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Administrative Segregation (AS)

- The use of AS involves the *housing of an inmate in conditions by substantial isolation from other inmates* (ABA, 2011).

- There is a *critical need* to better understand who ends up in AS.

- This study represents the first known meta-analytic review of the research on the predictors of AS.

- The results have important *policy implications* for the management of correctional institutions, as well as *practical applications* within the context of offender treatment.
Eligibility Criteria

- In order to be eligible for inclusion, studies were required to:
  - Be conducted on prisoners in custodial settings
  - Compare characteristics of inmates in AS settings to those in GP settings
  - Contain sufficient data to calculate an effect size (i.e., Pearson $r$ or phi coefficient)
Group Comparisons

• **Inmate characteristics**
  - Age, race, mental disorder, gang, risk level

• **Criminal history**
  - Juvenile justice involvement, record of violence

• **Institutional behavior**
  - Prior segregation, misconduct history, initial security rating

• **Criminogenic needs**
  - Antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates, community functioning, education, employment, family/marital, personal/emotional, substance abuse, motivation for treatment
Effect Size Calculation and Interpretation

- Hedge’s $g$ was selected to estimate the magnitude of the effect size (ES).

- Studies could contribute more than one ES per category as long as each one represented an estimate for a unique sample of offenders.

- Random effects model results are reported.

- $I^2$ is used to evaluate the heterogeneity of the ES estimates.
Description of Studies

• Total # of studies included = 16
• Total # of effect size estimates = 131

• 88% of studies occurred in North America
• 75% of studies were produced after 2000
• 63% of studies were peer reviewed journal articles
• 25% of studies separated results by gender
### Meta-Analysis of AS vs. GP Inmates by Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$I^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>[-.42, -.30]</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>91,610</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>[-.07, .46]</td>
<td>96.89</td>
<td>88,019</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental disorder</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>[.19, .51]</td>
<td>93.20</td>
<td>33,468</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>[.14, .79]</td>
<td>96.73</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-risk</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>[.34, .51]</td>
<td>89.31</td>
<td>50,899</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent criminal history</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>[.34, .49]</td>
<td>86.37</td>
<td>102,942</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice involvement</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>[.42, .56]</td>
<td>64.99</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial security level</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>[.26, .70]</td>
<td>62.81</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior segregation</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>[.30, .84]</td>
<td>98.73</td>
<td>22,923</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior misconduct</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>[1.24, 2.97]</td>
<td>96.95</td>
<td>63,898</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ES = mean weighted effect size (Hedge’s $g$); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of ES; $I^2$ = percentage of variability across effect sizes; $n$ = total sample size; $k$ = number of effect sizes.
## Meta-Analysis of AS vs. GP Inmates by Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$I^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial attitudes</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>[.29, .45]</td>
<td>76.17</td>
<td>14,212</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial associates</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>[.15, .40]</td>
<td>90.37</td>
<td>13,993</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community functioning/leisure</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>[.12, .30]</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/HS diploma</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>[.25, .50]</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>21,246</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>[.10, .30]</td>
<td>92.34</td>
<td>31,733</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/marital</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>[.06, .19]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/emotional</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>[.23, .35]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>[.17, .41]</td>
<td>95.91</td>
<td>35,279</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for treatment</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>[.10, 1.07]</td>
<td>73.32</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ES = mean weighted effect size (Hedge’s g); 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of ES; $I^2$ = percentage of variability across effect sizes; n = total sample size; k = number of effect sizes.*
Conclusion

• Who ends up in administrative segregation?
  • “Worst of the worst” inmates
  • “Nuisance” inmates
  • “Difficult to manage” inmates

• There is little empirical evidence to suggest that AS is effective in improving subsequent inmate institutional behavior (see Labrecque, 2015; Morris, 2015).

