

**INVESTIGATION OF THE RECLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENT:  
THE USE OF CELL RESTRICTION AS A CLASS II DISPOSITION**

**Department of Rehabilitation and Correction**

Reginald A. Wilkinson, Director

Thomas J. Stickrath, Assistant Director

**Office of Management Information Systems**

Peg Ritchie-Matsumoto, Deputy Director

**Bureau of Research**

Steve Van Dine, Chief

**Bureau of Classification**

Bernie Ryznar, Chief

---

**Bureau of Research Authors**

Jennifer Pribe Jayjohn

Sydney Halsall

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Investigation of the Reclassification Instrument: The Use of Cell Restriction as a Class 2 Disposition Pilot Study**

The purpose of the study is to determine the effects of a proposed change in the coding of two variables on the supervision review form used in the reclassification process. The proposed change involves an adjustment in the definition of the type of disciplinary ticket scored in Section B of the current supervision review form. The proposed change involves scoring Class II disciplinary tickets treated as Class III tickets which received a disposition of cell or bed restriction as a Class II ticket on the form.

The sample consisted of 380 female inmates incarcerated at the Ohio Reformatory for Women and 397 male inmates incarcerated at Allen Correctional Institution. These two institutions were chosen for the pilot test because both institutions have used bed or cell restriction as a disposition for at least one year. Demographic, reclassification, and disciplinary infraction information was collected for all inmates. All information was coded and entered into a computer database for analysis. Security and custody level distributions were computed using both the current supervision review form and revised form.

Key findings and estimates included:

1. A total of 76 additional female inmates received some type of disciplinary score as a result of the revised supervision review form, the form that counted cell restriction as a Class II disposition.
2. The largest increase as a result of the proposed change for the female population would occur for the number of reclassifications from medium level 3 to close security, an estimated 37% increase. Female maximum custody would more than double in size as a result of the revised instrument, with an estimated increase of 88 female inmates housed in maximum custody.
3. A total of 45 additional male inmates housed at ACI received some type of disciplinary report score as a result of the proposed change in the supervision review instrument.
4. The largest increase as a result of the proposed change for the male population would occur for the number of reclassifications from medium level 3 to close security, an estimated 18.3% increase. This increase would result in approximately 1900 medium security inmates reclassified up to close security.

The limitations of the present study and recommendations for further research are presented in detail within the research paper.

# **INVESTIGATION OF THE RECLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENT: THE USE OF CELL RESTRICTION AS A CLASS II DISPOSITION**

## ***PILOT STUDY***

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of a proposed change in the coding of two variables on the supervision review form used in the reclassification process. The two variables involved in the change are Type of Most Serious Disciplinary Report and Frequency of Disciplinary Reports. The change in these two variables involves an adjustment in the definition of the type of disciplinary tickets scored on these variables. The proposed change involves scoring Class II disciplinary tickets that were handled as Class III tickets and received a disposition of cell or bed restriction as a Class II “guilty” ticket for the purposes of the supervision review form.

The present practice is a result of the limited availability of segregation space in many institutions. Several issues are encompassed in the availability of bed space in segregation and these issues, in turn, affect security classification decisions. Inmates placed in segregation must be heard by the Rule Infraction Board (RIB) within seven days of placement. Due to time constraints, RIB panels may only be able to hear inmates with disciplinary tickets severe enough to warrant segregation placement. Inmates with rule infraction tickets not placed in segregation are generally heard by the hearing officer. The RIB panel imposes Class II ticket dispositions while the hearing officer is only empowered to impose Class III ticket dispositions. The hearing officer must, therefore, down-grade all Class II tickets that he or she hears to Class III tickets. The decision to down-grade a ticket can be affected by the availability or lack of segregation cells.

How does this affect the classification process of an inmate? The downgrading of Class II tickets to Class III tickets affects the reclassification process in one significant way. It does not allow staff to count the Class III tickets on the supervision review instrument.

The Department is concerned that the lack of segregation space and downgrading of Class II tickets is leading to the misclassification of some inmates. This study examines the effect on the inmate classification and security levels of changing the scoring process on the two inmate behavior variables.

## **Methodology**

For the pilot study, two institutions were used to test the proposed change in the instrument, a female institution and a medium security male institution. These two institutions were the Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW) and Allen Correctional Institution (ACI). These institutions were chosen for the pilot project because both institutions currently use cell or bed restriction as a disposition for serious Class III guilty tickets. Four hundred inmates were randomly chosen from each institution for inclusion in the pilot project. Basic demographic information was collected from the computerized inmate database. Institution unit files were then used to collect the most recent reclassification and disciplinary infraction information. All disciplinary tickets and dispositions, both Class II and Class III, for the year preceding the most recent reclassification action were collected.

