Appendix B: Jurisdictions’ Goals for Reviewing Administrative Segregation

What are/were your goals for a review?

**Alabama:** “To reflect changes in law/regulatory guidelines; to address gender specifics.”

**Arizona:** “Improvement of out of cell time and programming availability. Decrease of inmate negative behaviors.”

**Arkansas:** “Reduce the number of Inmates assigned to Administrative Segregation.”

**Colorado:** “1. Public Safety, 2. Staff Safety
Complete re-form from ad-seg to a restricted housing policy. Ultimately reducing the reliance on ad-seg and establishing specific assignment and duration guideline.”

**Connecticut:** “The Connecticut Department of Correction has partnered with an academic entity to review existing Administrative Segregation policies as well as developments across the country in order to ensure our program is serving its intended purpose and modifying negative behaviors, with particular emphasis on mitigating mental health issues associated with disciplinary segregation.”

**Delaware:** “To properly house offenders in the least restrictive environment to allow for programming and education needs.”

**Georgia:** “It is the policy of Facilities Operations to protect staff and offenders from offenders whose violent acts have been repetitive and serious and to confine in the most appropriate restrictive option offenders who present a serious threat to escape from a guarded perimeter. The goal is to provide as normal a routine as possible for those offenders who fall into neither of the above classes, thereby enabling as many offenders as possible to progress to a lower custodial status. The goal is to protect staff, offenders, and the public from offenders, who commit or lead others to [commit] violent, disruptive, predatory, or riotous actions, or who otherwise pose a threat to the safety and security of the institutional operation. The goal was to create a program that would be a part of a [comprehensive] facility-wide stratification plan that will manage the institutional conduct and programmatic need of the assigned population. The purpose of creating an effective stratification plan is to enhance staff's ability to safely and efficiently manage offenders in designated beds, buildings and during movement.”

**Hawaii:** “Restructure admin seg program to be consistent with current trends.”

**Indiana:** “To improve the conditions of confinement for offenders in ARSH.”

**Iowa:** “To review our Security Threat Group populations but ended up (in a good way) discussing Long and Short Term Restricted Housing, Protective Custody populations, Mental Health housing and STG identification.”
Kansas: “Better met the needs of mental health inmates housed in segregation.”

Kentucky: “Enhance segregation cognitive and education programming and improve our re-entry efforts.”

Michigan: “Ensure policy and procedure are being followed.”

Missouri: “Reduce the use of segregation while maintaining safety and security of the institution, staff, and offenders.”

Montana: “Assess and modify as needed.”

Nebraska: “Identify and adopt best practices, improve our ability to manage inmates with mental illness, and identify practices which will allow us to treat inmates behavioral health issues while maintaining institutional security.”

Nevada: “Effectively implement PREA Standards and closely review inmates to determine if they can transition to a lower restrictive environment.”

New Hampshire: “No specific goals. All policies are assigned to an individual director and are reviewed annually. The director solicits input from any and all staff that would like to provide it.”

New Jersey: “Review the existing ad seg process to determine effectiveness, efficiency and ability to meet the intended purpose as a punitive, close-custody unit to house inmates who have demonstrated an unwillingness to conform to Departmental rules and regulations.”

New York: “To ensure a safe and secure environment for staff and inmates alike; as well as, the surrounding community while confining those who are a risk to security so as to meet those goals as well as addressing programming, behavior and re-entry needs.”

North Dakota: “We review yearly to ensure compliance with our policy.”

Ohio: “To reduce restrictive housing and introduce new approaches to foster pro-social behavior in the inmate population.”

Oklahoma: “Step down process.”

Pennsylvania: To ensure that current procedures are acceptable and, if not, modify practices to make them more acceptable.

Rhode Island: “Revising policy to better describe classification statuses and particulars of each management.”

South Carolina: “To reduce time in disciplinary detention.”
South Dakota: “The review process was to include a comprehensive review of the department’s policies and procedures relating to restrictive housing, identification of current best practices in administrative restrictive housing, and the development and implementation of a revised administrative restrictive housing system which would support better conditions and outcomes for offenders and staff.”

Texas: “To ensure practices and policies in regards to administrative segregation maintain the safety and security of offenders, staff and the public as well as provide programs designed to divert offenders from ad seg, to transition offenders from ad seg to the general population and prepare offenders to transition from ad seg to the community.”

Utah: “To determine [where we] are currently compared to the 13 guiding principles and develop a plan to adjust current operations.”

Washington: “Some of the department’s main goals are: Having consistent policies, practices, procedures, processes and staff training for all Intensive Management Units/Segregation Units. Utilizing Restricted Housing in a more thoughtful and effective way. This includes evaluating why offenders are placed in restrictive housing, the amount of time they remain in restrictive housing and returning them to an appropriate general population. The department has gotten rid of self-harm/attempted suicide infractions and is working to work with these behaviors more effectively and it is anticipated “Isolation” will be phased out beginning in early 2015.”

West Virginia: “Ensure best practices.”

Wisconsin: “Least restrictive means of confinement for safety of all.”

Wyoming: “Streamline and reduce ad seg numbers and examine process . . . . also standardize across the department where possible.”

Bureau of Prisons: “Enhance our use of restricted housing to ensure it is used no more than necessary nor for longer than necessary to protect the safety and security of staff, inmates and the general public. Additionally, we want to ensure we are minimizing the disruption to reentry preparation and not having a negative impact on mental or physical health to include public safety.”