



UPAN Newsletter Volume 6 Number 6 | **JUNE 2019**

“Empowerment and Growth Through Knowledge and Unity”

* * * * *

**Visitation Policies Details - LS/RNR Risk Assessment
Healthcare Review – Women’s Issues Summary**

***** **NO UPAN MEETING IN JULY** *****

NEXT UPAN MEETING: MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 2019 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Kafeneio Coffee House 258 West 3300 South, Salt Lake City

GUEST SPEAKER: Stephanie Puffer of Bristol Hospice, Utah Hospice and Palliative Care Organization – To discuss possibilities for Prison Hospice in the new Utah State Prison

SEPTEMBER UPAN MEETING: Monday, September 9, 2019 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Kafeneio Coffee House 258 West 3300 South, Salt Lake City

GUEST SPEAKER: David Leavitt, Utah County Attorney on plans for changes and reforms
All UPAN Meetings are free and open to the public.

In This Issue:

Meeting Announcements, UPAN Newsletter Contents in this issue and UPAN Disclaimer	Page 1
UPAN Newsletter 5-Year, 60 th Issue Anniversary by Warren Rosenbaum (aka Ed.)	Page 1
» <u>UDC Visitation Policies Details</u> by Molly Prince et al, from FOCUS Meeting, May 2019	Pages 2-5
» <u>LS/RNR Risk Assessment</u> by Molly Prince – Greg & Angela Hendrix present at May Meeting	Pages 5-7
» <u>USP Healthcare Under Review</u> by Nat’l Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCHC)	Pages 7-9
» <u>Women’s Issues Summary</u> June UPAN Meeting Summary by Molly Prince	Page 9
Jokes and UPAN Writing Exercise New Theme Song – Remember, Deadline Mon., July 1, 2019	Page 10
List of UPAN Directors/Officers and UPAN Addresses/Contact Info (also our Facebook page)	Page 10

Celebrating UPAN Newsletter’s 5-Year Anniversary – Issue Number 60

Beginning with a modest issue of 4 pages in June 2014, UPAN’s principle information distribution source for inmates and families has been published every month except the Nov/Dec 2014 issues were combined. For the last 3½ years (beginning January 2016) we have published 10 pages every month. UPAN’s five-year history shows a total page count of 572 pages and about 440,000 words. That’s equivalent to over five 250-page books of 85,000 words each. Currently about 1,200 copies are printed each month; readership, including families, inmates, DOC personnel, legislators, and the Governor’s office is about 6,300 persons. I hope our efforts have been useful and at times, enjoyable as well as helping keep hope alive for a better future for those whom our network advocates for, Utah prisoners (UPAN). Ed.

**Disclaimer: Formulate your own opinions about the information presented.
This information is presented for the reader’s enlightenment and evaluation.**

UDC Visitation Policies – Covered in Depth at FOCUS Meeting, Monday May 6, 2019

Summarized by Molly Prince with notes and input from Shane Severson,
Mike McAinsh, Deb Stone, and Faye Jenkins

The quarterly FOCUS meeting was hosted by UDC's Public Information Specialist Liam Truchard at the West Valley City A P & P /TRC. Guest speakers included Division of Prison Operations (DPO) Jeremy Sharp; CUCF Captain Robert Jensen; Draper Captain Vic Smith; and Director of Programming Victor Kersey.

This meeting was held subsequent to DPO Jeremy Sharp asking for and receiving UPAN families input; questions, and concerns about visitation in both Draper and Gunnison a few months ago prior to finishing a review and revamping visitation policies. It also involved concerns related to specific issues around visiting in certain areas and with certain populations.

General Visitation – DPO Jeremy Sharp reported that 90% of the issues and concerns expressed by UPAN families were parallel to those of UDC. He also expressed the desire of UDC to foster more open relationships with inmates' families and advocates.

The changes in visiting policies were precipitated by Jeremy Sharp becoming the DPO director a year ago. With the constant mantra of safety and security in mind, they reviewed the known issues with the policies and some admittedly seemed "archaic" by modern standards. Sharp decided that families who visit are the key to helping to address this problem and reached out to a few family members and UPAN for feedback.

Concerns received and forwarded to Dir. Sharp included a lot of questions surrounding the "why" of policies that the prison deems are for safety and security. The UDC will not cover specific incidents that cause a change in policy but will cover rules and reasoning behind them.