• What are the alternatives to AS?
Implications

• One way to improve inmate behavior and reduce the use of AS is to apply the RNR framework to the management of inmates:
  • Identifying at-risk inmates (RISK)
  • Treatment targets (NEEDS)
    • Attitudes/cognitions
    • Personal/emotional
    • Substance abuse
    • Negative peer influences
    • Motivation for treatment
  • Potential moderators (RESPONSIVITY)
    • Variability in findings

Variability in findings
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Canadian Context

- **Correctional Services of Canada**
  - All custodial sentences of 2 or more years
    - Roughly 2% of convicted cases
    - Roughly 15,000 inmates at any given time

- **Corrections and Conditional Release Act:**
  3 reasons for segregation
  - Inmate jeopardizes security of the institution
  - Inmate is in danger
  - [Inmate’s presence in general population may interfere with investigation]
- 16,701 CSC Offenders
  - All men admitted FY 2007/2008 through 2009/2010
  - All women admitted from 1999/2000 through 2009/2010
  - 20% Aboriginal; 16% women

- Randomly split into development (N = 11,110) and validation (N = 5,591) sample
Administrative segregation placement

- Within 2 years of admission
- For a period of 6 days or more
- For reason of ‘inmate in danger’ (IMD) or ‘jeopardizing security of the institution’ (JS)

- 24% placed in administrative segregation within 2 years
  - Aboriginal offenders more likely; women less likely
413 Potential Predictor Variables

- Scale items (Static Factors Assessment, Dynamic Factors Intake Assessment, Custody Rating Scale)
- Demographic information
- Current sentence information
- Flags/needs/alerts
- Gang affiliation information
- Previous sentence information (institutional incidents and prior segregations)
Data Sources

- **Computerized file information**
  - Entry/exit in segregation is reliably documented
  - Predictor variables as assessed by front-line staff in policy-mandated assessments
    - *Vary in quality*
    - *Missing information*
    - *Mental health information particularly spotty*
Development Sample Analyses

- 86% of predictors were significant
- Limited differences in reason for segregation
- Many predicted better for women
- Reduced items considering:
  - Magnitude of effect sizes, face validity concerns, practicality (ease of obtaining/coding), statistical analyses to reduce redundancies, robustness for gender and Aboriginal ancestry
- Developed scales for static factors, dynamic, and both
The Chosen Scale

- Static scale: Risk of Administrative Segregation Tool (RAST)

  - Age at admission (0-3)
  - Prior convictions (0-2)
  - Admission to administrative segregation in previous federal sentence (0-1)
  - Sentence length (0-4)
  - Criminal versatility in current convictions (0-2)
  - Prior conviction for violence (0-1)
Summary of Findings

- Simple, 6-item scale had very high predictive accuracy (AUC = .80 in validation sample)
  - Higher than most risk scales in predicting recidivism
  - Worked great for women (sometimes better than men), well for Aboriginal (but not as well as non-Aboriginal)

- Possible utility
  - Risk principle of effective correctional practice
    - *Diversion efforts maximally effective when focused on highest risk offenders*

- Could it be applied to the U.S.?
  - Would require research and tweaking
    - *E.g., sentence length, potential policy differences*
It is possible to predict segregation with high accuracy
- More predictable than community behaviour?
- Data on 413 predictors separately for inmate in danger vs jeopardize security, or any segregation

Can be predicted with simple, static risk factors
- Dynamic risk factors also predict – may be informative

Few differences in predictors based on the reason for being in segregation

Antisociality risk factors generally more prominent than vulnerability risk factors (e.g., mental health)
- CAVEAT: I did not have extensive mental health information
A Possible Future?

- Individual Factors
- Prison Environment Factors
- Initial Assessment
- Revised Assessment
- Offender Change
- Environment Change
For more information: Lmaaikehelmus@gmail.com
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Introduction

• Maintaining safe and orderly institutions is a high priority for prison and jail administrators, but institutional misconduct and/or violence threatens the safety and order of an institution.

