



U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections



JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT
DOCUMENT: GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING, IMPLEMENTING
AND REVISING AN OBJECTIVE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

130102

**JAIL CLASSIFICATION
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT**



**GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING,
IMPLEMENTING AND REVISING AN
OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**

Prepared by

**James F. Austin, Ph.D., Executive Vice President
S. Christopher Baird, Senior Vice President**

National Council on Crime and Delinquency

**Headquarters
685 Market Street, Suite 620
San Francisco, California 94105
(415-896-6223)**

**Midwest Office
6409 Odana Road
Madison, Wisconsin 53719
(608-274-8882)**

and

**Robert A. Buchanan, President
Cindie A. Unger, Vice President
John F. Kohl, Corrections Management Specialist**

**Correctional Services Group
410 Archibald, Suite 200
Kansas City, Missouri 64111-3001
(816-753-6570)**

**Edited by
David Wells
Northwest Michigan Private Industry Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 506
Traverse City, Michigan 49685
(619-947-4780)**

October 1990

This project was supported by grant number GN-1 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document (or parts thereof) was prepared under grant number GN-1 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. The National Institute of Corrections reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use, all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	
INTRODUCTION	1
THE ADVANTAGES OF AN OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	2
ISSUES IN IMPLEMENTING AN OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	4
RECENT APPROACHES TO OBJECTIVE CLASSIFICATION	6
OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AN OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	8
Step 1: Decision to Adapt an Objective Jail Classification System	9
Step 2: Commitment of Top Agency Personnel	11
Step 3: Selection of Project Planning Staff	12
Step 4: Identification of Role of Classification System Planners	13
Step 5: Development of Goals and Objectives for the Objective Jail Classification System	14
Step 6: Appointment of Advisory Group	15
Step 7: Identification of Legal Issues	16
Step 8: Preparation of Adaptation Plan	17
Step 9: Revision of Classification Instruments and Instructions	18
Step 10: Preparation of an Implementation Plan	23
Step 11: Pilot Testing of the Objective Jail Classification System	24
Step 12: Development of Classification Policies and Procedures	27
Step 13: Training of Staff	28
Step 14: Ongoing Evaluation and Review of the Objective Classification System	30
FINAL CONSIDERATIONS	32
APPENDIX 1: THE NCCD JAIL ADDITIVE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	
Exhibit 1: Inmate Screening Form	
Exhibit 2: Initial Custody Assessment Scale	
Exhibit 3: Custody Reassessment Scale	
Exhibit 4: Inmate Needs Assessment Forms	
APPENDIX 2: THE CJA DECISION-TREE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	

Acknowledgements

This project was funded by the Jails Division, National Institute of Corrections (NIC). The project was initiated in response to the need for enhanced assessment of the risks and needs presented by inmates confined within the nation's jails. Conduct of the project was a collaborative effort between the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) and Correctional Services Group, Inc. (CSG).

Numerous other individuals also contributed to the successful completion of this project. Invaluable assistance was afforded by personnel at the three jail sites that implemented the objective classification system for a period of eight months. They provided project staff with not only information important to evaluating the system, but also insights into ways to improve it and modify it for use by other jails. While many personnel at these sites were involved in the implementation effort, the following individuals played key roles:

Hillsborough County (Florida) Detention Department

Colonel David M. Parrish, Commander
Major James Cook, Division Major
Marilyn C. Hall, General Manager I
James F. Gross, Assistant Supervisor
Christa J. Winstead, Classification Specialist

Johnson County (Kansas) Adult Detention Center

Captain John V. Zemites, Bureau Commander
Lieutenant R. B. Johnston, Division Commander
Sergeant Rodney A. Daniel, Classification Supervisor
Deputy Jeffrey A. Detwiler, Classification Officer
Deputy Linda C. Shuttlesworth, Classification Officer

Marion County (Oregon) Department of Community Corrections

Billy F. Wasson, Director
Jean Hill, Management Analyst
Ted Nelson, Jail Commander
Lieutenant Bill Putnam, Corrections Manager
Deputy James Herring, Classification Officer

In addition, thanks are due to staff at the two agencies that served as supplemental sites for objective classification system assessment. These sites had objective systems in place for several years prior to the start of the project and agreed to share their classification information and experiences with both project staff and the implementation sites. Within these agencies, special recognition is deserved by the following persons:

San Mateo County Sheriff's Office

Captain Jerry Cohn, Classification/Training Unit
Sergeant Dave Lynch, Classification Supervisor
Lieutenant Mike Lopez, Classification Supervisor
Deputy Rick Gutierrez, Classification Officer
Deputy Janet Neilson, Classification Officer

Hawaii State Department of Corrections

Winona Rubin, Director
Theodore Sakai, Administrator
Ken Hashi, Research Administrator
Martha Torney, Program Planner
Frank Lopez, CIS Administrator
Wendall Murakawa, Unit Supervisor

Tim Brennan, Ph.D., assisted in the preparation of this report by writing the decision-tree approach to objective classification presented in the Final Report. He also addressed project participants on the effects of over-classification and reviewed the classification instruments developed by the project team.

Many other individuals gave generously of their time to examine the classification instruments and offer helpful suggestions to project staff and the implementation sites. While these persons are too numerous to mention here, their assistance is greatly appreciated.

Project staff also wish to acknowledge the contribution made by the 60 jails that responded to the national survey on jail classification. These jails were instrumental in providing a detailed description of existing classification practices as well as information used in designing the objective classification system.

We are also grateful for the insightful comments and critique provided by the six independent reviewers: Marilyn B. Ayres; Norman R. Cox, Jr.; Francesca Digirolamo; Robert B. Levinson, Ph.D.; Carl R. Reed, and Jayne R. Russell. Their time and expertise were invaluable to the task of finalizing the project reports.

Finally, the project team would like to thank the Jails Division, National Institute of Corrections, for its unwavering support. Michael O'Toole and Jim T. Barbee served as project monitors. They reviewed all products emanating from the project and shared valuable insights into both jail operations and classification system development and implementation. William Frazier, the initial project monitor, helped refine the project work-plan and afforded early guidance for project activities.

INTRODUCTION

The history of inmate classification is primarily one of classification in prisons. The use of classification in jails is a relatively new phenomenon. The delay in implementing classification in jails is primarily a result of their unique functions and constraints.

First, unlike prisons, which confine only sentenced offenders, jails are responsible for detaining a diverse population. Classification criteria and scales must be designed in consideration of the variance in legal status within the jail population.

Second, jail classification is further complicated by the short length of stay for many persons. Frequently, inmates are released within 72 hours of their booking, making it difficult, if not impossible, for staff to obtain the information necessary to classify them. This lack of verifiable information limits the ability of staff to separate offenders into categories that would enhance inmate management.

Third, jail systems, particularly large systems, must contend with a high volume of admissions. High annual admission rates tax existing resources, create work overloads for staff, and decrease the time available to assess individual inmates and make classification decisions.

Fourth, jail classification is hampered by the physical design of the facilities themselves. The large majority of jails were designed with maximum security cells, precluding the need to classify for lower security designations. Older facilities, in particular, lack sufficient capacity and/or capability to physically separate inmates who have been classified differently.

Finally, in addition to such operational constraints, jail classification has been limited by a sort of benign neglect. Many jail administrators simply do not view classification as an important component in detention operations. Others have been forced to shortchange classification due to inadequate staff resources.

These and other challenges of operating jails slowed the evolution of jail classification. At present, most jail classification systems are at a point similar to where prison classification was nearly 20 years ago: separating males from females, adults from juveniles, and sentenced from unsentenced. However, a variety of other factors, including overcrowding of existing facilities, the recognized need to improve resource allocation, and intervention by the courts, have generated pressures directed toward enhancing the process of jail classification. Among jail administrators there is a growing awareness of -- and support for -- the benefits that can be derived from valid and reliable classification systems.

THE ADVANTAGES OF AN OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Regardless of its size and complexity, a jail's primary responsibility is to safely and securely detain all individuals remanded to its custody. Classification is an essential management tool for performing this function. By definition classification is the process of placing things or people into classes according to some rational idea or plan. A good system of classifying inmates will reduce escapes and escape attempts, suicides and suicide attempts, the unnecessary incarceration of non-threatening prisoners, and unwarranted inmate-on-inmate assaults. All of these

outcomes conserve valuable resources by reducing expenditures for legal fees and court costs, overtime pay, and medical expenses.

Moreover, inmate classification can lead to more effective jail operations and more consistent decision making regarding the assignment of inmates to appropriate custody levels. An effective classification system is one which meets its identified goals and objectives while adhering to the fundamental principles of inmate management. A consistent classification system is one which facilitates the same classification and screening conclusions among all classification staff and assures fair and equitable processing of the inmate.

Effective, objective classification systems will save money by placing inmates inappropriately held in highly secure/costly jails in less secure/less expensive settings. Consistent classification allows for the redistribution of personnel according to the custody requirements of inmates, which permits better daily administration and crisis management. However, it is not reasonable to expect classification, by itself, to reduce the level of staffing needed in jail facilities.

The advantages of an objective system go beyond those associated with cost savings and improved management. An effective classification system will also provide:

- Standardized inmate custody profile information and other inmate-specific data, in support of ongoing management, planning and policy development;
- Improved security and control of inmates by identifying and providing surveillance for the appropriate group, and by assisting the corrections staff in knowing what "kind" of inmate is where;

- Assistance in the effective use of personnel based on an understanding of inmates' differing program and custody needs;
- Information for monitoring and evaluating program goals;
- Assistance in population management by identifying those inmate groups who may be eligible for various release programs, and by helping decision-makers project the level of security required for future bed space needs.

Objective inmate classification contributes to efficient jail operations. Information about the inmate is collected and a program is developed based upon custodial requirements and the inmate's needs. An orderly method is furnished for assessing the varied needs and requirements of each inmate from commitment to release.

ISSUES IN IMPLEMENTING AN OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Most jail classification systems may be categorized as either subjective or objective. When using the subjective approach, decisions are reached based upon the agency's correctional philosophy, the jail's physical design, and the inmate's own characteristics. The assumption underlying such systems is that experienced staff know the inmates and will make the most appropriate decisions. Problems arise because not all staff are experienced, they do not all possess equal ability to make classification decisions in a consistent or valid manner, and it is unlikely that staff know all inmates well enough to classify them accurately.

Objective systems employ standardized screening instruments and assessment tools to determine inmates' custody and/or program needs. Completion of the forms

leads to recommendations for custody designation and programming. The role of staff expertise and judgment is confined to agreement or disagreement with these recommendations.

Objective classification systems are characterized by the following elements:

- Using test and classification instruments that have been validated for inmate populations;
- Using the same components and decision criteria approach with all inmates;
- Fostering similar decisions among classification staff on comparable cases;
- Assigning inmates to custody levels consistent with their background;
- Structuring classification decision-making authority while minimizing overrides¹; and
- Limiting discretionary decision-making to ensure uniformity in agency operations and minimizing the potential for unfavorable litigation.

RECENT APPROACHES TO OBJECTIVE CLASSIFICATION

Objective inmate classification systems first surfaced in the nation's prison systems during the late 1970s. The Federal Bureau of Prisons was the first to implement objective inmate classification on a system-wide basis in 1977. The California Department of Corrections followed suit in 1980 with its own unique

¹Override is a term which refers to overriding the classification system; a process which results in classifying inmates to a higher or lower level than the resulting score would justify. Overrides occur when the classification score obtained is not viewed as valid for a particular inmate.

approach. Since then the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has supported the ongoing development of objective approaches for both prisons and jails.

While objective classification in local jurisdictions has in the past been confined primarily to pre-trial release screening, some jurisdictions have recently developed objective classification instruments and systems to determine, or assist in determining, an inmate's custody level and program placement.

Objective classification systems commonly employ one of two types of scales: the additive scale or the decision-tree scale. It must be emphasized that whether choosing an additive or decision-tree approach, that choice will have nothing to do with the reliability or validity of the classification system. In fact, both additive and decision-tree scales typically use the same variables to make custody level determinations. What is different is the format or style of the scoring instruments and the ability to make modifications in classification criteria.

The additive approach is the most common format used in correctional classification systems. An example of an additive scale developed by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) for jail classification is shown in Appendix 1. In such systems, a number of scoring items are created with each item establishing a rank ordering to score the inmate. For example, a scoring item could be "Severity of Offense" with a severity ranking of "highest", "high", "moderate" and "low". This ranking ordering would then be assigned points to reflect the weighing of each level of severity. For example, "highest" might receive a point score of 7 points and "low" a weight of 1 point. These scores are summed and a classification

level is assigned based on the total. Similar to all scaling methods, the additive scale can be developed through a variety of means, including statistical analyses and consensus-building techniques.

The decision-tree scale approach, as the name implies, uses a branch-like format to determine an inmate's custody level. An example of a decision-tree format developed by Community Justice Alternatives (CJA) for jail classification is shown in Appendix 2. In such scales, the responses tend to be "yes" and "no" as opposed to the points used in additive models. Responses to each question on the "tree" determine which branch the inmate's case will proceed along and eventually be linked to a scored custody level. For example, the first decision-point may ask the question of whether an inmate has ever been convicted of an assaultive felony. If the response is "Yes" then the inmate proceeds along the branch leading to maximum custody. A "No" response places the inmate on the branch leading toward minimum custody. How the inmate is scored according to a number of intervening questions will determine the inmate's final custody score.

Both additive and decision-tree systems require the availability of the pertinent data required to respond to each of the decision criteria. Often, as a prerequisite to implementation, a restructuring or enhancement of the current inmate information system is required. The lack of information for any objective system puts an additional burden on the classification staff and ultimately the facility.

Finally, it must also be emphasized that methodology for developing and implementing an objective classification system as described next is the same whether

an agency decides upon an additive or decision-tree format for its classification scoring instruments.

OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AN OBJECTIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Generally speaking, the approach an agency takes in developing and implementing a new classification system is as important, or more important, than the objective system selected. A study of jails instituting objective systems found that many approached the change process in different ways -- with varying results. It was also found that the most successful strategies shared common elements; elements that will likely improve the effectiveness of any effort to develop and institute a new classification system. These commonalities are summarized in the following 14 steps. These steps can help other agencies to develop or adopt an objective jail classification system that will meet their local needs and resources.

Step 1: Decision to Adapt An Objective Jail Classification System

Several factors can prompt jurisdictions to adapt existing objective systems for classifying prisoners. For example, the courts have frequently mandated a process that is uniformly applied to all inmates. In other cases, overcrowding has created pressure to implement more efficient and cost-effective policies and procedures for classifying inmates. With objective systems, most decisions can be made relatively quickly by line staff who have been trained to complete the assessment form and who have sufficient experience to identify those few cases requiring special handling.