Bathrooms - A concern that inmates are not allowed to use the restroom during visits was addressed. Inmate access to bathrooms is restricted due to potential for contraband being transferred via bathrooms and the prison cannot put cameras in the bathrooms. The prison would have to strip search the inmate upon going into the bathroom and back out of the bathroom to the visit. Searches would take up a significant part of the visiting time. They say prisoners (including those with bladder / medical problems) need to plan ahead and use the restroom prior to visits and not consume anything during visits that would require a restroom prior to the end of the visit.

Vending Machines - Concerns had been expressed that some visiting areas allow bottle caps to go into visiting and others require the caps to be discarded prior to entering visiting area. This issue has been discussed with the captains and wardens and they will be addressing the issue of inconsistency and want it to

be consistent between all facilities. The reason bottle caps are not supposed to be allowed in the visiting area is that they can be made into weapons or used for smuggling contraband by obscuring a hand off. Dark sodas were discussed as not acceptable, clear liquids are preferable in visiting. Regarding vending machines ripping people off, there needs to be contact information on the vending machines so visitors can contact the outside vendors for refunds. This would then require allowing visitors writing materials in the vending machine / visiting area to write this information down.

Visitation Seating - The seating arrangements are different in every facility. There were complaints about small tables versus long tables. Smaller tables enable easier passing of contraband by reaching around the table. It is easier for officers and cameras to see what is going on by utilizing longer tables. Sometimes the officers want offenders to sit in certain locations for closer observation or separation from others. The prison has arrested more people in the past six months for smuggling in drugs than in prior years.

Lockdown Issues - During lockdowns which are instituted for security reasons but can be the result of many different scenarios and situations, there is always collateral damage to the serving of meals, inmates having access to programming and education, religious time, etc. They discussed lockdowns are hard on staff, inmates and families. During a recent power outage, there was no power for culinary, and staff had to make the meals without the help of kitchen workers. The prison wants to get back to normal operations as soon as possible and does not like lengthy lockdowns.

Communication related to lockdowns was discussed. It was stated that Liam Truchard and Kaitlin Felsted in the Public Information Office will use the Corrections website www.corrections.utah.gov to notify the public of lockdowns and inform visitors of cancelled visitation. During lockdowns it is possible for some housing units to come off of lockdown before others do. This depends on the reason for the lockdown, the length of time it lasts, and other various factors. They need time to review the situation that could result in inmate moves, searches, interviews, etc. At this time the UDC is considering implementing a mass text service where families can receive notifications of lockdowns. The DPO is looking for other solutions on how to communicate and deal with family concerns during lockdown. They are open to suggestions.

Visiting from Long Distances - The policy has been changed to now allow the shift commander the discretion to make a decision on whether to allow a visit with visitors who have traveled a long distance. They can look at it case by case, but someone on-site can

now make that decision instead of waiting for a Captain's response. Most of this impact is during weekends when some Captains are not working.

Dress Code – The Revised Dress Code is posted online and in the visiting application. It has been subjective in the past – meaning some officers allow some types of clothing if it is not spelled out clearly and others will not, which has led to frustration and inconsistency in enforcement throughout the system. Sometimes there are specialized staff that may not be the normal visiting staff. The Captains are working toward getting more consistency in staff decision-making about questionable clothing worn by visitors.

Staff wants the code to be very clear, black and white, to make their job easier and make it more predictable. However, USP administration acknowledges the need for flexibility at times. They have shifted the collar bone rule. Zippers on a shirt or sweater are now approved if it stays zipped up to the collarbone. If the visitor's attire too closely resembles an inmate's clothing they can be turned away. This means in color and style. The prison has worked to make the policy less gender-biased and more gender neutral. Layers have been an issue, especially in the Uintas where visitors have to walk in rain and snow between the check-in area and the housing unit they visit. Layers are now okay, but the visitor must pass the metal detector. There is still a no-hood policy for coats or sweatshirts.

The following is what is currently posted on the website under Visiting Rules with some added because it is more detailed on the visitor application dress code:

1. All visitors shall adhere to the following visitor dress standards:

- a. Visitors must be fully clothed including footwear;
- b. All clothing shall be knee length when standing including slits in garments (this means shorts for male and female, dresses / skirts for females);
- c. Undergarments must be worn at all times and cannot be exposed; and
- d. Religious attire may be worn but is subject to removal so it can be searched.