• The imposition of segregation is a common response to inmate misconduct and/or violence that corrections officials use to regulate inmate behavior and promote order and safety within their institutions.
Violence in Correctional Institutions

• In 2005, the within prison rate of assaults on inmates was 16.25 assaults per 1,000 inmates, whereas the rate of assaults per 1,000 persons in the general population was .44 (FBI, 2005).

• Studies of inmate victimization have revealed varied estimates:
  • 20% of inmates victimized by physical violence or threat of violence during a 6-month period (Wolff et al., 2007)
  • 14% of inmates victimized by personal crime during a 3-month period (Wooldredge, 1994)
  • 10% inmates victimized by physical assault or robbery during a 6-month period (Wooldredge, 1998)
  • 7% inmates victimized by physical assault during a 6-month period (Wooldredge & Steiner, 2014)
  • Less than 2% of the general population experiences an assault in a given year (Catalano, 2005; 2006; Rand, 2009).
Violence in Correctional Institutions (cont.)

• Approximately 4.4% of inmates experienced one or more sexual victimizations in the past year (Beck & Harrison, 2010).
• Nearly 7.5% of former inmates were sexually victimized during their most recent period of imprisonment (Beck & Johnson, 2012).
• Less than 1% of persons in the general population were sexually assaulted in 2008 (Rand, 2009).
Segregation Use in Correctional Institutions

- Definitions of “administrative segregation”
- Typically, 2.5% of the custodial population within each state is held in administrative segregation (range = .1 - 7.5%), whereas 6.6% of the custodial population within each state is held in some form of restrictive housing (range = 2.1 - 14.2%) (Baumgartel et al., 2015).
- Between 5% and 8% of the state prison population is held in segregated housing (Shames et al., 2015).
Segregation Population Characteristics

- Compared to the general prison population, the population in segregation is more likely to contain inmates with the following characteristics:
  - Younger, male, and nonwhite
  - Incarcerated for violent offense, more significant prior record, and longer prison sentence
  - Served more time, involved in gang/STG, higher rate of rule infractions, and more mental health problems
  - Higher risk/need
    - (Baumgartel et al., 2015; Lovell et al., 2000; McGinnis et al., 2014; Mears & Bales, 2010; Motiuk & Blanchette, 1997; O’Keefe, 2008).
Predictors of Officials’ use of Segregation

• Evidence from the existing studies of the predictors of placement in disciplinary segregation is mixed.
  • Researchers have found that inmates found guilty of more serious offenses and/or inmates with lengthier misconduct histories typically received more severe sanctions (e.g., Crouch, 1985; Flanagan, 1982; Lindquist, 1980), but others have not found such effects (Howard et al., 1994).
  • Researchers have found that younger inmates are sanctioned more severely than older inmates (Flanagan, 1982; Lindquist, 1980), but Howard et al. (1994) found a nonsignificant age effect.
  • Lindquist (1980) found that women were sanctioned less severely than men; Howard et al. (1994) found a nonsignificant sex effect.
  • No studies have uncovered significant race effects (Crouch, 1985; Flanagan, 1982; Howard et al., 1994; Lindquist, 1980).
Officials’ use of Segregation (cont.)

• O’Keefe (2007) found the following factors predicted placement in administrative segregation:
  • Sex (male)
  • Ethnicity (Hispanic)
  • Incarcerated for violent offense
  • Mental illness
  • Security threat group
  • Higher # of disciplinary infractions
  • Higher # of disciplinary segregation placements
Officials’ use of Segregation (cont.)

