Days Lost by Administrative Action	17
Table 12.	Disciplinary Report Appeals	18
Table 13.	Selected Characteristics of Offenders Receiving Disciplinary Reports	20

**DISCIPLINARY REPORTS ISSUED IN THE  
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION,**

**1984**

**Introduction**

Inmates in the custody of the Department of Correction (DOC) can receive disciplinary reports for a variety of behavioral infractions. A hearing is held on each disciplinary report and a finding is issued. In some cases sanctions are meted out and inmates can appeal the results of these disciplinary hearings.

The purpose of this bulletin is to present information on disciplinary reports written in the Department of Correction during 1984. The bulletin presents information on the disciplinary reports including: reporting institution, disciplinary offenses, findings, sanctions and appeals. The bulletin also presents information on the offenders receiving disciplinary reports, including characteristics of present offense, criminal history and social background.

The information in this bulletin is derived from disciplinary report rosters submitted to the Research Division by each institution. Additional offense, social background and criminal history information is derived from the computerized inmate data base. The bulletin contains information only on those disciplinary reports received by sentenced inmates in the DOC and excludes any disciplinary reports incurred by women in the Awaiting Trial Unit at Framingham and by Charles Street inmates housed at Concord or Norfolk. Also excluded from the analysis are disciplinary reports that were written and subsequently reduced to incident reports. In addition, 9 disciplinary reports were excluded from the analysis. In 7 cases the disciplinary offense was unknown and in 2 cases the identity of the offender receiving the report could not be positively determined.

#### Number of Disciplinary Reports

During 1984 there were 15,291 disciplinary reports written in DOC facilities. The number of disciplinary reports ranged from 26 at the Medfield Prison Project to 5,741 at Cedar Junction. Three institutions, had more than 1,000 reports: Cedar Junction, Norfolk, and Framingham. Four institutions had between 500 and 1,000 reports: NCCI, Concord, SECC and Shirley. Table 1 shows the number of disciplinary reports for each DOC facility.

Table 1

Reporting Institution

Reporting Institution	Number	Percent
<b>Maximum Security</b>		
Cedar Junction	5741	(38)
Lemuel Shattuck	28	(0)
Sub-Total	5769	(38)
<b>Medium Security</b>		
Concord	714	(5)
Framingham	1657	(11)
Norfolk	3119	(20)
NCCI	972	(6)
SECC	665	(4)
Sub-Total	7127	(47)
<b>Minimum Security</b>		
Bay State	110	(1)
Medfield	26	(0)
NCC	95	(1)
Sub-Total	231	(2)
<b>Minimum/Pre-Release</b>		
Lancaster	253	(2)
Plymouth	313	(2)
Shirley	568	(4)
Warwick	117	(1)
Sub-Total	1251	(8)
<b>Pre-Release</b>		
Boston State	300	(2)
Norfolk PRC	161	(1)
Park Drive	148	(1)
South Middlesex	304	(2)
Sub-Total	913	(6)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15291</b>	<b>(100)</b>



Individual offenders can also receive multiple disciplinary reports. The 15,291 disciplinary reports written in 1984 involved 3,949 different individuals. Individuals involved in the disciplinary process during 1984 received from one to seventy-seven disciplinary reports. The median number of disciplinary reports received, for individuals who received any reports, was two. There were eighty-five individuals who received twenty or more disciplinary reports during the year. Table 2 shows the number of disciplinary reports received by each of the 3,949 offenders involved in the disciplinary process during the year.

Table 2

Number of Disciplinary Reports  
Received by Individual

Number of Disciplinary Reports Received	Number	Percent
One	1424	(36)
Two	799	(20)
Three	487	(12)
Four	314	(8)
Five to Nine	596	(15)
Ten to Fourteen	175	(4)
Fifteen to Nineteen	69	(2)
Twenty or More	85	(2)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3949</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Not all offenders in the DOC received disciplinary reports during 1984. An estimate of the proportion of the population involved in the disciplinary process can be derived by calculating the "base population" for the particular facility or the DOC as a whole, and comparing the "base population" with the number of individuals who received disciplinary reports. The "base population" is the population at the beginning of the period plus any new admissions during the period and represents the total number of offenders served during the period.