All information was coded and entered into a computer database for analysis. Security and custody level distributions were computed for inmates in the pilot sample using both the present supervision form and the modified supervision form. The modified supervision form differed from the present form by counting the tickets with the Class III cell restriction disposition on Section B of the supervision review form. The two distributions were compared to determine the percentage increase from one form to the other. The sample was split by sex to determine the increase for male and female institutions. Three separate estimates were provided for male inmates: 1) estimates for the entire population at Allen; 2) estimates for minimum and medium security institutions similar to Allen; and 3) estimates for all male institutions.

The estimates for the male medium institutions and the male institutional population as a whole were based on the increases that were computed for the sample used at Allen Correctional Institution. There are several caveats that must be made to clarify the estimates that are presented. First, the estimates are based on one medium security male institution. Therefore, for the estimates to be valid for other medium security male institutions and the male inmate population as a whole, the practice for using cell restriction as a disposition needs to be a universal practice of other wardens at male prisons. Since this is not the case, practices at other institutions will affect the estimated increases in security level populations.

Second, the number and type of tickets used in the analysis are based on ticket practices at Allen. For the estimates to be valid, the criteria and tolerance for writing tickets needs to be universal across all institutions. Again, the differences across institutions for the type of tickets that are written and the number of tickets that are written affect the estimated increases in inmate security classifications.

Third, the estimated increases in inmate security classifications are based on a computer program that generated the classification scores. It was impossible to control for any mitigating factors or overrides associated with classification.

## Findings

### *Female Inmates*

Table 1 below shows the frequency distribution for the female inmate sample at ORW. A little over half (50.9%) of the female inmates were classified to minimum custody, supervision level 1 or 2, as a result of the most recent reclassification decision. Thirty-four percent were classified to medium custody (level 2 and 3), with the remaining inmates split between close (8.6%) and maximum (6.6%) custody.

**Table 1. Custody and Supervision Level of Female Inmates**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Minimum 1	92	22.6
Minimum2	115	28.3
Medium 2	57	14.0
Medium 3	81	19.9
Close	35	8.6
Maximum	27	6.6

Table 2 presents a comparison of the frequency of disciplinary reports between the current supervision review form and the revised form. As previously noted, the revised form counts disciplinary tickets that received a disposition of cell or bed restriction as a Class II ticket. A total of 76 additional inmates received some type of disciplinary ticket score as a result of the revised form. Scoring the additional tickets on the revised supervision review form resulted in ten times the number of female inmates receiving six or more reports on the reclassification instrument. Over twice as many inmates received a score for between 3 and 5 reports on the revised instrument when compared to the current instrument.

**Table 2. Comparison of Frequency of Disciplinary Reports  
Between the Current Form and the Revised Form**

<b>Frequency of Disciplinary Reports</b>	<b>Current Reclassification Form</b>		<b>Revised Form</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
6 or More Reports	4	1.0	41	10.1
3 - 5 Reports	33	8.1	75	18.4
1 or 2 Reports	104	25.6	101	24.8
No Disciplinary Reports	266	65.4	190	46.7

Table 3 presents the distribution of disciplinary report seriousness as scored on the current supervision review form compared to the distribution on the revised form. Type of ticket refers to the groupings used in the supervision review form. To clarify severity definitions, refer to Appendix A for a listing of ticket severity. Twice as many inmates received a ticket in the greatest severity category when cell restriction tickets were counted in the supervision review form. There were also increases in the number and percentage of inmates that received scores for high and moderate severity on the revised supervision review form. A slight increase in the number of inmates with low severity tickets was also observed.

**Table 3. Comparison of Disciplinary Report Seriousness  
Between the Current Form and the Revised Form**

Type of Most Serious Disciplinary Report	Current Reclassification Form		Revised Form	
	N	%	N	%
Greatest Severity	11	2.7	22	5.4
High Severity	64	15.7	83	20.4
Moderate Severity	59	14.5	102	25.1
Low Severity	7	1.7	10	2.4
No Disciplinary Reports	266	65.4	190	46.7

A comparison between the current and the revised custody level is presented in Table 4. Although the proposed change in the instrument takes points away from an inmate's score (which can result in an increase in security level), some inmates actually decreased in security level as a result of the revised instrument. This takes place due to the exclusively numerical nature of the revised form. It is important to note that the revised form and resulting custody level does not take into account administrative rules regarding custody, overrides, or bed availability at specific security levels. Estimated increases in security levels are presented in bold type.