• Mears and Bales (2010) found the following factors predicted placement in supermax:
  • Age (younger)
  • Incarcerated for violent offense
  • Higher # of prior violent convictions
  • Higher # of prior escape convictions
  • More time served
  • Higher # of violent disciplinary infractions
  • Higher # of defiance disciplinary infractions
  • Higher # of contraband disciplinary infractions
Effects of Segregation on Behavior

• Supermax confinement
  • Individual level studies
    • Nonsignificant effect on recidivism (Lovell et al., 2007; Mears & Bales, 2009; Butler & Steiner, In Press, but see Lovell & Johnson, 2004)
    • Higher odds of violent recidivism (Lovell & Johnson, 2004; Mears & Bales, 2009)
    • Evidence mixed regarding effect of direct release from supermax confinement on recidivism (compare Lovell et al., 2007 to Mears & Bales, 2009)
    • Nonsignificant effect on odds of obtaining employment or completing treatment post-release (Butler & Steiner, In Press)
  • Aggregate level studies
    • Opening of supermax prisons had little to no effect on system wide inmate-inmate assaults (Briggs et al., 2003; Sundt et al., 2008).
    • Opening of supermax prison resulted in reduction in inmate-staff assaults in IL (Sundt et al., 2008).
    • Suicides more frequent in supermax prisons relative to minimum-security prisons (Dye, 2010).
Effects of Segregation on Behavior (cont.)

• Disciplinary Segregation
  • Individual level studies
    • Men who spent more days in segregation displayed increased aggression, but days spent in segregation had a nonsignificant effect on aggression among women (Wolff et al., 2013).
    • Nonsignificant effect on subsequent misconduct (Labrecque, 2015; Morris, In Press)
  • Aggregate level studies
    • Most studies have found nonsignificant effect on rates of violence (Steiner & Cain, In Press).
Effects of Segregation on Behavior (cont.)

• Any Segregation
  • Higher odds of recidivism (Motiuk & Blanchette, 2001)
  • Higher odds of self-harm (Lanes, 2009)

• Jail Segregation
  • Higher odds of self harm and potentially fatal self-harm (Kaba et al., 2014)
What do we know?

What do we need to know?
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“Summary of Change:
The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
Mental Health Care System”

Lucas D. Malishchak, M.A., NCP
PADOC Mental Health Program Manager
Total Male Population: 45,584 or 95%
Total Female Population: 2,447 or 5%
Total Population 48,031

Total MH/ID Roster: 12,403/48,031 = 25.8%
Males on MH/ID Roster: 10,758/45,584 = 23.6%
Females on MH/ID Roster: 1645/2447 = 67.2%

Total Seriously Mentally Ill Inmates: 4061/48,031 = 8.5%
Seriously Mentally Ill Males: 3442/45,584 = 7.6%
Seriously Mentally Ill Females: 619/2447 = 25.3%
Historical Perspective

• “The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections subjects prisoners with SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESSES to prolonged periods of solitary confinement.”

• “The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections does not adequately consider mental illness in its disciplinary and administrative processes.”

• “The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections continues to lack key oversight mechanisms that would identify and address the harmful effects of solitary confinement and ensure the provision of adequate mental health care.”

• “The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections does not track the number of prisoners with SMI in solitary confinement units; does not examine the role of solitary confinement in causing suicides; does not track self-injurious behavior; does not critically review serious self-injuries; and does not track or analyze the additional punitive responses that prisoners with SMI experience in solitary confinement units…”
Mental Health Classification System: identification, stability, & location.
Disciplinary Process
Inmates diagnosed with Serious Mental Illnesses
Alternatives to Segregation
Out of Cell time and programming
Mental Health Rounds
Individual Treatment Plans
DOC Employees/Contractors/Volunteers
Central Office Oversight
Training and Mental Health Advocacy
Arizona Department of Corrections

Mental Health in Restrictive Housing

Nicole Taylor, J.D., Ph.D.