Table 3 shows the results of this analysis. For example, Cedar Junction had 666 offenders at the beginning of the year and 1,848 offenders admitted during the year for a total of 2,514 offenders. There were 988 individuals involved in the disciplinary process at Cedar Junction during the year. Thus, it can be estimated that 39 percent of the population at Cedar Junction received one or more disciplinary reports during the year.

Overall, an estimated 55 percent of the offenders in the DOC during 1984 received one or more disciplinary reports during the year and 45 percent received no disciplinary reports during the same period. For individual facilities, the proportion of the population involved in the disciplinary process ranged from 4 percent at Lemuel Shattuck to 62 percent at Boston State Pre-Release Center. Because offenders are generally placed at more than one facility during the year, the proportion involved in the disciplinary process at each facility is generally lower than the proportion involved in the DOC as a whole.

Table 3

Number of Individuals  
Receiving Disciplinary Reports

Institution	Beginning Population	Admissions	Total	Individuals Receiving D-Report*	Percent Of Population
Cedar Junction	666	1848	2514	988	(39)
Lemuel Shattuck	11	447	458	20	(4)
Concord	527	3249	3776	466	(12)
Framingham	193	929	1122	415	(37)
Norfolk	1028	1690	2718	1181	(43)
NCCI	551	1058	1609	479	(30)
SECC	285	606	891	315	(35)
Bay State	139	175	314	74	(24)
Medfield	32	24	56	18	(32)
N.C.C.	202	288	490	76	(16)
Lancaster	139	182	321	127	(40)
Plymouth	109	412	521	189	(36)
Shirley	199	659	858	332	(39)
Warwick	61	167	228	68	(30)
Boston State	54	120	174	108	(62)
Norfolk PRC	40	96	136	72	(53)
Park Drive	49	141	190	83	(44)
South Middlesex	69	160	229	123	(54)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4354</b>	<b>2762</b>	<b>7116</b>	<b>3949</b>	<b>(55)</b>

\* Individuals can receive disciplinary reports at more than one institution. Thus, the sum of this column is greater than the total number of individuals receiving disciplinary reports.

The number of disciplinary reports issued in any month ranged from 1,167 in January to 1,471 in June. Table 4 presents the month in which disciplinary reports were issued. There seems to be little seasonal variation in the issuance of disciplinary reports.

Table 4

Month In Which Disciplinary  
Report Issued

<u>Number of Disciplinary Reports Received</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
January	1167	(8)
February	1197	(8)
March	1378	(9)
April	1219	(8)
May	1276	(8)
June	1471	(10)
July	1207	(8)
August	1400	(9)
September	1170	(8)
October	1203	(8)
November	1320	(9)
December	1283	(8)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15291</b>	<b>(100)</b>

## Characteristics of Disciplinary Reports

In this section several characteristics of disciplinary reports are discussed including: type of disciplinary report, disciplinary offense, finding, sanctions, administrative actions taken on sanctions, isolation days, recommendations for loss of good conduct time and disciplinary appeals.

### Type of Disciplinary Report

Disciplinary reports are classified into three types: major, minor and referred to District attorney (D.A.). Overall, 71 percent of the reports were classified as major 29 percent were classified as minor, and less than one percent were initially referred to the D.A. Table 5 shows the type of disciplinary report issued for each reporting institution. The type of disciplinary report varied widely by institution. For example, 98 percent of the reports written at Norfolk were classified as major while only 34 percent of the reports written at Shirley were classified as major.