2. The following types of clothing shall NOT be allowed:

- a. Any clothing, that overall resembles inmate issued clothing (Maroon, white, orange or scrubs); but these colors may be worn if they are only part of the outfit. A maroon, white or orange top cannot be worn with the same color bottoms.
- b. Transparent, tight, revealing or sheer clothing;
- c. Any items that may not pass the metal detector; this includes underwire bras
- d. Any shirt that shows the bare shoulders, midriff or back and low cut shirts that show cleavage;
- e. Clothing that displays gang insignia, offensive slogans or obscene words, phrases or pictures;
- f. Hats, hoods, caps, hooded tops and jackets with

hoods and

g. No more than 3 items of jewelry can be worn.

Please note **additional restricted items** of apparel are listed on the visitor application as of June 4:

Hooded clothing – Scrubs – Camouflage patterned clothing – Military type clothing – Police-type clothing – Hats, Scarves, Shawls – Tight, form-fitting clothing such as spandex – Clothing fads that expose excessive amounts of skin such as “burn-out” fabrics, distressed, ripped, destroyed, etc. – Sunglasses

Changing Clothes for Visiting - There have been problems with people changing clothes in the parking lot and the prison has a policy against it. If a visitor arrives in clothing not appropriate to comply with the dress code and standards of USP they will need to go off prison property to change.

Diaper Changing Stations - According to the presenters there are diaper changing stations in every bathroom. Therefore there should not be a need to change a baby in a visiting room for any reason.

Ex-Felons Visiting – The policy is after 10 years off paper for a felony. Felon applications will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The UDC wants to balance safety and security. From a programming or mentoring perspective, it makes sense to allow rehabilitated persons with a criminal background to help incarcerated persons with their experience. Decisions to allow visitation will be made by programming director Victor Kersey and the Wardens of the facility. If a felon wants to attend a Board Hearing and their Adult Probation & Parole agent does not have a problem with it, the prison will consider allowing it.

People with Misdemeanor Criminal History – can visit after certain amounts of time elapsed off probation or off court supervision. Some instances can be after 4 years off, some are 2 years off. The prospective visitor with a misdemeanor in their past can contact the visiting captains and ask more specifically about the policies.

Children - CUCF has children's play areas, USP Draper does not. The new prison will have play areas. Old buildings at Draper are too old and not possible to retrofit for this in an affordable manner. Visiting is open to suggestions to consider how to better accommodate children in visiting in Draper.

All Juvenile Visitors must have an accompanying guardian or designated adult because it is a liability issue for UDC. Grandparents can accompany the child, but they must bring a signed note from the parents. Children must be approved and on inmate's visiting list.

Family Visits – Adults and children should participate in the visits. Children can get easily bored. UDC has crayons and paper for kids to color with during the visit. There will be family visitation areas in the new prison.

Special Visits - Complaint - Why does it take six weeks to work out a special visit? UDC disputes this and policy is that it takes 5 days. With that said, all necessary information for the special visit needs to be provided by the inmate and prospective visitor.

Visitation Duration – 2-hour visits include inmate searches for on-boarding and off-boarding procedures. Includes visitor check in time. The policy has changed to read “90 minutes” but really is the same duration of actual visiting time as before – which was between 1 ¼ and 1 ½ hours actual visiting time. The prison is trying to “achieve more clarity when visitors say they didn’t get their full 2 hours of visiting time.” If the visitors can be screened quickly, they will allow extra time.

NOTE: *What this means for visitors – You can influence how long you visit if you come early (don’t wait until the visiting start time to arrive and check in), check in prior to visiting start time, wear exactly what is approved, have your ID for everyone in your party, and don’t wear clothing that will set the metal detector off. This makes the check-in process go quickly and smoothly and gets everyone into the visiting room quickly so your loved ones will be called and processed in more quickly.*

Batch / Group Processing of Visitors - Some visitor feedback sent to Dir. Sharp concerned having to wait until a large group of visitors accumulate before going through metal detector and proceeding to visiting area. This causes a log jam and is not very efficient. It will require better communication among officers but UDC will work to pace the process better. They are changing their check-in process policy to “clear and go.” This will reward visitors who arrive early enough to be checked in 15 or 20 minutes ahead of visiting time to get into the visit in a timely manner while those visitors who arrive right at visiting start time will be processed in when they arrive later, and the early birds are not waiting on them.