Moreover, use of a valid, equitable classification system can reduce over classification², thereby decreasing costs associated with unnecessary incarceration or excessive security requirements. Finally, the desire to receive accreditation has led many correctional administrators to adopt objective classification systems.

While complete objectivity in classifying inmates is not possible, supporters of objective systems contend that this approach:

- Controls discretion by permitting overrides of the classification process, but only within explicitly stated parameters;
- Assures everyone is aware of decision-making criteria, including the inmate, by including the rules or guidelines;
- Improves information-gathering by promoting the accurate, consistent, and comprehensive accumulation of information;
- Promotes consistency in decision-making by requiring decision-makers to use standardized criteria and apply them in the same manner each time;
- Provides for easier evaluation/monitoring by using standardized criteria and procedures that facilitate review and assessment.

Before adopting a new classification system, it is helpful for agencies to review the following questions:

- What short and long-term purposes are to be served by the classification effort?
- How much will it cost to adapt a new system and to operate it once implemented?

²Overclassification refers to a system error which results in classifying an inmate to a higher security level than required.

- To what extent will the new system reduce costs associated with over building, overcrowding, escapes, etc.?
- Do top management staff and others responsible for overseeing the system's development understand the magnitude of the effort they will be undertaking?
- Are there qualified and experienced staff available to adapt the new classification system to local needs and to implement it successfully once it is developed?
- Does the agency have a real need for a new classification system, and is this need recognized by most staff and key officials outside the agency?
- Is there a clear understanding of the consequences if an objective system is not implemented?
- How long will the adaptation and implementation of a new classification system take?
- Can an organizational climate be developed to support successful completion of the classification project?
- Is there an adequate experience base to sustain the development and periodic revision of the objective system?

It is not necessary that an agency answer all these questions immediately or to everyone's satisfaction. The primary reason for asking these questions is to identify potential problems and pitfalls the agency may face as early in the process as possible. Strategies may be planned that will embody alternative methods for problem resolution.

Few agencies develop new classification systems "from scratch." These agencies usually adapt an existing system to local needs. In rare cases, a local jurisdiction will borrow components from several systems, merging them into an

approach unique to that agency. Reasons an agency may have for "borrowing" a classification system from another jurisdiction include:

- The apparent success of the system in improving classification decision making;
- The time, effort, and cost of evaluating the current classification process;
- A lack of expertise on the part of correctional administrators relative to understanding the intricacies of an effective classification system; and
- The belief that other agencies often possess knowledge and experience above and beyond that of the agency considering a new classification approach.

Step 2: Commitment of Top Agency Personnel

Strong commitment from the Sheriff, Police Chief, or agency director, is critical to the success of a new classification system. Obtaining a high level of commitment from top agency personnel and maintaining it can usually be accomplished by identifying for them the benefits the agency will receive from the new classification system; ensuring that they receive informal and formal communication describing the progress of the project on a regular basis; ensuring that they have a role in developing and implementing the project; and making sure that they are credited with the successful project.

The commitment of top agency personnel will help to reduce or eliminate numerous problems that can hinder the progress of the project. These include:

- Insufficient staff time

- Insufficient funding
- Insufficient staff expertise
- Changes in administration
- Lack of staff support
- Insufficient commitment by the agency
- Minimal realization of the potential application/benefits of the system

Step 3: Selection of Project Planning Staff

In those cases when agencies have had problems developing and implementing new classification systems, one reason was inexperienced project staff. Staff who are currently knowledgeable of objective approaches and their developmental processes or who possess the skills to acquire such knowledge through training, document review, and/or examination of other objective classification systems make everyone's job easier. It is particularly helpful if the agency employs planners who are familiar with the problems and job realities of developing a classification system for an inmate population. If the agency's planning staff have to acquire this knowledge as they go along, it can impact the effectiveness of the classification system.

Sometimes the agency may find that it does not employ the staff with the appropriate credentials, or, if it does, is unable to commit them full time to the project. In either event, the agency may wish to retain a consultant(s) who is qualified to help the agency with the process.

Step 4: Identification of Role of Classification System Planners

The role of the project staff in adapting the new classification system for agency use is very important. It will determine, for example, the extent to which the objective jail classification system is adjusted to local factors before it is implemented. For example, the criteria employed in actual decision-making by any classification system selected for adoption need to be weighted by the adoptive agency. In weighing the classification factors, one role for planning staff is to solicit staff opinions on the relative seriousness of each factor with respect to the others. The planners then revise the classification instruments and instructions based upon staff input and expectations. This type of staff involvement can substantially increase the acceptance of the new system.

Step 5: Development of Goals and Objectives for the Objective Jail Classification System

Formulating answers to the questions below is a useful task when selecting goals and objectives for the new classification system.

- Why is the objective classification system being implemented?
- What short- and long-term impact on the facility's operations is trying to be achieved?
- What are the concerns of other key actors or constituencies, i.e., the public, county planners or commissioners, the courts, the sheriff, etc.
- How might the system be implemented to support its maximum potential regarding inmate management, public safety, efficient utilization of limited space, and future planning and policy development?

- What classification system goals and objectives fit best with the overall goals of the agency?
- What goals and objectives will be most difficult to achieve?
- What goals and objectives are the most feasible?

With the answers to these questions as guidelines, the agency can develop a "Statement of Purpose" summarizing in a few sentences the overall aim of the classification system and the general impact it is expected to have on jail operations.

The "Statement of Purpose" is made up of goals and objectives. "Goals" specify the major areas that the classification system will address, such as protection of the public, principle of least restrictive confinement consistent with the prisoner's risk, and so forth. "Objectives" explicitly describe the results to be achieved, such as a 40 percent reduction in serious incidents during the next fiscal year, a 25 percent reduction in the number of disciplinary referrals, etc. To illustrate, an objective related to the goal of reducing major disciplinary violations could be:

"By January 1, 1990, 45 percent of all inmates with two or more violations will be reviewed monthly by the classification committee."

In preparing classification system objectives, staff can develop two types of objectives. Those addressing the system are called end-result objectives. Those describing the process for accomplishing those objectives are called process objectives. Process objectives are important in ensuring that the system runs smoothly, as they describe the implementation activities of agency staff. End-result objectives are important to evaluation efforts, as they specify the impact of the system on inmate behaviors and jail operations.

Examples of end-result objectives for a classification system are as follows:

- Specify the outcomes of the system;
- Specify the tasks and responsibilities staff are expected to undertake;
- Provide consistency and integration among the diverse elements of the system; and
- Establish a basis for evaluation.

Step 6: Appointment of Advisory Group

Most successful classification systems are the product of input from not only project staff but also from an advisory group. The advisory group is often formed to augment the expertise and skills of agency staff. These "knowledgeable others" typically include staff representing administration, programs, security, services, planning and information systems. The advisory group may also include officials from other criminal justice agencies who will affect the development of the classification system and its eventual implementation.

Advisory groups can fulfill many useful functions in developing and implementing an objective jail classification system. For instance, the group can help develop goals for the new system, review the proposed criteria, help determine the importance of classification variables, examine the classification instruments, and develop policies and procedures to execute the new system. They also may be able to provide information that greatly improves the performance of the system while enhancing its acceptance by other persons both inside and outside the agency.

By arranging regular advisory group meetings and calling special meetings if necessary, an agency can clarify the planning and implementation process and give staff a feeling of being a part of the process. Wise use of the advisory group can also increase support for the completed system.

Step 7: Identification of Legal Issues

Litigation pertaining to prisoner classification has become increasingly common in recent years. The judicial system has not only been carefully scrutinizing classification policies and procedures, but has also been directly involved in shaping classification practices.

In light of this judicial interest, correctional agencies will want to develop written policies and procedures governing the application of their jail classification system. These policies and procedures will include procedural safeguards to ensure that due process, equal protection, and other legal requirements are met.

This proactive approach will extend to inmates those rights guaranteed by the constitution. It should also limit litigation pertaining to classification following the implementation of the system.

Step 8: Preparation of Adaptation Plan

Once an agency determines the type of objective jail classification system it will adopt, an adaptation plan is needed. The agency's approach to adapting an existing

classification system to the agency's needs is influenced by answers to the following questions:

- How well does the system address the agency's overall goals and objectives?
- To what extent is the system consistent with the purpose of the agency's present classification system?
- Is currently available offender information consistent with the informational requirements of the system?
- Does the system facilitate housing assignment, custody needs and program assignment, as well as security assessment?
- Does the system promote the matching of inmate needs and agency resources?
- Is the system so complex that it is unrealistic to believe that it can be successfully implemented?
- Does the system incorporate a monitoring plan to permit periodic evaluations of classification decision making and outcomes?
- Can the system be automated and incorporated into the agency's management information system?
- Finally, is the system consistent with the philosophy of agency classification and security staff; that is, is it an approach that they will find acceptable and eventually commit to?

Beginning with the issues raised in answering the preceding questions, the agency may want to prepare an action plan that specifies the tasks that need to be performed, the resources needed to complete each task, and a schedule for completing each task.

Step 9: Revision of Classification Instruments and Instructions

Objective jail classification systems may have as many as five components.

Typically, these include:

- A form for screening inmates after booking;
- An instrument for performing initial custody assessment;
- An instrument for reclassifying the inmate during confinement (a Custody Reassessment Scale);
- A form for initially assessing inmate needs; and
- A form for reassessing inmate needs during confinement.

The agency will want to tailor the system they decide to adapt to its unique needs and resources. This revision may be simply a matter of fine tuning the classification forms, instruments, or checklists and the instructions for their use. Or, it may involve a greater modification. The extent to which the agency modifies an existing system for its own use should parallel the degree to which the system fails to consider local idiosyncracies while balancing the need to maintain the validity, objectivity, and reliability of the instruments.

The four most common components of a classification system are described next.

Initial Inmate Screening

The form used to initially screen inmates should recognize that limited information is typically available on inmates during their first hours in custody. As such, the ultimate goal of any type of initial screening form should be to identify any

emergency needs and make the appropriate initial treatment referrals and housing and supervision decisions apart from the routine management of the general population.

The screening form should contain, at a minimum, identifying information and information on: substance abuse needs; suicide risk; mental health needs; and medical health needs. At this point, all that is needed is a simple yes/no response. Qualified staff will complete in-depth assessment of those persons who are identified as presenting these types of needs/risks. Agencies may wish to incorporate time frames into the assessment criteria, if the available form does not.

Initial Custody Assessment

The agency should review the factors used to determine inmates' most appropriate custody classification. For informational purposes, the most common factors used are:

- Severity of current charges/convictions;
- Serious offense history;
- Escape history;
- Institutional disciplinary history;
- Prior felony convictions;
- Alcohol/drug abuse; and
- Stability factors (age, employment, length of residence).

In deciding what modifications to make to the initial assessment process, the agency will want to give special consideration to:

- The factors included. The agency may eliminate some of the factors, add others, and increase/decrease the importance attached to the factors.
- The time frames that specify when the factors apply. The agency will wish to select time frames that reflect the correctional philosophy and policies of the agency.
- Allowances for overrides. It is helpful to include a checklist of special management issues for staff when recommending an override. These may include:
 - Protective custody;
 - Psychological impairment;
 - Mental deficiency;
 - Escape threat;
 - Serious violence threat;
 - Known gang affiliation;
 - Substance abuse problems;
 - Known management problems;
 - Suspected drug trafficker;
 - Suicide risk;
 - Medical problems;
 - Physical impairment.

Custody Reassessment/Classification Review

A reassessment or review component is necessary to allow for changes over time in inmates' behavior, legal status, appeal, or other circumstances. (This ability is particularly valuable in re-evaluating inmates for low custody assignments.) It is also needed to take into account the behavior exhibited by inmates during their confinement. Some reassessment (or review) instruments decrease the importance of or eliminate some of the variables used during the initial classification process. In this way, the reassessment (review) process provides inmates with an incentive for good behavior through a structured system of rewards and punishments.

As with initial custody assessment, the forms used for custody reassessment should be examined with consideration given to:

- The factors included. The agency may eliminate some of the factors, add others, and increase/decrease the importance attached to the factors.
- The time frames that specify when the factors apply. The agency will wish to select time frames that reflect the correctional philosophy and policies of the agency.
- Allowances for overrides. It is helpful to include a checklist of special management issues for staff to use when recommending an override. These may include:
 - Protective custody;
 - Psychological impairment;
 - Mental deficiency;
 - Escape threat;
 - Serious violence threat;
 - Known gang affiliation;
 - Substance abuse problems;
 - Known management problems;
 - Suspected drug trafficker;
 - Suicide risk;
 - Medical problems;
 - Physical impairment.

Inmate Needs Assessment

Typically, inmate needs assessment addresses at least six general areas of needs:

- Health;
- Emotional stability;
- Education;
- Vocational skill;
- Substance abuse;
- Mental ability.

The assessment should also include a mechanism for entering program and service recommendations to meet these needs. Some agencies code these recommendations for computer entry.

Unlike other objective systems the agency may wish to adapt, the approaches developed by NCCD and CJA include forms that were designed to serve as prototypes. That is, the agency can copy a form, add its name at the top, and begin using the form on a trial or regular basis. Also, each form has its own set of instructions.

Further detailed information describing how an agency could revise the additive classification approach developed by NCCD is provided in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 describes, in some detail, the decision-tree classification approach developed by CJA.

Step 10: Preparation of an Implementation Plan

The successful introduction of an objective classification system does not end with its adoption, for it still must be implemented. To minimize the effects of constraints on time, money, or staff, it is helpful to prepare a comprehensive implementation plan that includes the following components:

- Pilot testing of classification instruments;
- Development of classification system policies and procedures; and
- Training of staff.

One implementation plan, developed by CJA for the decision-tree approach, has eight phases:

- Policy and Procedure Development;
- Staff Training;
- Classification On-Line Implementation;
- Data Collection Custody Profile Analysis and Feedback;
- Internal Monitoring (relative to policy and procedure and correct use of instruments);
- Internal Management Application Review (Once procedural bugs have been addressed, how is the system's application relative to inmate and facility management issues being optimized?);
- Court Education/Coordination;
- System Evaluation and Review.

It is important to note that every effort should be made to avoid any delay between system development and implementation phases since a long delay can dampen staff enthusiasm.

To be useful, the implementation plan should specify the tasks that must be completed, a reasonable time frame for their completion, the products that will result (if any), and who is responsible for seeing the task is performed adequately and on-time.

Step 11: Pilot Testing of the Objective Jail Classification System

It is important for an agency to pre-test the instruments and/or pilot test the new classification system (including procedures). This will assist in determining both the appropriateness of the instruments and the implementation procedures and instruments. The instruments should be evaluated with particular attention towards

the validity of the resulting custody and screening decisions. The procedures should be evaluated for appropriateness relative to staff responsibilities, timeliness, data requirements, and overall staff acceptance. In addition, during this pre-test or pilot stage, the anticipated number of maximum, medium, and minimum security beds needed to match the new custody profile of the population will likely need some modifications. This pre-test/pilot phase will also assist in confirming that the classification system will likely achieve some of its goals and objectives, particularly short-term internal management objectives. Pilot testing can help the agency avoid making piecemeal modifications to correct problems. Minor modifications, however, especially in procedures, are likely to occur as the system becomes incorporated into the standard operating procedures of the facility.