Table 5

Type of Disciplinary Report  
By Reporting Institution

Reporting Institution	<u>Major</u>		<u>Minor</u>		<u>D.A.</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Maximum</b>								
Cedar Junction	3692	(64)	2049	(36)	0	(0)	5741	(100)
Lemuel Shattuck	28	(100)	0	(0)	0	(0)	28	(100)
Sub-Total	3720	(64)	2049	(36)	0	(0)	5769	(100)
<b>Medium</b>								
Concord	680	(95)	34	(5)	0	(0)	714	(100)
Framingham	883	(53)	774	(47)	0	(0)	1657	(100)
Norfolk	3055	(98)	56	(2)	8	(0)	3119	(100)
NCCI	655	(67)	316	(33)	1	(0)	972	(100)
SECC	394	(59)	271	(41)	0	(0)	665	(100)
Sub-Total	5667	(80)	1451	(20)	9	(0)	7127	(100)
<b>Minimum</b>								
Bay State	42	(38)	68	(62)	0	(0)	110	(100)
Medfield	26	(100)	0	(0)	0	(0)	26	(100)
N.C.C.	74	(78)	11	(12)	10	(10)	95	(100)
Sub-Total	142	(61)	79	(34)	10	(4)	231	(100)
<b>Minimum/Pre-Release</b>								
Lancaster	126	(50)	127	(50)	0	(0)	253	(100)
Plymouth	220	(70)	93	(30)	0	(0)	313	(100)
Shirley	195	(34)	337	(60)	36	(6)	568	(100)
Warwick	83	(71)	34	(29)	0	(0)	117	(100)
Sub-Total	624	(50)	591	(47)	36	(3)	1251	(100)
<b>Pre-Release</b>								
Boston State	127	(42)	173	(58)	0	(0)	300	(100)
Norfolk PRC	141	(88)	20	(12)	0	(0)	161	(100)
Park Drive	121	(82)	27	(18)	0	(0)	148	(100)
South Middlesex	221	(73)	74	(24)	9	(3)	304	(100)
Sub-Total	610	(67)	294	(32)	9	(1)	913	(100)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10763</b>	<b>(71)</b>	<b>4464</b>	<b>(29)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>15291</b>	<b>(100)</b>

## Disciplinary Offense

There are thirty-one different offenses for which offenders can receive disciplinary reports. These offenses are shown in Appendix A. In any single disciplinary report an offender can be cited for more than one offense. The present analysis incorporates up to five offenses per disciplinary report. Of the 15,291 disciplinary reports, 6,697 (44 percent) involved one offense, 4,650 (30 percent) involved two offenses, 2,672 (18 percent) involved three offenses, 939 (6 percent) involved four offenses, and 333 (2 percent) involved five offenses. In total, the 15,291 disciplinary reports involved 29,434 separate disciplinary offenses.

Table 6 presents the offenses for which offenders received disciplinary reports in 1984. The first column represents the number of disciplinary reports in which the particular offense was involved and the second column represents the percentage of reports in which this offense was involved. For example, offense number 19, abusive language, was cited in 1,816 (12 percent) of the reports as one of the first five offenses. Because disciplinary reports often involve more than one offense the columns sum to more than the number of reports and to more than 100 percent.

The most common disciplinary offenses were: number 2, violating rules (42 percent); number 1, disobeying, lying or insolence (32 percent); and number 8, disrupting order (29 percent).

Table 6

Disciplinary  
Offenses

Disciplinary Offense	Number	Percent
1. Disobeying/Lying or Insolence	4826	(32)
2. Violating Rules	6454	(42)
3. Failure to Keep Quarters	728	(5)
4. Out of Place	2445	(16)
5. Failure to Perform Assignment	1003	(7)
6. Counterfeiting/Forgery	55	(0)
7. Tampering with Exit	219	(1)
8. Disrupting Order	4383	(29)
9. Escape	205	(1)
10. Alcohol/Other Drug	1755	(12)
11. Misuse Medication	63	(0)
12. Refusing Drug Test	161	(1)
13. Gambling	113	(1)
14. Rioting	261	(2)
15. Possession of Weapon	311	(2)
16. Killing	15	(0)
17. Self Mutilation	102	(1)
18. Fighting/Assaulting/Threatening	1396	(9)
19. Abusive Language	1816	(12)
20. Engaging in Sexual Acts	72	(1)
21. Setting a Fire	117	(1)
22. Destroying Property	691	(4)
23. Poss. of Others Property	225	(2)
24. Poss. of Unauthorized Items	827	(5)
25. Exchanging Money	132	(1)
26. Stealing	346	(2)
27. Bribing Staff	12	(0)
28. Bribing Staff with Services	9	(0)
29. Extortion	22	(0)
30. Violating Mass. Laws	261	(2)
31. Att. to Commit Infraction	409	(3)