Ignoring Visitors - Some complaints were received that visitors arriving to check in are ignored. UDC officials encouraged all visitors to step up and ask the officers if they can be checked in or to follow up on whatever the visitor may be waiting on. The speakers said to remember that the officers are human and can sometimes get busy and forget about late coming visitors or special issues that come up.

Renewals - The process has some challenges and there are problems in the communication process with renewals. Currently the visitor needs to keep track of when they need to renew and obtain the visiting form from the website or the prison visiting check in office, fill out and get submitted prior to their expiration date. In the future USP hopes to get an automated system that would allow the applications to be filled out on the website and submitted on the website. Staff would then check it and send the applicant a reply with rules and

schedule with notification of approval or denial. If denied, reply would include the reason and an appeal form to challenge it. Another option is to one day provide access to a computer at visiting waiting areas to renew or submit a new application. The problem with implementing this is that the procurement of this type of technology must go through Utah Dept of Technology Services (DTS) which is bureaucratic and slow. There are also limited financial resources and priorities. So for now visitors need to print out the application forms from the website and send in the documents via mail or hand-carry it to visiting. Then check back in a couple of weeks for results if their inmate does not notify them.

Photographs - For years there have been a variety of reasons that photographs have not been available to be taken and purchased for inmates and visitors during visits. Last Christmas, Scott Crowther (UCI) and Jeremy Sharp discussed it as part of a work program with a professional photographer using UCI printed backdrops. It is our understanding that this was going to be tested in one or two programming housing units. They said they want to do it more often. There would be a cost associated to participate. UDC believes it is a good thing for morale and incentivizes good behavior and would encourage participation in programming. The program would start in areas where they are more privilege based and see how that goes (such as in treatment programs).

Shackling During Barrier Visits for Maximum Security / Level 2 Inmates - This has been expressed as a concern by families for several reasons. It takes more time to apply and remove shackles, which reduces visiting time. It creates potential for an incident such as when putting them back on later. It is heartbreaking for children to see their parent in shackles. However, this is a policy for certain risk level inmates.

Sex Offender Visitation with Minors - Victor Kersey addressed the concerns about inability for someone with a sexual offense to have visits with minors. It appears even sex offenders who are not offenders against minors may have a problem being allowed to have visits from minors. Utah has strict rules about when someone who has committed a sexual offense can have visits with minors. He discussed that programming has done extensive consultation and research throughout the nation on this issue. Policy is that the offender should be in the “core pipeline” for treatment and comply with the 2-2-2 policy. This means at 2 months in the program they may apply to correspond with a minor (who would not be their victim); at 4 months in the program may apply to have phone contact with a minor; 6 months in the program goes through case worker, then the inmate’s assigned therapist for permission for contact visit. Approval may be contingent on progress in treatment; special restrictions may be required such as one hour a month with therapist supervision. It can range up to no

supervision at all, other than regular visiting officer supervision. This specialized visitation issue has many more nuances and is a lot more complicated than can be included in this article, so will be addressed more fully in a future article.

Overall, this FOCUS meeting was an informative and productive one and UPAN appreciates that the UDC administrators and staff took their time to come inform us on the evolution of these policies.

LS/RNR - Level of Services Inventory / Risk Needs Responsivity Presentation

May 13, 2019; UPAN Meeting Summarized by Molly Prince with Angela Hendrix

May's UPAN meeting was a very informative one with guest speakers Greg and Angela Hendrix. The presentation focused on the Level of Services Inventory/Risk Needs Responsivity (LS/RNR) risk assessment instrument utilized by the Utah Department of Corrections for all individuals involved in the adult criminal justice system.

Angela Hendrix is a Supervisor with Adult Probation & Parole who currently supervises Probation Agents monitoring male probationers in Utah County. She is also one of two experts in the UDC on the LS/RNR. She started her career as a substance abuse counselor in 1992, joining Corrections in 1995. She has worked at the Utah State Prison, Idaho Probation & Parole and Utah Probation and Parole. Greg Hendrix is the Deputy Warden of Programming for UDC. He has been with Corrections for 18 years. He is very involved in the prison's Substance Abuse Treatment and Sex Offender Treatment programs. They are also married: to each other. They make quite a knowledgeable team.

Angela presented the bulk of the information using PowerPoint (visual) presentation and a variety of examples from her own years of experience in the areas of probation and parole. Greg stepped in to discuss things as they pertain specifically to the incarcerated population.