Pilot testing may be either the last task in the adoption of the objective jail classification system or the first task in the implementation phase. The testing process may include both a "paper" test of the process using available data and a formal pilot test of the system by jail staff. The intent is to determine how well the instruments perform using a sample of the inmate population and what modification may be necessary prior to full implementation.

In pilot testing, the agency will want to measure the objective classification instruments and procedures against the goals and objectives established for the system. It is important to note here that while pre- or pilot testing is important, several of the systemic goals and objectives can only be evaluated over time. Consequently, the level of confidence in the newly adopted system is important in

countering the potential tendency to modify the system prematurely. With premature modification, systems tend to revert to prior practices. The agency should not be afraid to let the system work and find its own level in making inmate management decisions. Again, the initial level of confidence in the system and instruments selected is critical.

After an initial confidence level has been established with the classification/screening instruments, a pilot test of the instruments and policies must be conducted on a representative sample of inmates housed in the jail. Care must be taken in conducting this pilot test as its results will help inform the jail as how its inmate population will be classified if the designed system were to be fully implemented and help identify if the system has been properly designed. Procedural issues will likely be the area in need of closest scrutiny at this point. For example, do all agency staff understand their roles? Is the coordination and communication between inmate processing functions working as planned? Are the data received by classification staff, for completion of the classification/screening instruments, adequate and timely? Are the numbers of resultant custody designations matching up to the anticipated number of security bed needs? (It is of interest to note here that in most all experiences to date, the implementation of an objective classification system has resulted in a significant decrease in the previously perceived custody levels of the population. In particular it has generally demonstrated a significant increase in the number of minimum custody inmates and a decline in the number of inmates classified as maximum custody.) Additional issues to be assessed during the pilot stage may

be based upon the initial feedback from classification staff, from line staff, from administration.

Review of all classification and screening instruments during the pilot period is recommended. This is to insure that all instruments are being completed accurately and thoroughly. Statistical analysis of decision criteria and outcomes can also assist in assessing the adequacy of the selected decision variables. Statistical profiles of the inmate population during the pilot phase are also helpful in providing staff with an understanding of the shift in assessed custody level profiles. In addition, a frequency rate for use of the override option should be monitored to determine both the adequacy of the principal classification system and the extent to which classification staff are adhering to classification "by the book" and not using their professional judgement. This phenomenon results in too few overrides. Overuse of the override option may occur because staff are too subjective and do not trust the instrument to objectively drive the custody decision. The acceptable frequency of override use will vary from system to system, but, if the instrument is meeting its objectives, an override rate of from roughly 10 percent should be expected. If the override rate, excluding department policy overrides, (i.e., writs from prison), exceeds approximately 20 percent, an addition to the decision variables or an increase in priority of certain variables should be considered.

Step 12: Development of Classification Policies and Procedures

Written policies and procedures are necessary for the effective introduction of a new classification system. Written direction helps to ensure that staff will not deviate from the structure of the system, to the detriment of the general public, other staff, and the inmate population.

Policies are necessary for the agency to adequately convey its philosophy and objectives to all personnel. At a minimum, they should include general direction for interpreting the purpose, goals, and objectives of the new classification system. Policy statements should communicate what the agency intends to do and explain why the system does what it does.

In addition, written procedures should provide specific steps for carrying out the new classification system. They must state who will be responsible, what must be done, where the activity will occur, and in what time frame the task should be completed. Policies must also be formulated which will describe how the classification system will be monitored and how information from the system will be utilized.

Policies and procedures should be incorporated into a comprehensive manual that prescribes initial classification, reclassification, and administrative review requirements for the system. The manual should be updated periodically to include all revisions in policy and procedures. The classification manual should be completed prior to training staff in system use so that new staff can be given a thorough introduction to the new classification system. Additionally, serious consideration

should be given to using the classification manual to orient inmates to the new system.

Step 13: Training of Staff

Agencies implementing new classification systems must provide adequate staff training. Training for all correctional staff is an important factor in gaining staff support of the system on a day-to-day basis. Specialized training should be provided to those personnel identified as classification staff. Training typically covers such topics as instrument use, information management, resource allocation, and program development decisions. It should also include, at least in the initial training sessions, an overview of how the system was developed so that staff who were not involved will be acquainted with its background.

In addition to this initial orientation and implementation training, ongoing in-service training should occur. Ongoing training will assist in problem solving, evaluating the system, facilitating staff feedback, and continuing to re-enforce the systems objectives and enhance its management application potential.

Methods for presenting the material will vary according to the nature of the information to be learned and the role of the staff in the learning process. Subject matter may be taught in one-way presentations (lectures, symposiums, films, panels, debates) or in participatory methods (discussion and problem-solving groups, brainstorming sessions, role-playing). In the former method, staff will assume a relatively inactive role, listening, watching and taking notes. This type of presentation

is prepared in detail, prior to delivery, and is not affected much by the audience. In the latter method, staff are dynamically involved. They bring up examples from their own detention and correctional experience. Problems are identified and solutions are found collectively. With this type of training, it is useful to involve staff in hands-on application of scoring instruments, using case files with identifiers removed. This activity would be followed by discussions to enhance inter-rater reliability. The interests and concerns of staff relative to the classification system and its eventual implementation should direct the course of the participatory approach.

Another important component of the training program is the selection of the instructional staff. Instructors should be chosen on the basis of their expertise and teaching ability. Involvement in developing the classification system, while helpful, does not necessarily mean that participants can translate that knowledge to agency staff. Instructors may be drawn from a variety of sources within the agency, such as the proposed classification staff, administrative personnel, and from professional fields outside the agency. Selecting instructors from each of those areas has advantages and limitations. An instructor from the agency's staff will be familiar with the other participants; however, fulfilling the role of both co-learner and instructor is difficult unless all staff are given the opportunity and this is clarified beforehand. The planners of the classification system run the risk of being unable to break out of their role as system developers, who are seen by other staff as having a vested interest in the successful implementation of the classification system. Outside instructors can play the role of experts more easily, but they may be out of touch with both the

classification system and the job reality of agency staff. Clear lesson plans, personal contacts with staff, and last minute briefings will help minimize these potential problems.

Step 14: Ongoing Evaluation and Review of the Objective Classification System

The use of an objective jail classification system is a dynamic process. As the preceding discussion of system implementation makes clear, it is necessary to view revision as an ongoing process that is undertaken to accommodate changes in factors such as agency philosophy, legislative requirements, legal decisions, classification standards, and changes in the composition of the inmate population.

The need for revision will be determined as a result of the system monitoring procedures. A regular and systematic review of monitoring reports should be designed in order to plan revisions as soon as the need is documented.

Modifications to an objective classification system can be undertaken in any number of ways to meet changing needs. Necessary modifications may involve procedural changes or changes in the instruments. Decision or screening criteria and time frames may be modified, added or deleted and the importance or priority of the variables may be modified. It is important, however, to be careful that the validity and objectivity of the system do not suffer as a result of such modifications.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The following points should, if given due consideration by interested agencies, expedite adaption and implementation of an objective jail classification system.

- First, those staff charged with developing the new classification system should emphasize to other jail staff that the objective system takes a common-sense approach to classification. It therefore will be easier for personnel to recognize that it incorporates, in a restructured version, their own professional experience.
- Second, the criteria incorporated into the objective system should generally be comparable to those factors previously employed by jail staff in classifying inmates.
- Third, the objective system should attempt to mesh staff judgment and perspective with information and data used in classification decision-making.
- Fourth, careful consideration should be given to developing the classification reassessment/review instruments with criteria independent of some initial primary classification criteria. Studies have shown that some initial classification items, particularly those relating to current offense, are relatively weak predictors of behavior. Only age consistently appears to have even a moderate predictive capacity. Reclassification, consequently, should rely heavily on measures of in-custody conduct that promote a "just desserts" orientation to decision-making.
- Fifth, to ensure the effective operation of the objective system, the groundwork for monitoring and evaluation efforts should be laid during system adaption. If the system is to achieve maximum usefulness, it is critical that the system design specify a means for obtaining the quantifiable information needed to assess classification decision-making.
- Sixth, classification and other agency staff must accept that the objective decision instruments incorporated by the system are to be used as tools or guides to help them achieve effective classification. Classification officers should understand that their experience and opinions are valuable additions to the process by which classification decisions are reached. This understanding of the proper role of classification instruments helps assure the responsible participation of staff in the classification process.

- Finally, in both the additive and decision-tree approaches discussed, the quantitative and logical character of objective classification treats risk as an interaction of factors along a continuum. These approaches permit the agency to conduct statistical analyses of consistency, analyze trends, and simulate the results of proposed modifications.

In conclusion, the adaption and implementation of an objective jail classification system is a complex process that depends on:

- The commitment of staff and resources;
- The support of key people outside the agency;
- The allocation of sufficient time to accomplish the agency's goals and objectives;
- Most important, a well-conceived plan to guide the system's development and implementation.

The preceding guidelines, while not inclusive, were prepared to help agencies anticipate problems that may arise during system development, adoption and implementation, or revision, and to suggest strategies for addressing these issues before they become problematic.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1 THE NCCD ADDITIVE JAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM APPROACH

An agency that wishes to adapt this particular classification system will find the task of tailoring the system to its unique needs and resources much simplified. Modification options are included in descriptions of the forms, in the instructions, or, in the case of the custody assessment scales, appended to the instructions for each form. Planning staff will want to review the sample changes before beginning to modify the system.

The five instruments that compose the objective jail classification system are described below. These descriptions will give interested agencies a basic understanding of the system's capabilities and requirements.

Inmate Screening Form

The Inmate Screening Form recognizes that limited information is typically available on inmates during their first hours in custody. As such, the screening instrument focuses on identifying inmates with needs that require special attention. The ultimate goal of the Screening Form is to separate these inmates from those who will be placed in general population.

The Inmate Screening Form (see Exhibit 1) consists of two sections. The first requests personal data--the inmate's full name, identification number, and screening date and time. Agencies may also wish to incorporate other identification items into Section I; for example, inmate's date of birth, social security number, age, and medical insurance carrier, if any.

The second section addresses four assessment factors: substance abuse needs; suicide risk; mental health needs; and medical health needs. This section applies a yes-no approach to screening, with staff completing the form by circling an assessment response for every criterion associated with a particular factor. A comments space follows each factor to allow staff to explain assessments or to provide additional information. Agencies may also want to incorporate time frames into the assessment criteria. For example, an agency may decide to restrict "Past Treatment for Mental Health Problems" to services received during the last five years or "Recent Hospitalization" to the last year.

To allow for quick and easy completion, the screening instrument follows a checklist format. Further, agency staff will find that it is thorough enough to ensure the safety and well-being of not only the inmate undergoing screening, but also staff and other inmates.

Initial Custody Assessment Scale

Initial custody assessment takes place before inmates are removed from holding and placed in a housing area.

The Initial Custody Assessment Scale (Exhibit 2) has five sections. Section I requests inmate identification data: name, identification number, and assessment date. Since space for this date is also provided at the end of Section IV, this entry may be deleted here to save time and space. This observation is also true for the signature of the classification specialist. Other information that is needed by classification staff to identify an inmate, such as date of birth, sex, or FBI number, may also be added to this section.

Section II contains the factors used to effectively determine inmates' most appropriate custody classifications:

- Severity of current charges/convictions;
- Serious offense history;
- Escape history;
- Institutional disciplinary history;
- Prior felony convictions;
- Alcohol/drug abuse;¹ and
- Stability factors (age, employment, length of residence).²

Depending upon agency needs, other items relating to custody assessment may be added to Section II. Examples of such items are: number of prior jail stays; number of prior prison incarcerations; and number of prior juvenile confinements. In

¹This item may be deleted, particularly if a programming assessment is conducted to identify need for substance abuse treatment. Pilot-testing of the modified scale should help an agency to determine whether elimination of this item also necessitates revision of the point ranges in the custody classification chart in Section III.

²Although research has found these factors to be related to inmate behavior, factors pertaining to employment, school attendance, and length of residence may be deleted from the form if agency staff believe they are more related to pre-trial release than to in-custody behavior. Depending upon the composition of the inmate population, the age provided on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale may be raised or lowered. Similarly, the length of time employed, attending school, or living at the same address may be increased or decreased.

terms of non-scored information, the following types of information may also be considered by agency staff:

- Custody level during last jail or prison confinement;
- Assessment of eligibility for trusty status/work programs;
- Date of custody reassessment;
- Presumptive release date; and
- The inmate's signature, acknowledging his/her understanding of the classification process and scale completion.

With the exception of stability factors, the scale does not specify the time limit applicable to these factors. Planning staff are urged to choose time frames that reflect the correctional philosophy and policies of the agency.

Each item on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale is scored according to predetermined, weighted criteria. Any item assessment involving a specific offense, past or current, also requires use of a Severity of Offense Scale. This scale ranks offenses by their seriousness, a determination the agency will make according to state statute, existing agency policy, or agency consensus. The first three items on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale are used to derive a Maximum Custody Score, which, if it is sufficiently high, leads to automatic assignment to maximum custody. This scoring feature will enable agencies to quickly identify inmates who pose serious violence threats or are demonstrated escape risks, and place them in appropriate housing. Inmates who do not present such threats are assessed on all seven items, with scores for these items totaled and then matched with point ranges on the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

The Maximum Custody Score may be eliminated if it leads to problems in completing the scale or if it does not seem to meet agency needs. However, if this scoring feature is deleted, agency planning staff will want to reweigh Items 1 through 3 so that inmates with very serious charges, detainers, or convictions will receive sufficient points to fall within the maximum custody range listed in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

Since many jails consider outstanding detainers and warrants as important determinants of inmate management, the Initial Custody Assessment Scale incorporates two features to address this concern. First, detainers and warrants for serious charges are equated with current charges and convictions (Section II, Item 1), and can be scored using the Severity of Offense Scale. Second, current detainers and warrants are incorporated into the Custody Classification Chart in Section III: inmates

who score out minimum custody but have a current detainer and/or warrant are recommended for placement in medium custody.

Allowances for overrides of the instrument's custody level recommendation are included in the system. Recommendation for an override is supported by the checklist of special management issues included in Section III. This checklist addresses concerns that do not directly affect custody level but may influence supervision requirements and housing assignment. Included are:

- Protective custody
- Psychological impairment
- Mental deficiency
- Escape threat
- Serious violence threat
- Known gang affiliation
- Substance abuse problems
- Known management problems
- Suspected drug trafficker
- Suicide risk
- Medical problems
- Physical impairment

Section IV is reserved for supervisory approval of override recommendations, and the last part of the scale, Section V, provides space for entering on inmate's recommended housing assignment.