## Disciplinary Report Findings

The disciplinary report board that hears the case will issue a finding. Table 7 presents the findings of all 1984 disciplinary reports. In 75 percent of the reports the finding was guilty or filed; in 10 percent the report resulted in a warning; in 10 percent the report was dismissed or the offender was found not guilty; in 5 percent the report was pending or the offender was unavailable (on escape status or released before hearing); and in 1 percent the report was consolidated with other reports and a single finding was issued for all reports.

Table 7

### Disciplinary Report Findings

<u>Finding</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Guilty	10657	(70)
Warning	1563	(10)
Dismissed	1127	(7)
Filed	780	(5)
Pending	545	(4)
Not Guilty	428	(3)
Consolidated	104	(1)
Released Before Hearing	69	(1)
Escape Status	18	(0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15291</b>	<b>(100)</b>

## Sanctions

If an offender is found guilty of a disciplinary report, the board can impose sanctions upon the offender. The present analysis incorporates up to four sanctions per disciplinary report. Of the 15,291 disciplinary reports, 4,532 (30 percent) resulted in no sanction, 8,520 (56 percent) resulted in one sanction, 1,960 (13 percent) resulted in two sanctions, 268 (2 percent) resulted in three sanctions, and 11 (less than 1 percent) resulted in four sanctions. In total, the 15,291 disciplinary reports resulted in 13,288 sanctions.

Table 8 presents the sanctions that resulted from disciplinary reports issued in 1984. The first column represents the number of disciplinary reports in which the particular sanction was involved and the second column represents the percentage of reports in which this offense was involved. For example, extra work was cited in 1,609 reports (15 percent) as one of the first four sanctions. Because disciplinary reports often involve more than one sanction, the columns sum to more than the number of reports and to more than 100 percent.

The most common sanctions were isolation time (which was given in 60 percent of the reports), extra work (15 percent), room restriction (11 percent), and loss of privileges (10 percent).

Table 8

Disciplinary Report Sanctions

Sanction	Number	Percent
Reprimand	38	(0)
Loss of Privileges	1052	(10)
Room Restriction	1206	(11)
Restitution	199	(2)
Extra Work	1609	(15)
Isolation	6458	(60)
Loss of GCD	434	(4)
Consolidate	354	(3)
Reclassification	1007	(9)
Time Served	921	(9)
Probation	10	(0)
None	4532	(30)

Administrative Action: Sanctions for disciplinary reports can be invoked or suspended by the disciplinary board. Table 9 presents the administrative actions taken on each sanction. Overall, fifteen percent of all sanctions were suspended, 84 percent were invoked, and 1 percent were dealt with in another way (e.g. consolidated with other reports).

Table 9

Disciplinary Sanction by  
Administrative Action

Disciplinary Sanction	<u>Suspended</u>		<u>Invoked</u>		<u>Other</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Reprimand	0	(0)	38	(100)	0	(0)	38	(100)
Loss of Privileges	67	(6)	980	(93)	5	(1)	1052	(100)
Room Restriction	414	(34)	792	(66)	0	(0)	1206	(100)
Restitution	0	(0)	198	(99)	1	(1)	199	(100)
Extra Work	55	(3)	1553	(96)	1	(1)	1609	(100)
Isolation Time	1522	(24)	4933	(76)	3	(0)	6458	(100)
Loss of Good Time	0	(0)	427	(98)	7	(2)	434	(100)
Consolidated	12	(3)	276	(78)	66	(19)	354	(100)
Reclassification	17	(2)	989	(98)	1	(0)	1007	(100)
Time Served	2	(1)	919	(99)	0	(0)	921	(100)
Probation	0	(0)	10	(100)	0	(0)	10	(100)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2089</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>11115</b>	<b>(84)</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>13288</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Two types of sanction were suspended more often than other types: room restriction, suspended in 34 percent of all cases; and isolation time, suspended in 24 percent of all cases.