When examining the female inmates whose custody level increased as a result of the revised instrument, the greatest percentage increase was from medium custody level 3 to close custody (37.0% increase). The second largest increase occurred from close to maximum custody (17.1%). There was a fourteen percent increase from medium level 2 to medium level 3 supervision and a smaller increase (6.1%) from minimum level 2 to medium level 2 supervision.

This data, especially for Greatest and High Severity tickets, to some degree calls this study into question. It is difficult to believe that a Greatest Severity ticket was reduced to a Class III disposition based solely on the lack of available space in segregation, as the premise of this study suggests. If this downgrade is unlikely, the estimates made in this study overstate the impact of the intended change.

**Table 4. Comparison of Current Custody Level and Revised Custody Level**

Current Custody Level					Revised Custody Level							
	Minimum 1		Minimum 2		Medium 2		Medium 3		Close		Maximum	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minimum 1	92	100.0										
Minimum 2	35	30.4	73	63.5	7	6.1						
Medium 2			17	29.8	32	56.1	8	14.0				
Medium 3					3	3.7	48	59.3	30	37.0		
Close									29	82.9	6	17.1
Maximum					1	3.7					26	96.3

### **Change in Custody Level Numbers**

*Ohio Reformatory for Women - only*

As a result of the above pilot study on a female sample, we utilized the percentage increase in each custody level to estimate the effect on the overall population at ORW. These estimates are considered valid for the population because the sample was taken from ORW. The totals for ORW were taken from the July 1, 1996 institution count. The estimates for ORW are as follows:

- 6.1% of Minimum 2 inmates would move to Medium 2 custody  
This would result in a total of 30 female inmates reclassified to medium custody.
- 14.0% of Medium 2 inmates would move to Medium 3 custody  
This would result in a total of 21 inmates moving within medium custody.
- 37.0% of Medium 3 inmates would move to Close custody  
This would result in a total of 144 inmates moving into close custody.
- 17.1% of Close inmates would move to Maximum custody  
This would result in a total of 77 inmates moving into maximum custody.

### *All Female Institutions*

The next step was to estimate the total increases for all three female institutions, ORW, Franklin Pre-Release, and Northeast Pre-Release. These estimates are based on the total population at each institution on July 1, 1996. Briefly, some of the same cautions previously mentioned for interpreting the data for male inmates apply to the female population. First, the procedures and operations of the three prisons are different. These differences influence how tickets are handled and acceptable rates of ticket writing among correctional staff. These differences will affect the estimates given. Second, the structure of the three institutions differs. While cell restriction may be a feasible disposition for infractions at ORW, it may not be a realistic punishment at either of the other two institutions. If the other institutions are unable to utilize the disposition, it will not affect the classification decisions at each institution and, as a result, the numbers that are given below would overestimate the increases in inmate security classifications.

The results for all three female institutions are presented below:

- A total of 61 female inmates would move from Minimum 2 to Medium 2 custody.
- A total of 34 inmates would move within Medium custody, from supervision level 2 to 3.
- A total of 229 inmates would move from Medium 3 custody to Close custody.
- A total of 88 inmates would move from Close to Maximum custody.

The largest increase in custody levels for the female population would be from medium level 3 to close custody, a total increase of 141 inmates. Female maximum custody would more than double in size as a result of the revised instrument, an increase of 88 inmates for a total of 151 inmates housed in maximum custody.

### *Male Inmates*

Inmates for the male sample were drawn from Allen Correctional Institution. ACI was chosen because it met the parameters of 1) being a medium security male institution; 2) currently using cell or bed restriction as a Class III disposition; and 3) had used cell or bed restriction as a disposition for at least one year. An advantage to selecting ACI as the test institution for the pilot project was the fact that ACI has computerized rule infraction information for both Class II and Class III tickets for all inmates at the institution.



Table 5 below presents the frequency distribution for the male inmate sample from Allen Correctional Institution. The majority of inmates (53.4%) were classified to medium custody, both supervision levels 2 and 3, as a result of the most recent reclassification action. Forty-five percent were classified minimum custody levels 1 and 2. There were no maximum custody inmates and few close custody (1.3%) inmates. This is consistent with the fact that ACI is classified as a medium security institution and does not have the structural capacity to effectively supervise close and maximum security level inmates.