Custody Reassessment Scale

This objective jail classification system includes an instrument that agency staff can use to periodically reassess inmates' custody levels. This instrument makes allowances for the tendency of inmates' behavior to change over time and the receipt of new information on inmates after initial custody assessment. This ability is of particular value in evaluating inmates for such low custody assignments as trusty and work release.

As with the basic initial custody assessment format, the Custody Reassessment Scale (Exhibit 3) also contains five sections. Section I focuses on inmate identification and reasons for reclassification. Since space for dating the completion of the reassessment is provided at the end of Section IV, this entry may be deleted to save time and space. Further, since the classification specialist is required to sign his or her name at the end of Section IV, this entry may also be deleted. Other information, such as date of birth, sex, or FBI number, that is needed by agency staff to identify an inmate may be added to this section.

Section II employs an additive scoring procedure for seven items:

- **Severity of current charges/convictions.** Agencies are encouraged to develop their own Severity of Offense Scale. In developing the scale, state statutes, agency policy, staff consensus, and the sample scale should be used as guidelines.
- **Number of disciplinary convictions.** The point values associated with this item may be modified so that inmates with no disciplinary convictions receive a score of -1 in place of 0. If this point adjustment is made, an agency may want to use the point values specified on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale for Items 1 through 3. These values have been decreased on the Custody Reassessment Scale in order to enable inmates with positive institutional adjustment to move to lower custody levels.
- **Most serious disciplinary conviction.** The point values associated with this item may also be modified so that inmates with no serious disciplinary convictions receive a score of -1 in place of 0. If this point adjustment is made, an agency may want to use the point values specified on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale for Items 1 through 3. These values have been decreased on the Custody Reassessment Scale in order to enable inmates with positive institutional adjustment to move to lower custody levels. In addition, the agency is encouraged to develop its own Disciplinary Severity Scale, using agency rules and regulations, as well as the sample scale as guidelines.
- **Alcohol/drug abuse.** This item may be deleted, particularly if a programming assessment is conducted to identify the need for substance abuse treatment. Pilot-testing of the modified scale should help the agency determine whether elimination of this item also necessitates the revision of the point ranges in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.
- **Serious offense history.**
- **Escape history.**
- **Prior felony convictions.**

The reassessment instrument is designed to take into account the behavior exhibited by inmates during their confinement. Two items, 4 and 5, are directly related to rule infractions. These items are assessed using a Disciplinary Severity scale, which, like the Severity of Offense Scale, will be developed by agency staff.

This instrument is structured such that it is possible for inmates who demonstrate positive adjustment to attain a lower custody level. This is accomplished by decreasing the weights assigned to items pertaining to prior conduct. In this way, reassessment provides inmates with an incentive for good behavior through structured rewards and punishments.

Like the Initial Custody Assessment Scale, the Custody Reassessment Scale includes a Maximum Custody Score, which agency staff can use to identify difficult-to-manage inmates for automatic assignment to maximum custody. It also provides a chart for determining custody level (Section III). The Maximum Custody Score computation may be eliminated if it leads to problems in completing the scale or if it does not seem to meet an agency's needs. However, if this scoring feature is deleted, the agency staff also may want to reweigh Items 1 through 3 so that inmates with very serious charges, detainers, or convictions will receive sufficient points to fall within the maximum custody range listed in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

Depending upon an agency's operational philosophy and needs, other items relating to custody assessment may be added to Section II. For example, items addressing positive institutional adjustment, such as program participation or work assignments, may be incorporated into the scale. Indicators of positive adjustment may be assigned negative points in order to provide inmates with the opportunity to lower their custody levels. If items with negative point values are added to Section II, the agency, as noted previously, may wish to use the point values specified on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale for Items 1 through 3.

Further, other non-scored information may be added to the Custody Reassessment Scale. Examples include:

- Custody level during last jail or prison confinement;
- Assessment of eligibility for trusty status/work programs;
- Date of inmate's next custody reassessment;
- Presumptive release date; and
- The inmate's signature, acknowledging understanding of the custody reassessment process.

Time frames are not incorporated into the scale items. The agency may add them if desired. Procedures for instrument overrides (Section III) and for supervisory approval (Section IV) are provided. In addition, the Reassessment Form also includes

a Special Management Concern checklist (Section III) that will enable the agency to modify supervision and housing provisions without affecting scored custody levels.

Custody reassessment should occur a minimum of every 90 days. If possible, agency staff should conduct custody reassessments every 60 days.

Combined Initial Custody Assessment and Custody Reassessment Scales

The agency may wish to simplify the objective classification process as much as possible by considering the development of a single custody assessment scale that combines the most useful items in the Initial Custody Assessment Scale and the Custody Reassessment Scale. Such a scale, for instance, might include:

- Severity of current charges/convictions;
- Serious offense history;
- Escape history;
- Prior felony convictions;
- Institutional disciplinary history;
- Most serious disciplinary history (during current confinement); and
- Participation in program and/or work assignments (during current confinement).

The development of a single custody assessment form should be followed by extensive pilot-testing so that the point values associated with assessment criteria and the point ranges included in the Custody Classification Chart can be adjusted to meet an agency's operational philosophy.

Inmate Needs Assessment

The Initial Inmate Needs Assessment Form (Exhibit 4) assesses six general areas of need:

- Health
- Emotional stability
- Education
- Vocational skill
- Substance abuse
- Mental ability

Each area is then subdivided into three assessment categories indicating degree of need. For example, Vocational Skill comprises three categories: no discernible skill, limited skill, and marketable skill.

The Initial Inmate Needs Assessment Form consists of three sections: one for identifying inmates by name, number, and assessment date; a second for evaluating inmates' needs; and a third for entering program and service recommendations to meet these needs. Agency staff may wish to code these recommendations for computer entry. The recommendations may also be used by agency staff to document overall inmate need for specific programs and for enhancing the management of available jail resources.

The Inmate Needs Reassessment Form parallels the needs assessment form used at initial classification, addressing the same need areas and using the same assessment categories. The needs reassessment form includes a section for listing previous program and service recommendations, coupled with an adjustment, or progress evaluation, code. It also provides space for additional staff recommendations.

EXHIBIT 1

INMATE SCREENING FORM

INMATE SCREENING FORM

I. IDENTIFICATION

Inmate Name (Last, First, Middle)	Inmate ID #
Screening Date	Screening Time

II. RISK AND NEEDS SCREENING

1. SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Signs of Being Under Influence of Alcohol/Drugs	Yes	No
Signs of Alcohol/Drug Withdrawal	Yes	No
Type(s) of drug/alcohol used:		
Amount consumed/taken:		
Time consumed/taken:		

Comments:

2. SUICIDE RISK

Suicidal Threats	Yes	No
Previous Stress Experiences	Yes	No
Extreme Shame/Embarrassment	Yes	No
Extreme Nervousness/Restlessness	Yes	No
Extreme Depression	Yes	No
Withdrawn/No-communicative	Yes	No

Comments:

3. MENTAL HEALTH

Past Treatment for Mental Health Problems	Yes	No
Use of Psychotropic Medication	Yes	No
Type:		
Frequency:		
Amount:		
Abnormal Behavior	Yes	No

Comments:

4. MEDICAL HEALTH

Current Treatment for Medical Problems	Yes	No
What:		
Use of Prescription Medication	Yes	No
Type:	Frequency:	Amount:
Special Prescribed Diet	Yes	No
Recent Hospitalization	Yes	No
Why: Where:		
Recent Head Injury	Yes	No
Recent Blackouts/Fainting	Yes	No
Unconscious	Yes	No
Obvious Pain	Yes	No
Chronic Cough	Yes	No
Chronic Diarrhea	Yes	No
Current Itching/Skin Rash	Yes	No
Bleeding/Draining Wounds	Yes	No
Heart Condition	Yes	No
Diabetes	Yes	No
Epilepsy/Seizures	Yes	No
Asthma	Yes	No
History of Ulcers	Yes	No
History of/Exposure to Tuberculosis	Yes	No
History of/Exposure to Venereal Disease	Yes	No
History of Hepatitis/Jaundice	Yes	No
A.I.D.S.	Yes	No
Allergies	Yes	No
Current Pregnancy	Yes	No
Use of Birth Control Pills	Yes	No
Dental Problems	Yes	No
Eye Glasses/Contact Lenses	Yes	No
Physical Handicap	Yes	No
Restricted Mobility	Yes	No
Vermin	Yes	No
Lesions/Bruises/Other Signs of Injury	Yes	No
Fever/Swollen Lymph Nodes/Other Infectious Signs	Yes	No
Other Medical Problems	Yes	No

Comments:

I understand that this screening interview has been conducted in my own best interest, and I have answered all questions truthfully.

Inmate's Signature: _____

Interviewer's Signature: _____

INMATE SCREENING FORM INSTRUCTIONS

An Inmate Screening Form is completed for each inmate upon admission to the facility. This includes any offender previously booked, then released pending trial, and now returned to serve a jail sentence. Most of the information needed to fill out the Inmate Screening Form can usually be obtained from the committing documents, inmate interview, and staff observation. However, the staff member completing the screening form should also ask the arresting officer about behavior relevant to the inmate's risk and needs assessment. To ensure a fair trial, detailed questions about the inmate's current charge(s) are to be avoided.

The Inmate Screening Form is a checklist designed for relatively quick and easy completion. It requires only "yes" and "no" responses to various assessment criteria and, where necessary, brief commentary. Completion of this form functions as a preliminary step in the classification process. It is to be used to assist with inmate management and staff decision-making during an inmate's first hours in custody. Because a more thorough evaluation of each inmate will be performed at initial custody assessment, it is recommended that a copy of the screening form be forwarded to classification staff.

Completion Policy:

The Inmate Screening Form is completed on each inmate within 6 hours after booking and prior to completing the Initial Custody Assessment Scale. Inmates who have been previously admitted and released (i.e., pending trial) require a new screening when readmitted. Depending on agency policy, the screening form may be completed by medical, classification, or booking staff.

INSTRUCTIONS

Section I: Identification*

Inmate Name: Enter inmate's full name (last, first, middle initial).

Inmate ID #: Enter inmate's identifying number, if assigned. This number should be used on all subsequent classification forms.

Screening Date: Enter date the screening is completed.

Screening Time: Use military time to enter the time of inmate's screening.

* (NOTE: The jail using the Inmate Screening Form may incorporate other identification items into this section; for example, inmate's date of birth, social security number, age, and medical insurance carrier.)

Section II: Risk and Needs Screening

General Instructions:

In each of the four screening factor areas, circle "yes" or "no" for each assessment criterion to indicate that the issue has been addressed in screening. If information needed to assess a specific criterion is not available, circle "no" for that criterion and note the lack of information in the comments space provided for the screening factor associated with the criterion.

Screening Factors:

1. **Substance Abuse:** This factor is intended to assess immediate substance abuse problems and provide preliminary information regarding an inmate's abuse of or addiction to alcohol and/or drugs. It is necessary to rely on personal observation and inmate self-report in assessing criteria for this factor.

Signs of Being Under the Influence of Alcohol/Drugs: Circle "yes" if inmate exhibits signs such as slurred speech, physical imbalance, dilated pupils, disorganized thinking, euphoria, aggressive behavior, hyperactivity, extreme drowsiness, or alcohol odor. While such signs are not positive indicators, they do signal a need for observation and follow-up assessment by medical staff.

Signs of Alcohol/Drug Withdrawal: Circle "yes" if inmate states he or she is in withdrawal or if inmate exhibits signs such as repeated vomiting, muscle spasms, hallucinations, excessive sweating, chills, runny eyes or nose, cramps, pinpoint pupils, or serious breathing difficulties. **Contact medical staff at once, and watch inmate closely until he or she is under supervision of medical staff.**

If the inmate exhibits signs of withdrawal or being under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, determine the type(s) of drugs/alcohol used, the amount consumed or taken, and the time (date and hour) of last use.

2. **Suicide Risk:** This factor is intended to provide preliminary information regarding an inmate's likelihood to attempt suicide while in custody. Close observation and careful questioning are necessary to assess the criteria for this factor. An inmate receiving a "yes" for any of the following criteria is to be frequently observed and referred to mental health staff for further assessment.

Suicide Threats: Circle "yes" if the inmate currently is threatening, verbally or in writing, to take his or her life. **Contact mental health or medical staff at once, and watch inmate until he or she is under supervision of these staff.**

Physical Signs of Suicide Attempts: Circle "yes" if inmate has scars or wounds that suggest previous attempts to commit suicide. **Contact mental health or medical staff at once, and watch the inmate closely until he or she is under supervision of medical staff.**

Recent Stress Experiences: Circle "yes" if the inmate has recently lost a loved one, become divorced, lost a job or business, learned of a major health problem, or experienced serious financial trouble.

Extreme Shame/Embarrassment: Circle "yes" if the inmate seems unusually ashamed, distressed, or guilt-ridden about being arrested and detained or seems shocked by his or her current charge(s).

Extreme Nervousness/Restlessness: Circle "yes" if the inmate appears highly agitated, is unable to remain seated for normal period of time, and seems to be experiencing unreasonable emotional distress.

Extreme Depression: Circle "yes" if the inmate expresses exaggerated feelings of helplessness or hopelessness, laments his or her current existence, or appears unduly glum.

Withdrawn/Non-communicative: Circle "yes" if the inmate seems removed from current situation, distant from other people, unusually non-talkative, or non-responsive to verbal communication.

3. **Mental Health Needs:** This factor is intended to provide preliminary information regarding an inmate's mental health and potential for unstable and/or dangerous behavior. In assessing criteria for this factor, it is important to observe the inmate closely as well as to ask pertinent questions. An inmate receiving a "yes" for any of the following criteria is to be referred to mental health staff for further assessment. The inmate is to be carefully monitored and, when deemed necessary to the welfare of self and others, separated from other inmates.

Past Treatment for Mental Health Problems: Circle "yes" if the inmate has been hospitalized due to mental health problems or if the inmate has received professional counseling for mental health problems.

Use of Psychotropic Medication: Determine if the inmate currently takes, or has previously taken, prescription medication to control behavior and/or emotional instability. Such medication includes tranquilizers, anti-depressants, hypnotics, and stimulants. Circle "yes" if the inmate states such medication

has been prescribed for him or her. Also indicate, if known, what kind of medication has been prescribed, how much is taken, and how often it is taken.

Abnormal Behavior: Circle "yes" if the inmate displays other forms of behavior inconsistent with reality or nature of current situation (e.g., paranoia, hallucinations, excessive anxiety, extreme apathy). Briefly describe behavior in the comments space.