Thursday, October 22, 2015
Prevalence of Mental Illness in ADC

- There are currently 42,241 inmates (as of 8/24/15)

- 11,236 (26.6%) inmates are receiving mental health services
  - 10,697 inmates are receiving outpatient services
  - 447 inmates are receiving residential services
  - 92 inmates are receiving inpatient services
- 1,965 SMI (4.7% of total population, 17.5% of MH caseload)
Outpatient Treatment Services

- Inmates are routinely seen based on their subcode
  - A = a minimum of every 30 days by a clinician and 90 days by a provider if on medications
  - B = a minimum of every 90 days by a clinician and every 90-180 days by a provider
  - C = a minimum of every 180 days by a provider
  - D = a minimum of every 90 days by a clinician for at least 6 months until removed from the MH caseload

- Services include:
  - Psychotherapy
  - Psycho-educational programming
  - Psychopharmacology
Residential Treatment Services

- Programs are located in Medium, Close and Maximum custody

- Individual therapy = a minimum of every 30 days
- Group = a minimum of one mental health group per week
- Psychiatric services = a minimum of every 90 days if on medications
Inpatient Treatment Services

- Placement for ongoing stabilization or for short-term evaluations
  - Petitions for commitment upon release are typically handled at the Inpatient Hospital

- Individual therapy = a minimum of every 7 days
- Groups = typically occur daily
- Psychiatric services = a minimum of every 30 days if on medications
Maximum Custody

- Parsons v. Ryan Litigation
  - All SMI inmates in our maximum custody (restrictive housing) will have a minimum amount of out-of-cell time each week
    - 7.5 (up to 9.5) of out-of-cell time
    - 10 hours of unstructured out-of-cell time
    - 1 hour of psychotherapy group
    - 1 hour of psycho-educational group
    - 1 hour of additional programming
Maximum Custody (cont.)

- Parsons v. Ryan Litigation
  - All other inmates in our maximum custody (restrictive housing) will have a minimum amount of out-of-cell time each week
    - Step 1 – 7.5 hours
    - Step 2 – 8.5 hours
      - One hour of group programming
    - Step 3 – 9.5 hours
      - One hour of group programming
Maximum Custody (cont.)

- Tiered Incentive Program – Recreation
  - Step 1 – 6 hours per week in a standard enclosure
  - Step 2 – 7.5 hours per week with on in 10x10 enclosure per month
  - Step 3 (unrestrained) – 9 hours per week and all can be in 10x10 enclosure or rec field
Maximum Custody (cont.)
Maximum Custody (cont.)

- Tiered Incentive Program – **Group Programming**
  - Step 1 – mental health and other programs in individual enclosures
  - Step 2 – mental health and other programs typically in max custody chairs
  - Step 3 (unrestrained) – mental health and other programs often around a large table
  - Group education and college courses
Maximum Custody (cont.)
Maximum Custody (cont.)

- Tiered Incentive Program – Employment
  - Step 1 – no jobs available at this step
  - Step 2 – jobs as a porter or other position with an officer present (or another inmate)
  - Step 3 (unrestrained) – jobs in large groups such as yard crew or kitchen
Maximum Custody (cont.)

No Employment Available
**Litigation Effects**

- **Definition of Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI)**
  - Some states have retained their definition of diagnosis plus functional capacity
  - Other states have had to change their definition to include categories of diagnoses
    - The “Standard 9 Diagnoses”
    - CA – includes Exhibitionism or those who merely expose themselves
Litigation Effects (cont.)

- Are we providing the correct level of care to the inmate population?

- Is the data reported on the prevalence of SMI in corrections accurate?

- What effects will this have on reintegration into the community and their ability to provide services to this population?
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Safety and Wellness Literature Synthesis Review

1)-Prevalence of Correctional Officer Wellness and Safety Risks

2)-Contributing Factors
  ◦ Work-Related Dangers
  ◦ Institutional-Related Dangers
  ◦ Psycho-Social Dangers

  ◦ 3)-Consequences of Exposure to the Dangers
Administrative Segregation and Implications for Officer Safety and Wellness

1)-Conditions
  ◦ Deprivation of Human Contact

2)-Consequences (found to be connected with inmates)
  ◦ Psychosis
  ◦ Sensory Deprivation
  ◦ Hallucinations
  ◦ Exacerbation of Violent Conduct
  ◦ Mental Breakdowns
  ◦ Failure to Socialize