**Table 5**  
**Custody and Supervision Level of Male Inmates**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Minimum 1	5	1.3
Minimum 2	175	44.1
Medium 2	119	30.0
Medium 3	93	23.4
Close	5	1.3

Table 6 shows a comparison between the current supervision review form and the revised form concerning the frequency of disciplinary reports scored. A total of 45 additional inmates received some type of disciplinary report score as a result of the revision in the instrument. The largest increase occurred for inmates scoring 1 or 2 disciplinary reports on the revised instrument when these inmates were counted as having no tickets on the original classification form, an 8.8 percentage point increase.

**Table 6. Comparison of Frequency of Disciplinary Reports  
Between the Current Form and the Revised Form**

<b>Frequency of Disciplinary Reports</b>	<b>Current Classification Form</b>		<b>Revised Form</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
6 or More Reports	1	0.3	5	1.3
3 - 5 Reports	9	2.3	15	3.8
1 or 2 Reports	67	16.9	102	25.7
No Disciplinary Reports	320	80.6	275	69.3

Table 7 presents the distribution of disciplinary report seriousness as scored on the current supervision review form compared to the distribution on the revised form. The largest numerical increase occurred in the High Severity category where twice as many inmates received a high severity score on the revised instrument compared to the current instrument, a total of 44 additional inmates. A significant increase also was observed in the Greatest Severity category, where the number of inmates receiving points for having a greatest severity ticket increased from 3 to 11 inmates. As with the ORW data, one might hesitate to assume that a Greatest Severity ticket was dropped to a Class III disposition solely on the basis of available segregation space, and not for the possible over-charging of the ticket.

**Table 7. Comparison of Disciplinary Report Seriousness  
Between the Current Form and the Revised Form**

Type of Most Serious Disciplinary Report	Current Classification Form		Revised Form	
	N	%	N	%
Greatest Severity	3	0.8	11	2.8
High Severity	40	10.1	84	21.2
Moderate Severity	33	8.4	25	6.3
Low Severity	1	0.3	2	0.5
No Disciplinary Reports	320	80.6	275	69.3

Table 8 presents a comparison between the current custody level of inmates and the custody level that would result from the revised supervision review form. Inmates that increased in custody level as a result of the revised instrument are shown in bold type. Looking specifically at these inmates, the highest percentage increase in custody level occurred from medium 3 to close custody (18.3%). Smaller increases were observed within medium security, 5.9% from medium 2 to medium 3, and between minimum 2 and medium 2, a 2.9% increase. Maximum custody is not shown on this chart because there were no maximum custody inmates or any increases to maximum custody as a result of the revised instrument.

**Table 8. Comparison of Current Custody Level and Revised Custody Level**

<b>Current Custody Level</b>					<b>Revised Custody Level</b>						
	<b>Minimum 1</b>		<b>Minimum 2</b>		<b>Medium 2</b>		<b>Medium 3</b>		<b>Close</b>		
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Minimum 1</b>	5	100.0									
<b>Minimum 2</b>	58	33.1	112	64.0	<b>5</b>	<b>2.9</b>					
<b>Medium 2</b>			34	28.6	78	65.5	<b>7</b>	<b>5.9</b>			
<b>Medium 3</b>					4	4.3	72	77.4	<b>17</b>	<b>18.3</b>	
<b>Close</b>									5	100.0	

### **Change in Custody Level Numbers**

*Allen Correctional Institution - only*

As a result of the above pilot study on the male sample, we applied the percentage increase at each level to determine the effect on the overall population at ACI. The following estimates are considered valid because the sample was taken from Allen Correctional Institution and is being applied to the entire population at ACI. These estimates are based on the population at ACI on July 1, 1996.

The results for ACI are:

- 2.9% of Minimum 2 inmates would increase to Medium 2 custody.  
This would result in a total of 19 inmates reclassified to medium custody.
- 5.9% of Medium 2 inmates would increase to Medium 3 custody.  
This would result in a total of 14 inmates moving within medium security.
- 18.3% of Medium 3 inmates would increase to Close custody.  
This would result in a total of 63 inmates moving up to close security.

### *Minimum/ Medium Institutions*

Based on the pilot study at Allen Correctional Institution, we applied the percentage increases to institutions similar in security composition to Allen, specifically the Department's minimum and medium security institutions. Institutions used in this section of the analysis, based on official security classification as of July 1, 1996, were Belmont, Chillicothe, Dayton, Grafton, Hocking, Lima, London, Marion, North Central, Orient, Pickaway, and Southeastern Correctional Institutions.