- 4. Medical Health:** Once an inmate is admitted to the facility, the agency is responsible, and liable, for that inmate's well-being. This factor is intended to provide preliminary identification of problems that may affect the health of the inmate or other inmates confined in the facility and, therefore, need to be addressed.

Little, if any, documentation is likely to be available in regard to this factor. It is necessary that the inmate be closely observed and questioned regarding the criteria listed under this factor. The inmate's personal effects list also is to be checked for items such as medication and medical alert bracelets. Based on personal observation and inmate self-report, circle "yes" whenever applicable to a specific criterion. An inmate with health care needs is to be referred to medical staff for further assessment and, when necessary, treatment.

(NOTE: Jails using the Inmate Screening Form may want to incorporate time frames into the assessment criteria. For example, an agency may decide to restrict Past Treatment for Mental Health Problems to services received during the last five years or Recent Hospitalization to the last year.)

Inmate Signature: The inmate being screened is to review the screening form and then sign it in the space provided. If the inmate refuses to sign, this fact should be noted on the form.

Interviewer's Signature: The individual interviewing the inmate and completing the screening form is required to sign the form in the space provided.

EXHIBIT 2

INITIAL CUSTODY ASSESSMENT SCALE

INITIAL CUSTODY ASSESSMENT SCALE

I. IDENTIFICATION

Inmate Name (Last, First, MI) Inmate ID #
Assessment Date Classification Specialist

II. CUSTODY EVALUATION

- 1. SEVERITY OF CURRENT CHARGES/CONVICTIONS (Use Severity of Offense Scale; rate most serious charge/conviction, including any detainers/warrants)
2. SERIOUS OFFENSE HISTORY (Use Severity of Offense Scale; rate most serious prior conviction)
3. ESCAPE HISTORY (Excluding current charges)

MAXIMUM CUSTODY SCORE (Add Items 1, 2, and 3)
SCORE OF 7 OR HIGHER, ASSIGN TO MAXIMUM CUSTODY
(Always complete remaining items, but do not total score if inmate has already been assigned to maximum custody.)

- 4. INSTITUTIONAL DISCIPLINARY HISTORY
5. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (Excluding current charges)
6. ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE
7. STABILITY FACTORS (Deduct indicated points)

COMPREHENSIVE CUSTODY SCORE (Items 1-7) Total Score

III. SCALE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CUSTODY LEVEL INDICATED BY SCALE. Code
1 - Minimum 2 - Medium 3 - Maximum

Custody Classification Chart

7 or more points on items 1-3 Maximum
5 or fewer points on items 1-7 Minimum
5 or fewer points on items 1-7 with detainer/warrant Medium
6 to 10 points on items 1-7 Medium
11 or more points on items 1-7 Maximum

B. CHECK [X] ALL THE SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS WHICH APPLY TO THIS INMATE:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Protective Custody | <input type="checkbox"/> Known Management Problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Psychological Impairment | <input type="checkbox"/> Suspected Drug Trafficker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Deficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> Suicide Risk |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Escape Threat | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Serious Violence Threat | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Impairment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Known Gang Affiliation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Problem | |

C. OVERRIDE OF SCALE CUSTODY LEVEL IS RECOMMENDED Code
1 - Yes 2 - No

If yes, give rationale (required): _____

D. RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL. Code
1 - Minimum 2 - Medium 3 - Maximum

Specialist Signature _____ Date _____

IV. SUPERVISOR APPROVAL OF OVERRIDE

A. RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL. Code
1 - Approved 2 - Disapproved (Complete B.)

B. FINAL CUSTODY LEVEL (if override disapproved). Code
1 - Minimum 2 - Medium 3 - Maximum

Rationale (required if different from recommendation): _____

Supervisor Signature _____ Date _____

V. RECOMMENDED HOUSING ASSIGNMENT: _____

INITIAL CUSTODY ASSESSMENT SCALE INSTRUCTIONS

The Initial Custody Assessment Scale is used during initial classification to establish an inmate's recommended custody rating. This custody rating is based upon the classification specialist's assessment of seven items, each of which is to be assigned a numerical score. These items have been found to be associated with future conduct and, thus, help identify the types of risk likely to be presented by the inmate. When considered together, the items also help determine the extent of risk likely to be presented by the inmate. The custody rating recommendation derived from these items is used, in combination with other specified information, when making decisions relating to the inmate's housing assignment and supervision requirements. The custody rating recommendation may be altered due to management considerations that warrant special attention or intervention by staff.

Completion Policy:

The Initial Custody Assessment Scale is to be used on all inmates remaining in confinement after completion of the Inmate Screening Form. The scale is to be completed before an inmate is removed from the facility's holding area and given a housing assignment.

* (NOTE: The jail using the Initial Custody Assessment Scale should determine a time frame for its completion, based upon agency policy and procedures.)

INSTRUCTIONS

Section I: Identification

Inmate Name: Enter inmate's full name, last name followed by first name and middle initial.

Inmate ID Number: Enter inmate's identifying number. This should be the same number entered on the Inmate Screening Form.

Assessment Date: Enter date assessment is completed, using numbers to represent month, day and year.

Classification Specialist: Enter last name of specialist completing the scale.

Section II: Custody Evaluation

Items 1 through 3 are intended to identify the inmate who presents a serious risk to the safety, security, and orderly operation of the facility. Inmates who score seven

or above on the first three items are recommended for maximum custody without consideration of the scores for the remaining items.

1. **Severity of Current Charges/Convictions:** Determine most serious current charge, detainer, warrant, or conviction for inmate, using Severity of Offense Scale. If inmate has been booked on technical violation(s) of probation or parole, severity of current charge/conviction is to be based on offense(s) for which probation or parole was granted. Enter the number of points associated with the severity category into which the inmate's most serious offense falls.
2. **Serious Offense History:** Exclude current offense(s). Determine most serious prior conviction and rank it on Severity of Offense Scale. Enter the number of points associated with the severity category into which the inmate's most serious conviction falls. If the inmate has no record of prior convictions, enter 0.
3. **Escape History:** Consider any escapes or attempted escapes including current admission. Do not consider escapes or attempts scored in item 1. Enter the number of points corresponding to the inmate's most serious escape or attempt. Escapes from correctional settings or programs are to be recognized if the inmate was found guilty of the escape or attempt by an institutional disciplinary committee, regardless of court prosecution and conviction status.

Maximum Custody Score: Add the points for items 1-3, and enter the total in the box designated "maximum custody score." If this score is 7 or higher, assign the inmate to maximum custody. Complete items 4-7. Scores for items 4-7 do not need to be totaled unless maximum custody score is 6 or lower.

Items 4-7 are designed to establish a custody score for the inmate who is not immediately identified as a maximum custody risk on the first three items.

4. **Institutional Disciplinary History:** Consider the inmate's entire disciplinary history including the current admission. If the inmate has not received any disciplinary reports or has received only minor reports with no segregation time, enter 0.
5. **Prior Felony Convictions:** Excluding current offense, consider the inmate's entire history of convictions. Enter the number of points associated with the number of felony convictions.
6. **Alcohol/Drug Abuse:** Using the best information available, determine whether substance abuse has led to emotional, social, or legal problems. The degree of personal disruption is the key when assessing this factor.

If abuse has been related to assaultive behavior, score this item in the highest category. Inmate self-report and prior arrest record are expected to be the most frequent sources of the information. Enter the number of points associated with evaluation of the extent of abuse.

7. **Stability Factors:** Deduct the indicated number of points for each stability factor. This category provides the opportunity to lower the custody score based on selected stability factors. **This is the only scale in which the items are subtracted.** (Example: A 27-year-old who had been employed for 6 months at the time of arrest and living at the same address for 2 years has 3 points deducted.)

Comprehensive Custody Score: Enter total score from items 1-7 in box if maximum custody score is 6 or lower.

Section III: Scale Summary and Recommendations

- A. **CUSTODY- LEVEL INDICATED BY SCALE:** Using the Custody Classification Chart, enter the code that indicates the custody level designated by the scale.
- B. **SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS:** This section is designed to address management issues that warrant attention and possible intervention by staff in the form of special housing and/or supervision. The following special management considerations are to be checked on the form if they exist (check all that apply):

Protective Custody: The inmate requires protective custody to ensure his or her safety and well-being; the inmate may, for example, be a current or former criminal justice staff member, witness, known informant, or homosexual or have known enemies in the facility, a thin/frail appearance, an unresolvable language barrier, or charge(s) for heinous/notorious crime(s).

Psychological Impairment: The inmate has been examined by mental health staff and found to be incapable of functioning in any housing area other than a highly structured treatment environment because he or she constitutes a danger to self and/or others.

Mental Deficiency: The inmate has been examined by mental health staff and has been found to have difficulty interacting with others due to limited comprehension and communication skills.

Escape Threat: The inmate has made significant threats to escape or has a documented history of escape(s) and/or attempted escape(s).

Serious Violence Threat: The inmate has a documented history of violent conduct, such as murder, rape, assault, intimidation involving a weapon, and arson. This conduct may have occurred while confined or while in the community.

Known Gang Affiliation: The inmate is known to be a member of a racial, political, or religious group that uses violence to achieve its goals within a correctional setting and/or in the community and this affiliation is considered to be a management issue in the facility.

Substance Abuse Problem: The inmate was found to be under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs at the time of admission to the facility, was showing signs of withdrawal on admission, has reported a history of substance abuse, or has a criminal history indicating a substance abuse problem.

Known Management Problem: The inmate has a documented history of management problems while confined and/or disruptive behavior while in the community. The inmate is known to have incited, provoked, and/or agitated peers; disrupted facility operations; and/or to have demonstrated a substantial lack of cooperation with authority figures.

Suspected Drug Trafficker: The inmate has repeatedly been charged with and/or convicted of offenses related to sale and/or manufacture of illegal drugs; has been found guilty of introducing illicit drugs into a correctional setting; or has substantial financial resources that may be used to bribe staff, other inmates, or visitors in order to facilitate drug trafficking.

Suicide Risk: The inmate has been examined by mental health staff and is considered to be at risk for attempting to take his or her own life.

Medical Problem: The inmate has a medical problem that may require special housing or supervision. This includes an inmate who has been diagnosed by medical staff as having a communicable disease.

Physical Impairment: The inmate has physical impairment that may require special housing or supervision.

Other: Describe other management considerations that may involve special housing and/or supervision requirements.

- C. **VERRIDE RECOMMENDATION:** If the classification specialist believes there are factors that warrant a custody classification which is different

from that which is indicated by the scale (III.A. above), enter "1" for yes and provide rationale. Otherwise, enter "2" (No). Overrides may be recommended to higher or lower custody levels, depending upon the circumstances.

- D. **RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL:** After reviewing the scale score and all other information which may justify an override, enter the code indicating the recommended custody level. This will be the same code as III.A. above, if no override is recommended.

This section must be signed and dated by the classification specialist.

Section IV: Supervisor Approval of Override

Supervisor approval is required if the classification specialist recommends a scale override.

- A. **RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL:** If the classification specialist recommends an override of the custody level indicated by the Initial Custody Assessment Scale, enter the code for approval or disapproval of the recommended custody level. If the recommended custody level is disapproved, the supervisor must complete IV.B. below.
- B. **FINAL CUSTODY LEVEL:** Enter the custody level approved by the supervisor. Written rationale must be provided if this level is different from that recommended in III.D. above.

This section must be signed and dated by the supervisor if an override has been recommended.

Section V: Housing Assignment

RECOMMENDED HOUSING ASSIGNMENT: Enter the recommended housing assignment.

SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE (SAMPLE)

HIGHEST:

Aiding Escape
Aggravated Battery with Deadly Weapon
Armed Robbery (multiple, with injury)
Burglary with Assault
Escape (secure facility)
Inciting Riot
Kidnapping
Murder (1st°, 2nd°)
Sexual Battery (with violence, upon minor)

HIGH:

Aggravated Assault
Aggravated Battery
Aggravated Child Abuse
Arson
Battery Law Enforcement Officer
Burglary (armed)
Extortion
False Imprisonment
False Report of Bombings
Controlled Substances (importation, trafficking)
Introduction of Contraband into Detention Facility
Manufacture of Explosives
Robbery (armed, strong armed)
Sexual Battery (other than capital or life felony)

MODERATE:

Armed Trespass
Burglary
Carrying Concealed Firearm
Forgery
Grand Theft
Manslaughter
Sale, Delivery, Possession of Controlled Substance
Tampering with Witness
Worthless Checks (felony)
Welfare Fraud (felony)
Escape (Non-secure facility)

LOW:

Driving Under the Influence
Leaving the Scene of Accident
Battery
Carrying Concealed Weapon
Disorderly Conduct

Gambling
Offering to Commit Prostitution
Possession Marijuana (misdemeanor)
Possession Drug Paraphernalia
Petit Theft
Trespass
Worthless Check (misdemeanor)

INITIAL CUSTODY ASSESSMENT SCALE MODIFICATION OPTIONS

Through implementation of the objective classification system at three jails, as well as discussions of its utility, project staff have identified a number of options for modifying the Initial Custody Assessment Scale. Jail staff planning to implement the objective classification system may want to consider these options in adapting the scale for use in their facility. The options presented below are intended to serve as examples of the types of modifications that can be made without disturbing the integrity of the scale. Jail staff also may decide to make other, similar modifications that will tailor the scale to meet agency needs more adequately.

Section I: Identification

Assessment Date: Since space for dating assessment completion is provided at the end of Section IV, this entry may be deleted to save time and space.

Classification Specialist: Since the classification specialist is required to sign his or her name at the end of Section IV, this entry may be deleted to save time and space.

Other Identification Information: Other information that is needed by classification staff to identify an inmate (e.g., date of birth, sex, FBI #), may be added to this section.

Section II: Custody Evaluation

Alcohol/Drug Abuse: This item may be deleted, particularly if a programming assessment is conducted to identify need for substance abuse treatment. In addition, the Special Management Concerns checklist (Section III B) addresses substance abuse. Pilot-testing of the modified scale should help determine whether elimination of this item also necessitates revision of the point ranges in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

Maximum Custody Score: This computation may be eliminated if it leads to problems in completing the scale or if it does not seem to meet a jail's needs. However, if this scoring feature is deleted, jail and/or classification staff also may want to reweigh Items 1-3 so that inmates with very serious charges, detainers, or convictions will receive sufficient points to fall within the maximum custody range listed in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

Stability Factors: Although research has found these factors to be associated with behavior, factors pertaining to employment, school attendance, and length of residence may be deleted if jail staff deem them to be more related to pre-trial release than in-custody behavior. Depending upon the composition of a jail's inmate population, the age provided on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale may be raised or lowered. Similarly, the length of time employed, attending school, or living at the same address may be increased or decreased.