Isolation Time. One common sanction imposed in response to disciplinary reports is isolation time. Table 10 shows the number of isolation days meted out for disciplinary infractions and shows whether those isolation days were invoked or suspended. Isolation days were given in 6,389 cases. The number of days ranged from 1 to 65. The median number of days was 10.

Table 10

Isolation Days Imposed  
by Administrative Action

Isolation Days	Suspended	Invoked	Total
1 to 4	387	628	1015
5	527	990	1517
6 to 9	113	524	637
10	273	972	1245
11 to 14	7	23	30
15	170	1522	1692
16 or more	24	229	253
<b>Total</b>	<b>1501</b>	<b>4888</b>	<b>6389</b>

Good Conduct Days Lost. Another common sanction is the recommendation of loss of good conduct days. Table 11 shows the number of good conduct days that were recommended to be deducted and whether the recommendation was suspended or invoked. In 431 cases there was a recommendation for loss of good conduct days, ranging from 1 to 300 days. The modal number of recommended good conduct days lost was 50.

Table 11

Recommended Loss of  
Good Conduct Days  
by Administrative Action

<b>GCD Loss</b>	<b>Suspended</b>	<b>Invoked</b>	<b>Total</b>
1 to 49	50	6	56
50	107	34	141
51 to 99	19	6	25
100	57	17	74
101 to 149	6	0	6
150	84	39	123
151 or more	5	1	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>431</b>

### Disciplinary Report Appeals

Inmates can appeal the results of their disciplinary report to the Superintendent. In 1984, nine percent of all disciplinary report findings were appealed. Of all appeals, 79 percent were denied and 21 percent were approved by the Superintendent. Of those appeals that were approved, one percent resulted in a reversal of the finding and 20 percent resulted in a reduction of the sanction.

Table 12

### Disciplinary Report Appeals

<b>Appeal</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No Appeal	13975	(91)
Appeal Denied	1040	(7)
Appeal Approved Finding Reversed	10	(0)
Appeal Approved Sanction Reduced	266	(2)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15291</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Characteristics of Offenders Receiving  
Disciplinary Reports

Table 13 presents selected characteristics of offenders receiving disciplinary reports. The first two columns presents offender characteristics for each disciplinary report. Thus, offenders receiving multiple disciplinary reports are represented multiple times in these columns. The last two columns present information on individuals who received disciplinary reports. Thus, each individual is represented once, regardless of the number of disciplinary reports received.

Most individuals receiving disciplinary reports were violent offenders (68 percent). Eight percent were lifers and 52 percent were serving other Cedar Junction sentences. Eighty-nine percent were male and 11 percent were female. Sixty-two percent were white and 34 percent were black. The median age at disciplinary report was 27 years.