3)-Potential Consequences for Correctional Line Staff
  ◦ Elevated Risk of Physical and Mental Health Ailments
  ◦ Exposure to Inmate Trauma (Vicarious Traumatization-McMann & Pearlman, 1990) (Levin & Griesburg, 2003; Peters, 2007)
  ◦ Officers Become Desensitized and Potentially Violent Themselves
Implications

Potential Resolutions
◦ Early Identification of Potentially Problematic Inmates
◦ Additional Staff Required
◦ Expansion of Rehabilitation Programs
◦ Improved Training
◦ Re-formatting of Administrative Segregation Conditions
◦ Coping for Officers
◦ Psychiatric Professionals for Officers as well as Inmates

Future Research Considerations
◦ The Correctional Officer Perspective
◦ Prevalence of (Generalized) Risks for Officers
◦ Implications of Specific Risks (e.g., mentally ill; gang leaders; chronically violent, etc.)
The Relationship Between Correctional Officer Safety and Wellness & Administrative Segregation

Frank Ferdik
Kenneth T. McKee
Civil Rights Enforcement & Administrative Segregation

Vanita Gupta
Recap and Summary
National Institute of Justice
Topical Working Group on the Use of Administrative Segregation in the U.S.

Thursday, October 22, 2015
National Institute of Justice
Topical Working Group on the Use of Administrative Segregation in the U.S.

Friday, October 23, 2015
National Institute of Justice
Topical Working Group on the Use of Administrative Segregation in the U.S.

Karol V. Mason
Safe Alternatives to Segregation

Juliene James
Nicholas Turner
Key Research Questions and Current Data Collection Efforts

Allen Beck
Dan Mears
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Overview

• Use of restrictive housing in difficult to measure
  ➢ Absence of uniform definitions and information systems that classify inmates in comparable ways

• Based on the National Inmate Survey, 2011-12
  ➢ conducted in 233 state and federal prisoners and 357 local jails
  ➢ nationally-representative sample of 38,200 adult prison inmates and 52,900 jail inmates
  ➢ conducted between February 2011 and May 2012
  ➢ provides measures of prevalence on single day; prevalence in the past 12 months or since coming to the facility, if shorter; and total amount time they had spent in restrictive housing
  ➢ provides individual-rates by inmate risk factor and facility-level rates by characteristics of facilities