Before presenting estimates for other medium and minimum institutions using the ACI estimates, it is important to emphasize the limitations in generalizing these estimates to other institutions. First, as mentioned before, the operations of prisons are individualized. There are not consistent standards for the writing or disposition of institutional rule infractions. Different prisons utilize differing thresholds of acceptability for institutional behavior and how to deal with institutional misbehavior. It is unknown whether ACI is typical of other medium security prisons in the amount and type of tickets that are written. If ACI is typical, the estimates may be accurate in reflecting what will happen among medium security institutions as a result of the change. If ACI is atypical, or another institution is atypical, these estimates may only be an accurate reflection of changes that will occur at ACI and no other prison. For the purposes of this analysis, we make the assumption that ACI is a typical medium security institution.

A second caution concerns the ability of different medium and minimum security prisons to utilize cell or bed restriction as a realistic punishment for inmates who misbehave in the institution. If several other medium or minimum security institutions are unable to use cell or bed restriction, the estimates provided would obviously overestimate the number of inmates who will move into a higher security level as a result of the proposed change. On the other hand, if all institutions are able to use cell or bed restriction as a feasible punishment, the estimates given may actually underestimate the number of inmates who will increase in security level. This underestimation would be a result of increased use of cell or bed restriction as a punishment after it is incorporated as a Class 2 punishment for the purposes of the reclassification procedure.

On the other hand, two circumstances might generate an overestimation of the number of movements. First, some institutions may have enough disciplinary cells. These institutions do not use, or need to use, ticket downgrades. Applying ACI patterns to such institutions will result in overestimating the number of inmates who would be shifted to a higher security level.

Second, this study makes the assumption that every Class II ticket resulting in a Class III disposition of cell restriction was reduced only because of cell space restrictions in segregation units. The more serious the ticket, the less reasonable that assumption becomes. For inmates charged with a Greatest Severity ticket, it seems unlikely that the assumption of restricted space is correct. There may be a problem in overcharging the

inmate; this study design does not take that possibility into account. If this is the case, the study would overestimate reclassifications to a higher security level.

These estimates are based on the total population at each institution on July 1, 1996. The results for other medium and minimum security institutions using the ACI estimates are:

- A total of 264 male inmates currently housed as Minimum level 2 security would move to Medium 2 security.
- A total of 264 inmates would progress within Medium security, from supervision level 2 to supervision level 3.
- A total of 1,397 inmates would move from Medium level 3 security to Close security.

#### *All Male Institutions*

Although ACI is not representative of all prisons in Ohio's system, some estimations were made regarding the increases in custody levels of inmates across all institutions. The same cautions that were discussed above apply to the following estimates.

Based on ACI estimates, the results for all male institutions are:

- An increase of 381 inmates to Medium level 2 custody from Minimum level 2.
- An increase of 289 inmates to Medium level 3 supervision from Medium level 2.
- An increase of 1,898 inmates to Close custody from Medium level 3.

These increases are based on the numerical dictates of the classification instruments. Several topics must be addressed before conclusions can be made regarding the pilot test of the revised instrument. First, administrative overrides, administrative rules, and sliding scales were not used in analysis. Possible overcharging or mischarging of the original ticket was not taken into account. Concerns about available bed space at different security levels were not incorporated into the analysis. The custody levels were generated purely from the final supervision score on the instrument.

Second, the revised instrument was only tested at Allen Correctional Institution for the male inmate sample. ACI may not be representative of other prisons in Ohio. The inmate population housed at ACI may not accurately portray the inmate population as a whole. The manner in which tickets are written and discipline is decided may not be representative of other institutions. ACI was chosen because it used cell restriction as a

disciplinary measure at the time the pilot was conducted. Not all male prisons use cell restriction or have the capacity to utilize such a discipline. This clearly affects the number of inmates estimated to move between security levels as a result of the revised instrument.

Third, the pilot study for male inmates was only conducted for inmates currently classified minimum or medium security. Therefore, data were unavailable to estimate the effect the revised scoring would have on close or maximum security inmates. A second pilot test is being developed to test the effect the proposed revision will have on close security inmates.

A final concern not addressed by the present analysis is the impact that the scoring of cell restriction dispositions on the supervision review form will have on the use of cell restriction as a discipline. Although all institutions may not have the capabilities to use cell restriction as a discipline for rule infractions, it is unknown to what extent cell restriction will be utilized once it would become a Class II disposition. It is probable that more hearing officers may use cell restriction as a valid punishment. How large or small of an increase is undetermined at present.