Table 13

Selected Characteristics of  
Offenders Receiving  
Disciplinary Reports

Offender Characteristic	Disc. Report		Individual	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b><u>Offense</u></b>				
Person	9825	(64)	2304	(58)
Sex	1439	(9)	396	(10)
Property	2756	(18)	791	(20)
Drug	488	(3)	199	(5)
Other	720	(5)	233	(6)
Unknown	63	(0)	26	(1)
Total	15291	(100)	3949	(100)
<b><u>Sentence</u></b>				
First-Degree Lifer	574	(4)	152	(4)
Second-Degree Lifer	756	(5)	179	(4)
Other Walpole	8391	(55)	2056	(52)
Concord	3830	(25)	1128	(28)
Framingham	1740	(11)	434	(11)
Total	15291	(100)	3949	(100)
<b><u>Sex</u></b>				
Male	13551	(89)	3515	(89)
Female	1740	(11)	434	(11)
Total	15291	(100)	3949	(100)
<b><u>Race</u></b>				
White	8843	(58)	2430	(62)
Black	5916	(39)	1346	(34)
Hispanic	141	(1)	53	(1)
Other	41	(0)	8	(0)
Unknown	350	(2)	112	(3)
Total	15291	(100)	3949	(100)
<b><u>Age at Report</u></b>				
19 or Younger	966	(6)	203	(5)
20 to 24	5689	(37)	1210	(31)
25 to 29	4541	(30)	1113	(28)
30 to 34	2181	(14)	690	(17)
35 to 39	842	(6)	334	(8)
40 to 44	387	(2)	151	(4)
45 to 49	208	(1)	67	(2)
50 to 59	118	(1)	61	(2)
60 and Older	17	(0)	10	(0)
Unknown	342	(2)	110	(3)
Total	15291	(100)	3949	(100)

## Summary

During 1984 over 15,000 disciplinary reports were written. The disciplinary process involved over half of the offenders in the DOC custody during 1984. Three institutions (Cedar Junction, Norfolk, and Framingham) were responsible for 69 percent of all disciplinary reports. Individual offenders received up to seventy-seven reports in a single year. Seventy percent of all reports were classified as major. The most commonly cited disciplinary offenses were violation of rule number 2, 1, or 8. The offender was probably found guilty of the offense which resulted in recommendations for isolation time, extra work or room restriction. The results of the board were usually not appealed. The typical offender receiving a disciplinary report was 27 years old, white, male and serving a Cedar Junction sentence for a violent offense.

**APPENDIX A  
DISCIPLINARY OFFENSES**

<u>NUMERIC CODE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
1	Disobeying an order of, lying to, or insolence toward a staff member.
2	Violating any departmental rule or regulation, or any other rule, regulation or condition of an institution or community-based-program.
3	Failure to keep ones person or ones quarters in accordance with institutional rules.
4	Being out of place.
5	Unexcused absence from, willful failure to properly perform or refusal to accept a work or program assignment.
6	Counterfeiting, forging, or unauthorized reproduction of any document, article of indentification, money, security, or official paper.
7	Tampering with or blocking any locking device, door, gate or window.
8	Conduct which disrupts or interferes with the security or orderly running of the institution.
9	Escape or possession of escape tools.
10	Manufacture, possession, introduction or use of any unauthorized controlled substance, alcoholic beverage or associated paraphernalia.
11	Misuse of authorized medication, for example the unauthorized accumulation of prescribed medication.
12	Refusal to take a breathalizer test or to provide a urine specimen.
13	Gambling.
14	Participating in or encouraging a riot, work stoppage, hostage taking, or unauthorized group demonstration.
15	Possession, manufacture or introduction of a gun,

firearm, explosive, ammunition, weapon, sharpened instrument, knife or tool.

- 16 Killing.
- 17 Self mutilation.
- 18 Fighting with, assaulting or threatening another person with any offense against his person or property.
- 19 Use of obscene, abusive or threatening language action or gesture to any inmate or staff member.
- 20 Engaging in unauthorized sexual acts with others.
- 21 Setting a fire.
- 22 Willfully destroying or damaging state property or the property of another person.
- 23 Unauthorized possession of property belonging to another person.
- 24 Possession of anything, including money or currency, not authorized for retention or receipt by the inmate.
- 25 Giving money or anything of value to or accepting money or anything of value from another inmate, a member of his family or his friend, without authorization.
- 26 Stealing.
- 27 Giving or offering any official or staff member a bribe.
- 28 Giving or offering any official or staff member any item or service of value.
- 29 Extortion, blackmail, protection: demanding or receiving money or anything of value in return for protection against others.
- 30 Violating any law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or United States.
- 31 Attempting to commit any of the above offenses, aiding another person to commit any of the above offenses, and making plans to commit any of the above offenses shall be considered the same as commission of the offense itself.