Time Frames For Assessment Items: Depending upon an a jail's operating philosophy and requirements, time frames may be added to the items comprising the scale. For example, only escapes or attempted escapes occurring within the last five years may be considered in scoring Escape History.

Severity of Offense Scale: A jail is encouraged to develop its own Severity of Offense Scale. In developing the scale, state statutes, agency policy, staff consensus, and the sample scale may be used as guidelines.

Other Custody Evaluation Items: Depending upon jail needs, other items relating to custody assessment may be added to Section II. Examples of such items are provided below:

- Number of prior jail stays
- Number of prior prison incarcerations
- Number of prior juvenile confinements

Other Information: Depending on jail needs, other non-scored information may be added to the Initial Custody Assessment Scale. Examples of such information are provided below:

- Custody level during last jail or prison confinement
- Assessment of eligibility for trusty status/work programs
- Date of custody reassessment
- Presumptive release date
- The inmate's signature, acknowledging understanding of the classification process and scale completion

EXHIBIT 3

CUSTODY REASSESSMENT SCALE

CUSTODY REASSESSMENT SCALE

I. IDENTIFICATION

Inmate Name (Last, First, MI)	Inmate ID #	Reassessment Reason
_____	_____	1 - Routine
Reassessment Date	Classification Specialist	2 - Disciplinary
_____	_____	3 - Other

II. CUSTODY EVALUATION

1. SEVERITY OF CURRENT CHARGES/CONVICTIONS (Use Severity of Offense Scale; rate most serious charge/conviction, including any detainers/warrants)

Low _____	0	Score
Moderate _____	1	
High _____	4	
Highest _____	6	

2. SERIOUS OFFENSE HISTORY (Use Severity of Offense Scale; rate most serious prior conviction)

None or Low _____	0	Score
Moderate _____	1	
High _____	3	
Highest _____	6	

3. ESCAPE HISTORY (Excluding current charges)

No escape or attempts _____	0	Score
Walkaway or attempted escape from minimum security or failure to return from authorized absence _____	2	
Escape or attempted escape from medium or maximum security setting _____	6	

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

SCORE OF 7 OR HIGHER, ASSIGN TO MAXIMUM CUSTODY;

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

4. NUMBER OF DISCIPLINARY CONVICTIONS (Since last classification)

None _____	0	Score
One _____	2	
Two _____	4	
Three or more _____	6	

5. MOST SERIOUS DISCIPLINARY CONVICTION (Use Disciplinary Severity Scale; rate during this period of confinement)

None _____	0	Score
Low _____	1	
Moderate _____	2	
High _____	5	
Highest _____	7	

6. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS (Excluding current charges)

None _____	0	Score
One _____	1	
Two or more _____	2	

7. ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE

No problems or occasional abuse resulting in economic or legal problems _____	0	Score
Abuse resulting in social, economic or legal problems _____	1	
Abuse resulting in assaultive behavior _____	2	

COMPREHENSIVE CUSTODY SCORE (Items 1-7)

Total Score

III. SCALE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CUSTODY LEVEL INDICATED BY SCALE. Code
1 - Minimum 2 - Medium 3 - Maximum

Custody Classification Chart

7 or more points on items 1-3 Maximum
5 or fewer points on items 1-7 Minimum
5 or fewer points on items 1-7 with detainer/warrant Medium
6 to 10 points on items 1-7 Medium
11 or more points on items 1-7 Maximum

B. CHECK [X] ALL THE SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS WHICH APPLY TO THIS INMATE:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Protective Custody | <input type="checkbox"/> Known Management Problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Psychological Impairment | <input type="checkbox"/> Suspected Drug Trafficker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Deficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> Suicide Risk |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Escape Threat | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Serious Violence Threat | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Impairment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Known Gang Affiliation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Problem | |

C. OVERRIDE OF SCALE CUSTODY LEVEL IS RECOMMENDED Code

1 - Yes 2 - No

If yes, give rationale (required): _____

D. RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL. Code

1 - Minimum 2 - Medium 3 - Maximum

Specialist Signature _____ Date _____

IV. SUPERVISOR APPROVAL OF OVERRIDE

A. RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL. Code
1 - Approved 2 - Disapproved (Complete B.)

B. FINAL CUSTODY LEVEL (if override disapproved). Code
1 - Minimum 2 - Medium 3 - Maximum

Rationale (required if different from recommendation): _____

Supervisor Signature _____ Date _____

V. RECOMMENDED HOUSING ASSIGNMENT: _____

CUSTODY REASSESSMENT SCALE INSTRUCTIONS

The Custody Reassessment Scale is used to update and review an inmate's initial custody assessment. The reassessment scale is completed at regular intervals specified by policy and when new information affecting the inmate's management is received (e.g., detainers or conviction on current charge). Custody reassessment does not necessarily result in a change of custody rating or housing assignment. Its primary function is to monitor the inmate's adjustment and bring attention to problems that may arise.

Custody reassessment is similar to initial custody assessment, but places greater emphasis on institutional conduct to reflect the inmate's actual behavior while confined. It is important that inmates with long lengths of stay have the opportunity for reduced custody levels based on compliance with institution requirements.

Completion Policy:

The first custody reassessment is completed 30 days following the date of initial assessment. Subsequent reassessments are completed every 60 days. A special reassessment is completed within 48 hours before an inmate leaves disciplinary segregation.

* (NOTE: The jail using the Custody Reassessment Scale may want to establish a time frame for subsequent reassessments that more closely meets its needs.)

INSTRUCTIONS

Section I: Identification

Inmate Name: Enter the inmate's full name, last name followed by first name and middle initial.

Inmate ID Number: Enter the inmate's identifying number. This should be the same number entered on the Inmate Screening Form and the Initial Custody Assessment Scale.

Reassessment Date: Enter the date the reassessment is completed, using numbers to represent month, day and year.

Classification Specialist: Enter the last name of the specialist completing the scale.

Reassessment Reason: Circle the reason that best describes why the reassessment is being done. "Routine" means it is being conducted per time frames specified by policy. "Disciplinary" is to be circled if reassessment results from an infraction. Use "other" code to indicate any special circumstances that require a reassessment.

Section II: Custody Evaluation

Items 1 through 3 are intended to identify the inmate who presents a serious risk to the safety, security, and orderly operation of the facility. **Inmates who score seven or above on the first three items are recommended for maximum custody without consideration of the scores for the remaining items.**

1. Severity of Current Charge(s)/Convictions: Determine the most serious current charge, detainer, warrant, or conviction, using the Severity of Offense Scale. Enter the number of points associated with the severity category into which the inmate's most serious offense falls.
2. Serious Offense History: Exclude current offense(s). Determine the most serious prior conviction and rank it on the Severity of Offense Scale. Enter the number of points associated with the severity category into which the inmate's most serious conviction falls. If the inmate has no record of prior convictions, enter 0.
3. Escape History: Consider any escapes or attempted escapes, including current admission. **Do not consider escapes or attempted escapes scored in item 1.** Enter the number of points corresponding to the inmate's most serious escape or attempt. Escapes from correctional settings or programs are to be recognized if the inmate was found guilty of the escape or attempt by an institutional disciplinary committee, regardless of court prosecution and conviction status.

Maximum Custody Score: Add points for items 1-3, and enter the total in the box designated "maximum custody score." **If this score is 7 or greater, the inmate is to be assigned to maximum custody. Scores for the remaining items do not need to be completed unless the maximum custody score is 6 or lower.**

Items 4 through 7 are designed to establish a custody score for the inmate who is not immediately identified as a maximum custody risk on the first three items.

5. Number of Disciplinary Convictions: Enter the number of points associated with the number of disciplinary convictions since last reassessment date.

6. Most Serious Disciplinary Conviction: Determine the most serious disciplinary conviction, using the Disciplinary Severity Scale. Enter the number of points associated with the severity category for the inmate's most serious conviction during this period of confinement.
7. Prior Felony Convictions: Excluding the current offense, consider the inmate's entire history of convictions. Enter the number of points associated with the number of felony convictions.
8. Alcohol/Drug Abuse: Using the best information available, determine whether substance abuse has led to emotional, social, or legal problems. The degree of personal disruption is the key when assessing this item. Inmate self-report and prior arrest records are expected to be the most frequent sources of information. Enter the number of points associated with evaluation of the extent of abuse.

Comprehensive Custody Score: Enter the total score from items 1-7 in the box.

Section III: Scale Summary and Recommendations

- A. CUSTODY LEVEL INDICATED BY SCALE: Using the Custody Classification Chart, enter the code which indicates the custody level designated by the scale.
- B. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS: This section is designed to address management issues that warrant attention and possible intervention by staff in the form of special housing and/or supervision. The following special management considerations are to be checked on the form if they exist (check all that apply):

Protective Custody: The inmate requires protective custody to ensure his or her safety and well-being; the inmate may, for example, be a current or former criminal justice staff member, witness, known informant, or homosexual or have known enemies in the facility, a thin/frail appearance, an unresolvable language barrier, or charge(s) for heinous/notorious crime(s).

Psychological Impairment: The inmate has been examined by mental health staff and found to be incapable of functioning in any housing area other than a highly structured treatment environment because he or she constitutes a danger to self and/or others.

Mental Deficiency: The inmate has been examined by mental health staff and has been found to have difficulty interacting with others due to limited comprehension and communication skills.

Escape Threat: The inmate has made significant threats to escape or has a documented history of escape(s) and/or attempted escape(s).

Serious Violence Threat: The inmate has a documented history of violent conduct, such as murder, rape, assault, intimidation involving a weapon, and arson. This conduct may have occurred while confined or while in the community.

Known Gang Affiliation: The inmate is known to be a member of an organized group that uses violence to achieve its goals within a correctional setting and/or in the community and this affiliation is considered to be a management issue in the facility.

Substance Abuse Problem: The inmate was found to be under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs at the time of admission to the facility, was showing signs of withdrawal on admission, has reported a history of substance abuse, or has a criminal history indicating a substance abuse problem.

Known Management Problem: The inmate has a documented history of management problems while confined and/or disruptive behavior while in the community. The inmate is known to have incited, provoked, and/or agitated peers; disrupted facility operations; and/or to have demonstrated a substantial lack of cooperation with authority figures:

Suspected Drug Trafficker: The inmate has repeatedly been charged with and/or convicted of offenses related to sale and/or manufacture of illegal drugs, has been found guilty of introducing illicit drugs into a correctional setting, or has substantial financial resources that may be used to bribe staff, other inmates, or visitors in order to facilitate drug trafficking.

Suicide Risk: The inmate has been examined by mental health staff and is considered to be at risk for attempting to take his or her own life.

Medical Problem: The inmate has a medical problem that may require special housing and/or supervision. This includes an inmate who has been diagnosed by medical staff as having a communicable disease.

Physical Impairment: The inmate has physical impairment that may require special housing and/or supervision.

Other: Describe other management considerations that may involve special housing and/or supervision requirements.

- C. **OVERRIDE RECOMMENDATION:** If the classification specialist believes there are factors that warrant a custody classification which is different from that indicated by the scale (II.A. above), enter "1" for yes and provide rationale. Otherwise, enter "2" (No). Overrides may be recommended to higher or lower levels, depending upon the circumstances.
- D. **RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL:** After reviewing the scale score and all other information that may justify an override, enter the code indicating recommended custody level. This will be the same code as III.A. above, if no override is recommended.

This section must be signed and dated by the classification specialist.

Section IV: Supervisor Approval of Override

Supervisor approval is required if the classification specialist recommends a scale override.

- A. **RECOMMENDED CUSTODY LEVEL:** If the classification specialist recommends an override of the custody level indicated by the Custody Reassessment Scale, enter code for approval or disapproval of the recommended custody level. If recommended custody level is disapproved, supervisor must complete IV.B. below.
- B. **FINAL CUSTODY LEVEL:** Enter custody level approved by the supervisor. Written rationale must be provided if this level is different from that recommended in III.D. above.

This section must be signed and dated by the supervisor if an override is recommended.

Section V: Housing Assignment

RECOMMENDED HOUSING ASSIGNMENT: Enter the recommended housing assignment.

SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE (SAMPLE)

HIGHEST:

Aiding Escape
Aggravated Battery with Deadly Weapon
Armed Robbery (multiple, with injury)
Burglary with Assault
Escape (secure facility)
Inciting Riot
Kidnapping
Murder (1st°, 2nd°)
Sexual Battery (with violence, upon minor)

HIGH:

Aggravated Assault
Aggravated Battery
Aggravated Child Abuse
Arson
Battery Law Enforcement Officer
Burglary (armed)
Extortion
False Imprisonment
False Report of Bombings
Controlled Substances (importation, trafficking)
Introduction of Contraband into Detention Facility
Manufacture of Explosives
Robbery (armed, strong armed)
Sexual Battery (other than capital or life felony)

MODERATE:

Armed Trespass
Burglary
Carrying Concealed Firearm
Forgery
Grand Theft
Manslaughter
Sale, Delivery, Possession of Controlled Substance
Tampering with Witness
Worthless Checks (felony)
Welfare Fraud (felony)
Escape (Non-secure facility)

LOW:

Driving Under the Influence
Leaving the Scene of Accident
Battery
Carrying Concealed Weapon
Disorderly Conduct
Gambling

Offering to Commit Prostitution
Possession Marijuana (misdemeanor)
Possession Drug Paraphernalia
Petit Theft
Trespass
Worthless Check (misdemeanor)

DISCIPLINARY SEVERITY SCALE
(Sample)

HIGHEST:

Assaulting Any Person
Fighting With Another Person
Threatening Another With Bodily Harm, Or Any Offense Against
His Person or Property
Extortion, Blackmail, Protection, Demanding or Receiving Money
or Anything of Value in Return for Protection
Engaging in Sexual Acts With Others
Making Sexual Propositions or Threats to Another
Escape
Attempting or Planning Escape
Setting a Fire
Tampering With or Blocking Any Locking Device
Adulteration of Any Food or Drink
Possession or Introduction of Any Explosive or Ammunition
Possession of Contraband
Rioting
Encouraging Others To Riot
Engaging In, or Encouraging, a Group Demonstration
Giving or Offering Any Official or Staff Member a Bribe or Anything
of Value
Giving Money or Anything of Value to, or Accepting Money or
Anything of Value From a Prisoner, a Member of His Family, or His
Friend

HIGH:

Destroying, Altering, or Damaging Government Property or the
Property of Another
Stealing
Misuse of Authorized Medication
Loaning of Property or Anything of Value for Profit or Increased
Return
Possession of Anything Not Authorized for Retention or Receipt
Through Regular Institutional Channels
Encouraging Others To Refuse To Work or To Participate in Work
Stoppage
Refusing To Obey an Order of Any Staff Member
Insolence Toward a Staff Member
Lying or Providing False Statement to a Staff Member
Conduct That Disrupts or Interferes With the Security or Orderly
Running of the Institution

Counterfeiting, Forging, or Unauthorized Reproduction of Any Document, Article, Identification, Money, Security, or Official Paper

Participating in Unauthorized Meeting or Gathering

Failure To Stand Count

Interfering With Taking of Count

Making Intoxicants or Being Intoxicated

Tattooing or Self-Mutilation

MODERATE:

Indecent Exposure

Mutilating or Altering Issued Clothing

Refusing To Work

Unexcused Absence From Work or Any Assignment

Malingering or Feigning Illness

Failure To Perform Work as Instructed by Supervisor

Being in an Unauthorized Area

Using Abusive or Obscene Language

Unauthorized Use of Mail or Telephone

Unauthorized Contacts With the Public

Correspondence or Conduct With a Visitor in Violation of Posted Regulations

LOW:

Wearing a Disguise or Mask

Failure To Follow Safety or Sanitation Guidelines

Using Any Equipment or Machinery Contrary to Instructions or Posted Safety Standards

Smoking Where Prohibited

Gambling, Preparing or Conducting a Gambling Pool, Possession of Gambling Paraphernalia

Being Unsanitary or Untidy, Failure To Keep One's Person and Quarters in Accordance With Posted Standards

CUSTODY REASSESSMENT SCALE MODIFICATION OPTIONS

Through implementation of the objective classification system at three jails, as well as discussions of its utility, project staff have identified a number of options for modifying the Custody Reassessment Scale. Jail Staff planning to implement the objective classification system may want to consider these options in adapting the scale for use in their facility. The options presented below are intended to serve as examples of the types of modifications that can be made without disturbing the integrity of the scale. Jail staff also may decide to make other, similar modifications that will tailor the scale to meet agency needs more adequately. **However, any alterations in the scale should continue to afford inmates a means of reducing their custody level through positive institutional adjustment.**

Section I: Identification

Reassessment Date: Since space for dating reassessment completion is provided at the end of Section IV, this entry may be deleted to save time and space.