HB 348 Justice Reinvestment Initiative passed in 2015 and requires that Utah Dept. of Corrections will use an evidence based risk assessment on all types of offenders under its supervision with the goal to help the offender be successful and build their skills to become a better person. That goal is a long term process. It also helps to hold offenders accountable as well as to increase safety and security when supervising them in the community.

What makes a good assessment?

It is Actuarial: based on risk, research, facts and statistics. A good assessment is generally also widely used because it is recognized to be effective and accurate. It is Quantitative – it uses all the information available on the population it is assessing. It has a high inter-rater reliability; meaning that an assessment of the same person should score the same regardless of the person performing the assessment. This results in high validity. This tool is based on decades of research by experts in the criminal justice arena. The LS/RNR that the UDC uses is a fourth-generation product that has

been used for the past 15 years in Adult Probation and Parole. It is new to the use in Utah State Prison system for case planning purposes.

The LS/RNR determines the Risk level of a particular person for re-offense. It also assesses the problem areas (Needs) that should be addressed in order for that person to make changes and become successful in abstaining from criminal behavior. It then looks at how to address those needs, considering the Responsivity portion – what are all the ways in which the offender can be helped to change? Finally, it identifies the “How” of the process to help the person make the changes and maintain those changes. This tool helps to assess if the processes and target areas are being identified in the best way possible. The question here is “will this program / intervention make a positive or meaningful difference to this person?”

The Risk Principle: The LS/RNR will assess an individual in four levels of risk and needed intervention: Low, Moderate, High, or Intensive. Also, the more risk factors an individual experiences, the higher the risk to re-offend. The focus is on the offender's risk being reduced, so the goal is to provide interventions and treatment to offenders who need it the most. It was suggested that truly low risk offenders (excluding sex offenses and some additional person crimes) generally will not go to prison based on a Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) LS/RNR assessment.

Moderate to High and Intense offenders need interventions of Corrections the most - which includes AP&P.

Since low risk individuals can often become worse when exposed to higher risk individuals, the LS/RNR is also used to identify them, so they get a lower intervention dosage. For example, rather than prison they may go to jail. Or rather than jail, they may be given the opportunity of probation to avoid exposing very low level offenders to higher risk and more criminal offenders. The overall goal is to reduce risk of re-offense and to help the individual succeed. Offenders, who have committed serious person-crimes, might not fit into this example.

The attention is on risk reduction. Compliance with probation or parole, or with institutional rules, does not necessarily equal risk reduction. So risk is assessed and interventions are planned with a focus on offenders

who need it the most. Then the assessment is ongoing to measure change going up or down in risk over time.

Risk level also can determine the amount of the treatment or skills classes the offender will be involved in. A standard such as someone who is High Risk would receive about 240 hours of treatment which includes psycho-educational skills classes directed to their individual need, and any other treatment recommended for that individual. A Low Risk offender would receive approximately 100 hours of treatment intervention in their areas of need. A Moderate Risk would receive a number of hours somewhere in between based on their needs.

The Need Principle: The focus is on the “right problem.” The assessment is to identify the appropriate needs that will be targeted for change. Which of the Central Eight need-areas are driving this person’s criminal acts? It becomes personal for that individual.

The Responsivity Principle: The focus is on approaching the intervention the “right way.” It is based on social learning and cognitive behavioral principles. The reality is that the way we think affects the way we behave. Therefore, this component matches specific intervention modes and strategies to the learning styles of the offender, keeping in mind their motivation and demographics. The question being examined in this part of the assessment is “Will this program make a difference to this particular person based on his / her learning style and ability, motivation to change level, and gender, culture, and other social factors that could impact the intervention’s success with that individual.” The attention using the responsivity principle is on :

- a) matching the services provided to the individual’s criminogenic needs; to prioritize interventions to the highest scoring needs, and
- b) to determine if the prescribed program or intervention will make a difference for the person being assessed with that person’s particular problems.

The Fidelity Principle is the degree of exactness with which something is copied or reproduced as it is designed. It is the right “how.” What this means is that all those conducting the LS/RNR need to be trained, supervised and reviewed to make sure there is fidelity between the various individuals scoring these assessments across the state. To accomplish this, the Utah DOC obtained a grant and has increased the training for UDC staff throughout the state. This includes coaches for the scorers (the staff conducting the assessments). The prison staff is included in this increased training and coaching.