### **Summary and Recommendations:**

Before such a change as this is implemented, we recommend further information be developed.

1. The revised scoring system should be further tested on a larger sample of medium security inmates to determine whether the findings at ACI are valid. The research should replicate the research protocol of this study, but also control for the possibility of overcharging on serious tickets.
2. The revised scoring system should be tested at a close security institution to determine the effect on close custody inmates.
3. If the revised scoring system is recommended, it should be pilot tested as to determine the increase in the use of cell or bed restriction as a punishment for rule infractions.

Further study seems reasonable given the possible consequences of such a change in the scoring of the reclassification instrument. The greatest consequence would be the need for another medium security institution to be upgraded to close security. This would require several million dollars of capital expenditure that is not presently in the budget.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **RULE SEVERITY**

**1 = GREATEST SEVERITY**  
**2 = HIGH SEVERITY**  
**3 = MODERATE SEVERITY**  
**4 = LOW SEVERITY**  
**5 = NONE**

#### *GREATEST SEVERITY*

Class II, Rule 4 (Major disturbance)  
Class II, Rule 8 (Escape contraband)  
Class II, Rule 16  
Class II, Rule 17\*  
Class II, Rule 19  
Class II, Rule 21\*  
Class II, Rule 22\*

\* In greatest severity  
category

#### *HIGH SEVERITY*

Class II, Rule 2  
Class II, Rule 6  
Class II, Rule 7  
Class II, Rule 8 (Dangerous contraband)  
Class II, Rule 11  
Class II, Rule 12  
Class II, Rule 13  
Class II, Rule 15  
Class II, Rule 17\*\*  
Class II, Rule 21\*\*  
Class II, Rule 22\*\*

\*\* In high severity category

#### *MODERATE SEVERITY*

Class II, Rule 1  
Class II, Rule 3  
Class II, Rule 4 (Minor disturbance)  
Class II, Rule 6  
Class II, Rule 10  
Class II, Rule 17\*\*\*  
Class II, Rule 18  
Class II, Rule 20  
Class II, Rule 21\*\*\*  
Class II, Rule 22\*\*\*  
Class II, Rule 23  
Class II, Rule 24  
Class II, Rule 25  
Class II, Rule 27  
Class II, Rule 28  
Class II, Rule 29

\*\*\* In moderate severity category

#### *LOW SEVERITY*

Class II, Rule 8 (Nuisance contraband)  
Class II, Rule 14  
Class II, Rule 15  
Class II, Rule 17^  
Class II, Rule 18  
Class II, Rule 21^  
Class II, Rule 22^  
Class II, Rule 26

^ In low severity category

**Appendix B**  
**Class II Rule Violations**

<b>Rule Number</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
(1)	Disobedience of a Direct Order
(2)	Refusal to Carry Out Work Assignments
(3)	Refusal to Accept an Assignment or Classification Action
(4)	Encouraging or Creating a Disturbance
(5)	Fighting with or without a Weapon
(6)	Stealing/ Embezzlement of Property, Fraudulent Obtainment of Property
(7)	Possession/ Consumption of Intoxicating Substance
(8)	Possession/ Manufacture of a Weapon or Contraband
(9)	Dealing
(10)	Forging Documents
(11)	Consensual Sexual Contact for the Purpose of Sexual Arousal/ Gratification
(12)	Threats with or without a Weapon/ Use of Force
(13)	Gambling/ Possession of Gambling Articles
(14)	Disrespect to a Staff Member, Visitor, or Other Inmate
(15)	Malicious Destruction, Alteration, or Misuse of Property
(16)	Act that Constitutes a Threat to the Security of Institution, Staff, or Inmates
(17)	Aiding and Abetting Class II Violation
(18)	Repeated Violation of Class III Violations
(19)	Act that is a Felony or Misdemeanor as Defined by Law



- (20) Business Operations Conducted without Authorization
- (21) Conspiracy to Violate a Rule
- (22) Attempt to Violate a Rule
- (23) Violation of Visiting or Mail Rules
- (24) Giving False Information/ Lying to Staff
- (25) Being Out of Place
- (26) Unauthorized Use of Telephone
- (27) Possession/ Use of Money
- (28) Misuse of Authorized Medicine
- (29) Seductive/ Obscene Acts
- (30) Establishing/Attempt to Establish a Personal Relationship with an Employee
- (31) Participating in Organizing any Gang or Disruptive Gang Activity
- (32) Self-Mutilation, Including Tattooing