Classification Specialist: Since the classification specialist is required to sign his or her name at the end of Section IV, this entry may be deleted to save time and space.

Other Identification Information: Other information that is needed by classification staff to identify an inmate (e.g., date of birth, sex, FBI #) may be added to this section.

Section II: Custody Evaluation

Number of Disciplinary Convictions: The point values associated with this item may be modified so that inmates with no disciplinary convictions receive a score of -1 in place of 0. If this point adjustment is made, the jail may want to use the point values specified on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale for Items 1-3. These values have been decreased on the Custody Reassessment Scale in order to enable inmates with positive institutional adjustment to move to lower custody levels.

Most Serious Disciplinary Conviction: The point values associated with this item may be modified so that inmates without serious disciplinary convictions receive a score of -1 in place of 0. If this point adjustment is made, the jail may want to use the point values specified on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale for Items 1-3. These values have been decreased on the Custody Reassessment Scale in order to enable inmates with positive institutional adjustment to move to lower custody levels.

Alcohol/Drug Abuse: This item may be deleted, particularly if a programming assessment is conducted to identify need for substance abuse treatment. In addition, the Special Management Concerns checklist (Section III.B.) will highlight this area.

Pilot-testing of the modified scale should help determine whether elimination of this item also necessitates revision of the point ranges in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

Maximum Custody Score: This computation may be eliminated if it leads to problems in completing the scale or if it does not seem to meet a jail's needs. However, if this scoring feature is deleted, jail and/or classification staff also may want to reweigh Items 1-3 so that inmates with very serious charges, detainers, or convictions will receive sufficient point to fall within the maximum custody range listed in the Custody Classification Chart in Section III.

Time Frames For Assessment Items: Depending upon an a jail's operating philosophy and requirements, time frames may be added to the items comprising the scale. For example, only escapes or attempted escapes occurring within the last five years may be considered in scoring Escape History.

Severity of Offense Scale: A jail is encouraged to develop its own Severity of Offense Scale. In developing the scale, state statutes, agency policy, staff consensus, and the sample scale may be used as guidelines.

Disciplinary Severity Scale: A jail is encourage to develop its own Disciplinary Severity Scale, using agency rules and regulations as well as the sample scale as guidelines.

Other Custody Evaluation Items: Depending on a jail's operational philosophy and needs, other items relating to custody assessment may be added to Section II. For example, items addressing positive institutional adjustment, such as program participation or work assignments, may be incorporated into the scale. Indicators of positive adjustment may be assigned negative points in order to provide inmates with the opportunity to lower their custody level. If items with negative point values are added to Section II, the jail, as noted previously, may want to use the point values specified on the Initial Custody Assessment Scale for Items 1-3.

Other Information: Depending on jail needs, other non-scored information may be added to the Custody Reassessment Scale. Examples of such information are provided below:

- Custody level during last jail or prison confinement
- Assessment of eligibility for trusty status/work programs
- Date of inmate's next custody reassessment
- Presumptive release date

- The inmate's signature, acknowledging understanding of the custody reassessment process

Combination of Custody Reassessment and Initial Custody Assessment Scales: Jails desirous of simplifying the objective classification process as much as possible may want to consider development of a single custody assessment scale that combines the most useful items in the Initial Custody Assessment Scale and the Custody Reassessment Scale. Such a scale, for instance, might include the items below:

- Severity of Current Charges/Convictions
- Serious Offense History
- Escape History
- Prior Felony Convictions
- Institutional Disciplinary History
- Most Serious Disciplinary History (During current confinement)
- Participation in Program/Work Assignments (During current confinement)

Development of a single custody assessment form should be followed by extensive pilot-testing so that the point values associated with assessment criteria and the point ranges included in the Custody Classification Chart can be adjusted to meet the jail's operational philosophy and needs.

EXHIBIT 4

INMATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORMS

INITIAL INMATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORM

Inmate Name (Last, First, MI)

Inmate ID #

Assessment Date

Classification Specialist

HEALTH

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|------|
| 1 Limited physical capacity, acute illness; needs hospitalization or out-patient treatment | 2 Mild disability or illness; outpatient treatment required; non-strenuous work | 3 No problems which limit housing or work assignments | Code |
|--|---|---|------|

EMOTIONAL STABILITY

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|------|
| 1 Severe impairment; danger to self, others; needs hospital environment | 2 Moderate impairment; requires monitoring, individual or group therapy | 3 Emotionally stable; no indications of mental illness | Code |
|---|---|--|------|

EDUCATION

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|------|
| 1 5th grade or below reading, math skills; needs remedial or special education classes | 2 No H.S. diploma; needs adult education or GED program | 3 High school diploma, GED or equivalent | Code |
|--|---|--|------|

VOCATIONAL SKILL

- | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1 No discernible skill; needs training | 2 Limited skills; ability to hold semi-skilled position; needs training | 3 Possesses marketable skill or trade | Code |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|------|

SUBSTANCE ABUSE

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------|
| 1 Frequent abuse resulting in social, economic or legal problems; needs treatment | 2 Occasional abuse causing disruption of functioning | 3 No disruption of functioning or legal difficulties | Code |
|---|--|--|------|

MENTAL ABILITY

- | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------|
| 1 Serious disability limiting ability to function; needs sheltered living, work situations | 2 Mild disability limiting educational, vocational potential | 3 No discernible disability | Code |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------|

OTHER: (1) describe _____

Code

INITIAL PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

PROGRAM CODE PRIORITY CODE*

- | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|
| 1. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. _____ | _____ | _____ |

*Priority Codes: 1 - Urgent, immediate need
 2 - Problem directly related to criminal behavior; high priority
 3 - Problem resolution would enhance ability to succeed in community

INMATE NEEDS REASSESSMENT FORM

Inmate Name (Last, First, MI) _____

Inmate ID # _____

Assessment Date _____

Classification Specialist _____

HEALTH

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------|
| 1 Limited physical capacity, acute illness; needs hospitalization or out-patient treatment | 2 Mild disability or illness; outpatient treatment required; non-strenuous work | 3 No problems which limit housing or work assignments | Code _____ |
|--|---|---|------------|

EMOTIONAL STABILITY

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|
| 1 Severe impairment; danger to self, others; needs hospital environment | 2 Moderate impairment; requires monitoring, individual or group therapy | 3 Emotionally stable; no indications of mental illness | Code _____ |
|---|---|--|------------|

EDUCATION

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------|
| 1 5th grade or below reading, math skills; needs remedial or special education classes | 2 No H.S. diploma; needs adult education or GED program | 3 High school diploma, GED or equivalent | Code _____ |
|--|---|--|------------|

VOCATIONAL SKILL

- | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------|
| 1 No discernible skill; needs training | 2 Limited skills; ability to hold semi-skilled position; needs training | 3 Possesses marketable skill or trade | Code _____ |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------|

SUBSTANCE ABUSE

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------|
| 1 Frequent abuse resulting in social, economic or legal problems; needs treatment | 2 Occasional abuse causing disruption of functioning | 3 No disruption of functioning or legal difficulties | Code _____ |
|---|--|--|------------|

MENTAL ABILITY

- | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------------|
| 1 Serious disability limiting ability to function; needs sheltered living, work situations | 2 Mild disability limiting educational, vocational potential | 3 No discernible disability | Code _____ |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------------|

OTHER: (1) describe _____

Code _____

PREVIOUS PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

PROGRAM CODE

PRIORITY CODE

ADJUSTMENT CODE*

- | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

NEW PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

PROGRAM CODE

PRIORITY CODE*

- | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|
| 1. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. _____ | _____ | _____ |

*See Adjustment and Priority Codes on back of form.

ADJUSTMENT AND PRIORITY CODES

Adjustment Codes

- 1 = Completed program satisfactorily
- 2 = Completed program unsatisfactorily
- 3 = Currently enrolled; satisfactory participation
- 4 = Currently enrolled; adjustment problems noted
- 5 = Inmate dropped from program; lack of interest, progress
- 6 = Inmate refused participation
- 7 = Program or program space not available

Priority Codes

- 1 = Urgent, immediate need
- 2 = Problem directly related to criminal behavior; high priority
- 3 = Problem resolution would enhance ability to succeed in community

INMATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORMS--INSTRUCTIONS

The Initial Inmate Needs Assessment Form and Reassessment Form are designed to identify major areas of inmate needs and relate these areas to programs and referral opportunities while individuals are in custody. This becomes particularly important for longer-term inmates. Needs reassessments assure systematic evaluation of program participation and provide for programming changes.

Completion Policy:

The Initial Inmate Needs Assessment Form is completed at the same time as the Initial Custody Assessment Scale, and the Inmate Needs Reassessment Form is completed with each Custody Reclassification Scale.

* (NOTE: Agencies without existing programming capabilities may want to omit use of these forms or to complete only the initial assessment form as a tool for program planning.)

INSTRUCTIONS

Identification:

Inmate Name: Enter the inmate's full name (last, first, middle initial).

Inmate #: Enter the inmate's identifying number. This should be the same number entered on the Inmate Screening Form and the Initial Custody Assessment Scale.

Assessment/Reassessment Date: Enter the date the scale is completed. Use the numerical designation for month, day, year.

Classification Specialist: Enter the last name of the specialist completing the form.

Needs Categories:

Each of six need areas are identified with three levels of coding. Code "1" indicates a major problem in that area, code "2" a moderate problem and code "3" no problem. Enter the appropriate code in the designated space for each need area.

Space is also provided for the classification specialist to describe additional inmate needs that are not addressed by the previous six categories. If any additional needs are identified, enter code number "1" in the designated space.

The numerical codes for each item are not to be tallied for a total score. Their only purpose is to designate high, moderate, or no needs in an area, and provide for data entry capability.

Program Recommendations:

Initial Inmate Needs Assessment

Recommendations: Indicate the program recommendations made for each inmate.

Program Code: Each major program within a jail facility will be identified with a numerical code which will be entered here (i.e., AA, GED tutoring, individual counseling, etc.).

Priority Code: Identify the priority of each referral with the following codes:

- 1 = Urgent, immediate need
- 2 = Problem directly related to criminal behavior; high priority
- 3 = Problem resolution would enhance ability to succeed in community

Inmate Needs Reassessment

Previous Program Recommendations: Enter the recommendations made at last needs evaluation. This may have been the initial evaluation or, for long term inmates, the last reassessment.

Program Code: Enter the program code defined by the agency.

Priority Code: Enter the priority code assigned at the time the program recommendation was made.

Adjustment Code: Enter one of the following adjustment codes to indicate progress since the last evaluation:

- 1 = Completed program satisfactorily
- 2 = Completed program unsatisfactorily
- 3 = Currently enrolled, satisfactory participation
- 4 = Currently enrolled, adjustment problems noted
- 5 = Inmate dropped from program; lack of interest, progress
- 6 = Inmate refused participation

7 = Program or program space not available

New Program Recommendations, Program Code, and Priority: Enter the program recommendations (including program and priority codes) made at the time of this needs evaluation.

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 2

DECISION-TREE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM APPROACH

Introduction

In 1984, Community Justice Alternatives, the corrections division of the Northwest Michigan Council of Governments/Northwest Michigan Private Industry Council, developed a decision-tree classification system. This system has currently been implemented and tested in 16 metropolitan, urban and small jails primarily in Michigan. The system consists of three components plus an optional, but encouraged, fourth component for assessing inmate program needs and referral.

The system currently exists in both a manual and automated computerized version which is incorporated inside a complete jail management information system. The automated version automatically searches and provides all current and historical relevant information to the classification officer as the officer moves through the decision tree.

What follows is a brief description of the decision-tree format developed by CJA. Following the description and an assessment of its capabilities are classification and screening instruments.

Initial Screening/Assessment

The first phase of the decision-tree system developed by CJA is an Initial Screening/Assessment form covering initial medical concerns, officer observations and suicide risk assessment, among others, to assist in the initial housing and supervision decisions during the first 72 hours of incarceration.

Primary Classification

The second or Primary Classification phase uses the decision tree instrument to determine the inmate's custody level prior to being moved to general population. This system classifies an inmate into one of three custody levels, maximum, medium or minimum and within these three custody levels one of eight custody levels. This was specifically developed to further assist in housing and program decisions within the primary custody levels.

Maximum custody consists of level 1 High (super max single cell) and level 2 medium high close custody (single or group housing). Medium custody consists of level 3 medium with felony assaultive or escape backgrounds, level 4 medium and level 5 medium pre-sentence (a temporary medium custody assignment pending

sentencing by the court). Minimum custody consists of three custody levels including level 6, level 7 and level 8 for the very low minimum custody inmates.

Eligibility for various inmate programs and privileges within the facility are matched to the various custody levels promoting the behavior modification objective of more desirable housing and opportunities coinciding with a decrease in the custody level.