The Big Four: There are four major areas that have been found through research to influence risk. These include

- 1) Criminal History which is static, meaning it cannot be reduced but can be prevented from getting worse.
- 2) Pro-Criminal Attitude which is dynamic, meaning it’s

changeable and can be improved. It is how the offender views violations of the law in relation to self.

3) Anti-Social Patterns is a dynamic, changeable factor regarding beliefs and actions the offender has participated in over time.

4) Companions is the fourth important area influencing the success of an offender changing. Companions influence us. If we are always associating with individuals who influence, encourage us into criminal activity, or do not disapprove of violations of the law then we are not likely to change. Companions are also a dynamic factor because a person can change their companions, friends, and associates from those who also have criminal attitudes and behaviors to those who do not support criminal thinking and behavior.

Central Eight: The Central Eight factors include the **Big Four** described above as well as four other areas that influence criminal thinking and behavior. These include:

- 1) Family or marital involvement and the attitudes toward criminality from this source as well as the relationships and the offender’s loyalty to family values either positive or negative.
- 2) Alcohol or drug use / abuse will influence the offender’s thinking and decision-making processes and illegal drug use will influence the choice to remain involved in criminal behavior.
- 3) Education / employment: Studies have shown that education leads to better choice-making and can open doors to better paying jobs. Employment satisfaction and ability to support self and family reduce tendency to become involved in criminal activity in general. The amount of free time also influences our choices.
- 4) Leisure / recreation. Healthy, pro-social leisure and recreational activities can contribute to a non-criminal lifestyle.

It should be noted that Mental Health issues or Mental Illness is not in and of itself a predictor of criminal behavior. It may turn out to be a factor for some offenders but is not a predictor of criminality.

How the LS/RNR Assessment Process Works: A “paper review” is conducted; the person’s criminal history and current offenses are reviewed. Information contained in the correctional file is reviewed regarding the individual’s social history, including education, employment, medical and psychological health, substance abuse history, and any other information available to learn about the offender. Collateral information is used which may include reports and assessments from other persons who have been involved in some manner with the offender. This could possibly include reports from counselors, therapists, psychologists, or previous treatment. If this is not an original assessment for a Pre-sentence Investigation Report then the PSI may also be used as collateral information in an assessment for someone on parole probation, or in prison. Finally, an in-person interview is often used when feasible to get to know the individual

as they are today. This is not always possible for various reasons but should be strived for. The goal is to accurately assess the person to be able to create an individualized Case Action Plan to provide interventions that will assist to reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

Who Conducts an LS/RNR on a Probationer, Parolee, or Inmate? In the community, Adult Probation & Parole conducts LS/RNR during the Presentence Investigation phase and also on probationers and parolees. The UDC continues to train staff across the state which includes recording assessment interviews to be reviewed by coaches as the trained agents increase skills. Within the prisons and jails, there is a group of staff that is assigned specifically to complete/update the LS/RNR, and who are also receiving specific training and coaching. In addition, prison therapists are trained to complete RNRs and utilize the RNR results for programming.

LS/RNR Leads to the Development of the Case Action Plan (CAP). This is the actual written plan that sets goals for and with the offender and tracks if the individual is attaining them. Angela stated that “Research has indicated that if criminogenic risk characteristics are effectively identified and addressed, the likelihood of future criminal activity can be substantially reduced.” That is the entire purpose of this process. The assessment is redone periodically to assure that the goals are being reached. The needs and goals can change over a lifetime and what the need is now may not be what the need is a year from now. It is standard to review it every 12 months or upon significant life events (something changes during that period to warrant a re-assessment earlier).

The CAP is developed and discussed with the individual, so they understand the areas they should be working on to make needed changes. Angela stressed that the majority of offenders want to improve and can use the LS/RNR to help them guide that change.

What Information is given to the offender? Angela and Greg stressed those individuals in prison and in the community need to know their Risk level and significant Need areas. Angela stressed that the RNR Risk level and Need areas can be shown to the offender.

However, the raw data and the actual assessment questions cannot be shared due to copyright laws. That information is not what is important to the offender. The Risk Level and Need areas are what the individual can work on and improve. Offenders will discuss with their probation / parole officers or case managers the results and what they can be working on to reduce the risk scores in each category – Case Action Plan goals.