• Findings available in a BJS Special Report, issued today, on-line from our web site
Where you spent last night ... in administrative segregation or solitary confinement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In past 12 months... any time in disciplinary or administrative segregation or solitary confinement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In past 12 months... *total time spent in disciplinary or administrative segregation or solitary confinement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day or less</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6 days</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13 days</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-29 days</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days or more</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate characteristic</td>
<td>Prison inmates</td>
<td>Jail inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male*</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Hispanic origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20.8**</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.3**</td>
<td>21.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24*</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>19.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>19.6**</td>
<td>17.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>17.9**</td>
<td>14.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>13.8**</td>
<td>12.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>13.1**</td>
<td>11.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 or older</td>
<td>8.9**</td>
<td>10.3**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison group.
Percent who reported any time in restrictive housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate characteristic</th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>20.5%**</td>
<td>19.2%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or more*</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual*</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual or other</td>
<td>27.8**</td>
<td>21.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent sex offense</td>
<td>15.5%**</td>
<td>20.5%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other violent*</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>19.1**</td>
<td>18.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>14.4**</td>
<td>15.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.2**</td>
<td>13.5**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison group.
Percent who reported any time in restrictive housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal history</th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of times arrested</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time*</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>17.3**</td>
<td>14.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–10</td>
<td>19.6**</td>
<td>18.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>23.9**</td>
<td>21.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior incarceration as adult or juvenile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.0%*</td>
<td>19.0%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time in current facility since admission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days or less</td>
<td>8.5%**</td>
<td>8.0%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–6 months*</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12 months</td>
<td>23.0**</td>
<td>31.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years</td>
<td>21.5**</td>
<td>35.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10 years</td>
<td>19.3**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current/past mental health problems</th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Comparison group.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ever told by mental health professional had disorder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.7%**</td>
<td>23.0%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Had overnight stay in a hospital in year before current admission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.6%**</td>
<td>24.9%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Used prescription medications at time of current offense**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26.5%**</td>
<td>23.3%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ever received professional mental health therapy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.5%**</td>
<td>22.9%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current mental health status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No mental illness*</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety or mood disorder</td>
<td>23.3**</td>
<td>19.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious psychological distress</td>
<td>28.9**</td>
<td>22.2**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of prison inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in restrictive housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No mental illness</th>
<th>Anxiety or mood disorder</th>
<th>Serious psychological distress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day or less</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.3**</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>22.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.5**</td>
<td>22.2**</td>
<td>17.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55.5**</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>24.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14–29</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53.3**</td>
<td>24.4**</td>
<td>22.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or more</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53.2**</td>
<td>23.1**</td>
<td>23.7**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of jail inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in restrictive housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No mental illness</th>
<th>Anxiety or mood disorder</th>
<th>Serious psychological distress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day or less</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37.8**</td>
<td>27.2**</td>
<td>35.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43.0**</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>33.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45.1**</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>31.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14–29</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43.5**</td>
<td>27.4**</td>
<td>29.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or more</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41.0**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.1**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison group.
## Percent who reported any time in restrictive housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of misconduct</th>
<th>Prison inmates</th>
<th>Jail inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been in fight with another inmate</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.6**</td>
<td>43.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written up for physically assaulting another inmate</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77**</td>
<td>78.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been in fight with a staff member</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.5**</td>
<td>51.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written up for physically assaulting a staff member</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.6**</td>
<td>82.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written up for verbally assaulting a staff member</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74.5**</td>
<td>79.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison group.
## Correlation between facility condition and percent of inmates reporting time in restrictive housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of facility disorder/b</th>
<th>Facility average</th>
<th>Any time</th>
<th>30 days or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of inmates in prison—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who were frequently in fights</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who have been in fights with other inmates</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who feared being assaulted by other inmates</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who have seen inmates with weapons</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who reported a lot of gang activity in facility</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who have been in fights with staff</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who had possessions taken by other inmates</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation significant at the 95% confidence level.**
Correlation between facility composition and percent of inmates reporting time in restrictive housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of facility composition</th>
<th>Facility average</th>
<th>Any time</th>
<th>30 days or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of inmates in prison—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with serious psychological distress</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a past mental health problem</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who were held for a violent offense</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 11 or more prior arrests</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a prior incarceration</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with less than a high school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who were lesbian, gay, or bisexual</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who were ages 18 to 24</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation significant at the 95% confidence level.**
Correlation between negative facility climate and percent of inmates reporting time in restrictive housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of facility climate/b</th>
<th>Facility average</th>
<th>Any time</th>
<th>30 days or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison facility percent of inmates who reported—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the housing unit was very crowded</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas outside of the housing unit were very crowded</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the facility did not have enough staff to provide for safety and security of inmates</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative perception of staff fairness and trust</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation significant at the 95% confidence level.
Key points: Little is known about . . .

- **Definition** of ad seg (terminology issue; varied goals)
- **Need** for ad seg (conditions under which it is needed)
- **Theory** of ad seg and conditions under which it achieves goals
- **Use** of ad seg (for whom, duration, frequency, services, etc.)
- **Impacts** of ad seg on inmates, prisons, officers, system, society
- **Efficiency** of ad seg, as compared to alternatives
- **Alternatives** to ad seg (relative effectiveness and efficiency)
- **Views** about ad seg among officials, officers, and the public
- **These research gaps**, by state and nationally
Break Out Sessions

1. What are the major research questions and gaps in the topic areas of your breakout group?

2. What strategies and research methods would address existing research gaps?
Report Out from Group Discussions
Wrap-up, Summary, and Next Steps