Classification Criteria

This decision-tree approach identifies nine decision criteria in assigning the appropriate custody level through a process of elimination during the development stages of this instrument. These nine decision criteria include:

- Current type of offense or conviction (based on the felony assaultive criminal code in each state and other life sentence offenses).
- Prior felony assaultive convictions
- Escape history
- Prior felony conviction history
- Detainers, writs or other security-risk warrants
- Past and present institutional behavior
- Pre or Post sentenced status
- Current conviction(s) felony or misdemeanor
- Family ties and/or recent employment status

Overrides

This decision-tree approach, like all objective classification systems, has an override option. This override option is triggered by the classification officer if it is determined that circumstances requiring a deviation from the decision tree resulting in a custody designation that is other than what would routinely occur by following the decision tree. Such circumstances may include issues of concern for staff or inmate safety, mental health, inmate known to staff, increased escape risk, etc.

Special Flags

In addition the instrument provides for two additional "flags" which may accompany the custody classification. These are: Special Condition which identifies the inmate as having a need or condition which requires special attention such as a physical or mental handicap, diet restrictions, alcohol or drug withdrawal, medication requirements, etc.; and High Risk which identifies an inmate as being a grave threat to themselves (suicidal) or to the staff or fellow inmates (system risk). As a result of

a High Risk designation, a special high visibility or isolation placement may be warranted. A High Risk or Special Condition designation may or may not require a deviation from the decision tree warranting an override.

Classification Review

The third phase of this system is the classification review process which includes an inventory form of the inmate's status including offense, legal status, program participation, misconduct reports, and any other pertinent information to determine if the current custody level is still appropriate. If an adjustment is appropriate, either to a higher or lower level the inmate is reclassified accordingly. Typically, inmates are reviewed a minimum of every 60 or 90 days with automatic review triggered by sentencing, misconducts, appeal or staff request.

The advantages of this system and the primary reasons CJA chose the decision tree method was:

- Relative simplicity
- Ease of training and ease of use
- Strong face validity, (i.e., logical, high degree of common sense, easy to follow the flow of the classification decision)
- Non-reliance on math and point scales

Conclusion

Through its years of testing, this system has shown to be readily acceptable to staff, generally supporting their professional judgement of appropriate custody decisions and its high degree of consistency in the classification decision from officer to officer. By including custody levels within the primary security designations this system allows for the identification of the very serious offender being routed to a level 1 super max status while still identifying other maximum custody inmates which present less of a system risk to the facility. This similar dynamic occurs with the other custody levels within the system. It has proven to provide more flexibility, primarily within the large jails, regarding housing configurations and inmate grouping and in program considerations.

EXPLANATION OF DECISION SPLITS FOR THE PRIMARY JICS CLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENT

Current Offense Assaultive Felony: Is the inmate's current charge(s) or conviction(s) one of the offenses listed on the ASSAULTIVE FELONY CRIME list attached?

Prior Assaultive Felony Convictions: Does the inmate have a conviction history of one or more of the assaultive felony type offenses listed on the ASSAULTIVE FELONY CRIME list?

Escape History: Is there a prior record of an escape or attempt from a secure correctional facility? Note: If there is a record of a walk-away from a non-secure facility or court ordered program such as a half-way house, work release center or residential program, it should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. If it is felt that the circumstances surrounding the walk-away presently warrant a security concern, use the **Override** option documenting your reason for the concern and the appropriate custody level. If the circumstances or elapsed time element, in your opinion, does not warrant a higher custody level, mark the box "no", make comments and continue on through the tree.

3 or More Prior Felony Convictions: Does the inmate have a record of 3 or more prior felony convictions, not including the current offense(s), in the past 5 years of street time? Street time is defined as that period of time not spent in a correctional facility. Convictions prior to the past five years of street time, other than those crimes listed on the ASSAULTIVE FELONY CRIME list, should not be included. Juvenile felony type convictions would be included if they fall within the last 5 year street time period.

Detainer, Warrants or Pending Charges: Are there any outstanding warrants, liens, detainers, or pending charges (excluding the charges being booked on) which may pose a security risk? Note: This may require individual facility policy decisions on seriousness of outstanding charges to justify a higher custody level.

Known Past/Present Institutional Behavior Problem: Has or is the inmate observing the rules and regulations of the facility? Is the inmate disrupting the facility, intimidating or threatening fellow inmates or staff? Is the inmate cooperating with the staff and facility routine?

Pre-Sentence or Post Sentence: Is the inmate pre-sentence or post-sentence status? If the inmate has multiple charges, all charges must be resolved prior to being considered post sentence. Note: The inmate who is identified as pre-sentence at this juncture in the tree, and consequently classified as medium pre-sentence, will likely be reclassified as minimum custody upon sentencing.

Current Offense Felony or Misdemeanor: Is the most serious current conviction a felony or a misdemeanor? If the most serious offense is a civil offense consider it as a misdemeanant for purposes of the decision split.

Family Ties or Employment: Does the inmate have immediate family in the community and/or has the inmate resided in the area for one year or longer and/or has the inmate been steadily employed in the area for six or more of the last twelve months? Note: This decision split is intended to determine the inmates ties to the community.

Overrides: If it is determined that circumstances requiring a deviation from the primary decision tree resulting in a custody designation that is other than what would routinely occur by following the decision tree, it is designed an **override**. If you find it necessary to override the tree circle override on the form and note your reason in the designated area.

High Risk: Is a red flag identifying an inmate as being a grave threat to themselves (suicidal) or to the staff or fellow inmates (system risk). As a result of a **high risk designation**, a special high visibility or isolation placement may be warranted. If a high risk designation is warranted, circle the high risk box and note the specific reason in the comment section of the instrument. A high risk designation may or may not require an override to the decision tree. If it does require a deviation, circle override as well as the special condition box.

**MICHIGAN
ASSAULTIVE FELONY CRIMES**

750.136	Cruelty to Children
750.136A	Torture by Parent or Guardian
750.158	Sodomy
750.205	Place Explosive by Prop w/Int Disch
750.206	Place Explosives w/Int to do Damage
750.207	Use Explosives with Intent Dest/Inj
750.209	Place Foul Subst w/Int Injur, Coerce
750.210	Possession of Bomb
750.211	Conspiracy to Possess Explosives
750.211A	Explosive Device, Constr, Poss, and Use
750.213	Extortion
750.224	Mfg or Possession of Illegal Weapons
750.226	Carry Weapon w/Unlawful Intent
750.227	Carrying Concealed Weapons
750.227B	Poss of Firearm During Comm of Fel
750.316	First Degree Murder
750.317	Second Degree Murder
750.321	Manslaughter
750.349	Kidnapping
750.436	Poisoning Food, Drink, etc.
750.520	Rape
750.520B	Criminal Sexual Conduct, First Degree
750.520C	Criminal Sexual Conduct, 2nd Degree
750.520D	Criminal Sexual Conduct, 3rd Degree
750.520E	Criminal Sexual Conduct, 4th Degree
750.520G	Assault w/int C Sex C
750.529	Robbery Armed
750.530	Robbery Unarmed
750.72	Arson
750.81A	Assault and Inflict Serious Injury
750.82	Felonious Assault
750.83	Asslt w/Int to Commit Murder
750.84	Asslt w/Int Gr Bod Hrm Less Murder
750.85	Asslt w/Int to Rape
750.86	Asslt w/Int to Maim
750.87	Asslt w/Int Comm Fel
750.88	Asslt w/Int to Rob & Steal Unarmed
750.89	Asslt w/Int to Rob and Steal Armed
750.91	Attempt to Murder
800.283	Weapons, Prohibit Furnish in Prison
333.7401	Unlawful Man Del, Poss of Controlled Subst (<u>if facing life sentence</u>)
333.7403	Poss of Controlled Dangerous Substance 650 Grams
750.531	Bank Safe or Vault Robbery

769.11 Habitual, 3rd Felony
769.10 Habitual, 2nd Felony
769.12 Habitual, 4th Felony
750.350 Enticing Child Under 14 Years of Age (Kidnap Under 14)

Decision Tree
PROGRAM OPTIONS

Availability of certain programs is restricted by the degree of assigned security. Programming which may be available and are assessed based on need and level of security are:

High	-----	No in-house program participation. May receive one-on-one counseling as determined appropriate.
Med. High	-----	May participate in some or all "Inside the Jail" educational and treatment programs pending approval by custody staff. May receive one-on-one counseling as determined appropriate.
Med.	-----	May participate in all "Inside the Jail" educational treatment programs.
Low Med.	-----	May be considered for alternative to jail programs and alcohol/drug residential placement. Also may participate in day release programs such as Work/School Release, Sheltered Workshops, Vocational Training, Supervised Work Crews and all the "Inside the Jail" educational and treatment programs.
Low	-----	
Very Low	-----	Unsupervised community programs as an alternative to jail including Community Service Work, Victim/Offender Restitution Program or Enhanced Probation.

* Special Conditions and High Risk: ----- Program availability is determined by the assigned security level and individual circumstances for the classification on a case by case basis.

**Decision Tree
Initial Classification
Temporary Cell Assignment**

This instrument is intended to aid in the initial decisions of temporary cell assignment and appropriate supervision levels at booking. It requires a direct interview between the inmate and booking officer combined with specific observations.

Name _____ P# _____ Sex _____

Age _____ EXAMINER NAME: _____ Date _____

MEDICAL INTAKE AND HISTORY/RECEIVING SCREENING

This section is intended to inventory the inmates present physical condition and medical status.

VISUAL OBSERVATIONS: (Corrections Officer observations, objective. Circle Yes or No)

Physical condition at intake: Good _____ Fair _____ Poor _____

- Yes No 1. Does the inmate have obvious pain, bleeding or other symptoms suggesting need for emergency medical services?
- Yes No 2. Are there visible signs of injury or illness requiring immediate treatment or care?
- Yes No 3. Does inmate appear to be under the influence of alcohol, or exhibit signs?
- Yes No 4. Does inmate appear to be under the influence of barbituates, heroin or any other drugs, or exhibit signs?
- Yes No 5. Is there any jaundice?
- Yes No 6. Is the inmate carrying any medications?
- Yes No 7. Was the inmate taken to the hospital prior to intake? If so: treatment, medications, etc. _____
- Yes No 8. Does the inmate's behavior suggest the need for immediate psychological referral? _____

QUESTIONNAIRE: (Inmates response to questions, symptoms)

- Yes No 1. Is there any complaint of sore throat, fever, or other evidence of infection which may spread throughout the jail?
- Yes No 2. Is he/she on a special diet prescribed by a doctor?
- Yes No 3. Are you presently taking medications? If yes, list _____
- Yes No 4. Are you under a doctor's care? If yes, list: Doctor _____
Phone _____
- Yes No 5. Have you been hospitalized recently? If yes: Where _____
Explain _____
- Yes No 6. Does he/she have a history of VD or abnormal discharge?
- Yes No 7. Is inmate allergic to any medication or food? If yes, list: _____
- Yes No 8. Has inmate fainted recently or had a recent head injury?
- Yes No 9. Is there a history of TB, hepatitis, epilepsy or diabetes? (If yes, circle one)
- Yes No 10. Does inmate have a painful dental condition?
- Yes No 11. Is inmate pregnant or on birth control pills?
- Yes No 12. Do you have any physical handicaps? _____
- Yes No 13. Do you have any other medical problems we should know about? If yes, list: _____
- Yes No 14. Do you have any other medical/dental insurance? If yes, list: Company _____
Policy Number _____
- Yes No 15. Officer's input (medical) _____

I agree that the above information can be released to any counselor or attending physician .

Inmate signature

Officer's signature

Notification of Medical Director Designee. Time _____ Whom _____

Physician/Nurse Signature _____

Decision Tree
Resident Classification Review

Name _____ Desc. / P _____
(last) (first) (middle)

Date of Review: ___/___/___ Reviewed by: _____

Type of Review: ___ Periodic ___ Sentenced ___ Appeal ___ Disciplinary
___ Other _____

Booked: 1) Date: ___/___/___ Time: _____ 2) Date: ___/___/___ Time: _____
3) Date: ___/___/___ Time: _____ 4) Date: ___/___/___ Time: _____

Review Criteria

Offense Type:

___ Assaultive Felony _____	___ Property _____
___ Alcohol Related _____	___ Fraud _____
___ Traffic (non-alcohol) _____	___ Parole/Probation _____
___ F.O.C./N.S. _____	___ Drug _____
___ Other _____	___ Detainer/Warrant _____

Institutional Behavior/Attitude Adjustment: _____

Refer to Complaint # _____

Compliance with Court/Staff recommendations: Yes No N/A Explain: _____

Quotations: _____

Sentenced: Yes No Outdate if Sentenced: ___/___/___

Comments: _____

Declassified: ___ Yes ___ No Security Level _____

Next Review Date: (circle) Periodic ___ Days ___/___/___ None

Comments: _____

Decision Tree

SOCIAL STRESS/SUICIDAL RISK

This section is intended to aid in identifying the potentially suicidal inmate and in minimizing the potential liability of you and your department. Depression is the best single indicator of risk; however, also look for these symptoms: sadness and crying, withdrawal, silence, loss or gain in appetite, insomnia, mood variations and lethargy.

Have You Recently Experienced Any Of The Following?

Yes	No	Job Loss	Yes	No	Marital Separation	Yes	No	Loss of Business
Yes	No	Arrest of Loved One	Yes	No	Divorce	Yes	No	Major Financial Loss
Yes	No	Death of a Loved One						

Explain _____

Yes No Do you have any unusual home or family problems we should know about? List: _____

Yes No Have you ever been in a mental institution or had psychiatric care? List: _____

Yes No Have you ever attempted or contemplated suicide? Are you now? _____
When? _____ Where _____

Yes No Does the inmates behavior suggest a risk of suicide?

OFFICER OBSERVATIONS/COMMENTS

This section is intended to structure and document the booking officer's observations. These observations should be used in conjunction with the Suicide Risk Section.

	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Assaultive/violent behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uncooperative	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bizarre behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Blank stare in eyes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Angry/hostile behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unpleasant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Depressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unusual suspiciousness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loud/obnoxious behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Passive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Confused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seeing Visions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lifeless reaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hearing voices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-talkative	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Understands questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OTHER: (Extreme emotions, nervousness, indigent) _____

Yes	No		High	Med	Low	None				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Timid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Walks with stagger	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Talks with slur	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Feminine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Odor of alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Homosexual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eyes red or bloodshot	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Evidence of needle marks	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Known enemies: _____

Co-Defendants: _____

Arresting officer comments: _____

Screening officer comments: _____

Housing Assignment/Cell # Holding _____ Detoxification _____ Other _____

Level of Supervision Constant _____ 15 Minutes _____ Half an hour _____ Other _____

Name of screening officer (print) _____ Date _____ Time _____