UPAN has received letters from inmates expressing concern that they were refused information about their risk assessments. If a prison inmate has had an LS/RNR and has not received information from the assessor or their caseworker, Dep. Warden Hendrix advised the inmate should write their caseworker and ask for a meeting to review the LS/RNR results. While the inmate cannot receive all the raw data in the system for their RNR, they can receive a graph chart of the results. If going to their caseworker does not work, they could then contact Dep. Warden Hendrix. He acknowledges there is a slow learning curve happening in USP about the LS/RNR and the inmates need more education about it, how it affects them and how it can help them.

Inmates Have Expressed Concerns on Giving “Right” or “Wrong” answers in LS/RNR Interviews. The Hendrixes stressed that in an interview related to this assessment, there are no “right or wrong” answers. There are only answers based in the reality of the individual being assessed. So telling the truth leads to a valid assessment. If someone believes they have been assessed on invalid or outdated information, then they need to contact their caseworker and ask to be re-assessed while providing the corrected information.

For further information, individuals in the community can contact Angela Hendrix at 801-358-0896 or ahendrix@utah.gov Greg Hendrix can be reached at 801-656-8092 or ghendrix@utah.gov

UPAN would like to thank Angela and Greg for spending their Monday evening presenting this information to UPAN families and formerly incarcerated in the audience. It was a very thorough presentation that made a complicated subject understandable.

“The best preparation for tomorrow is doing your best today.” – H. Jackson Brown, Jr.

USP Under Review by National Commission on Correctional Health Care for Accreditation

Notices were put up in various housing units in Utah State Prison (Draper) that The National Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCHC) would be coming to the prison May 20 – 23, 2019 to survey the facility’s Medical Service for accreditation. It invited inmates to write to the organization with any information and the deadline for this ended May 15, 2019. UPAN received information from a couple of inmates and family

members and emailed a notice to all UPAN families to provide their input as well. This was done via US mail, email, and fax. We are aware of several family members and likely a larger number of inmates submitting their perspectives on the medical service in USP. The NCCHC cannot respond to all correspondence received regarding USP medical but

has confirmed receipt of several of the concerns UPAN families have submitted.

UPAN is pleased this process is taking place as we receive a regular stream of letters from inmates about problems accessing health care at a variety of levels.

Normally UPAN either contacts the medical service directly about these concerns and complaints or sometimes UPAN forwards concerns to the Disability Law Center for their information and records as well. It is encouraging to hear that USP is seeking to comply with the national standards for accreditation and UPAN hopes that in time, this process will assist USP in bringing its practices up to the highest standards of medical care.

NCCHC is a private, not for profit, organization that has developed national standards for providing health

services in correctional facilities. The NCCHC grants accreditation to facilities that comply with its published standards. USP voluntarily requested NCCHC conduct an on-site survey to verify the Medical Service and that facility's compliance with the 2018 NCCHC Standards for Health Services in Prisons.

We have received confirmation from inmates and families that the NCCHC was at USP the week of May 20th and even talked to several incarcerated individuals about their experiences.

Below is a list of some of the concerns that UPAN has had over the years and has shared in the past with USP Medical. These concerns were submitted by UPAN as well as others submitted from families to NCCHC prior to their going to survey the facility.

UPAN - ISSUES AND CONCERNS ABOUT MEDICAL TREATMENT AT USP

1. First we want to acknowledge there are many excellent medical staff, including med techs, nurses, physician's assistants, and doctors at Utah State Prison. However, it only takes a few of the staff that seemingly don't care, or worse, have an issue with inmates, or certain classes of inmates, to give the Medical Service a bad name. The attitude of the medical staff will make all the difference in the world.

2. Timely access to medical treatment, particularly in emergency and semi-emergency situations where there isn't time for health care requests to be triaged. Back in June 2016 after bringing this concern to USP, UPAN was informed by Medical Director Tony Washington that at that time, Medical had reduced the triage time for an inmate to see a medical provider to 24 - 48 hours from the time the health care request is received. Prior to that it had sometimes been days or weeks before a patient was assigned to see a medical provider. UPAN has also been informed by inmates since that time, that this is not consistently the case.

3. Medical staff performing their duties to the best of their abilities with compassion and integrity. UPAN would like to learn that there is no longer any ridiculing, condescension, or trivializing any inmate patient's ailments or concerns. If prison and medical staff takes every inmate's concern seriously there could be more effective and timely diagnoses and treatments provided, reducing the number of conditions that are made more severe due to lack of early intervention.

4. Provision of relevant information through clear communication to every inmate patient about whatever illness or condition they suffer from. Spend enough time with the inmate to assure this is accomplished. The patient should not be released from the medical visit until they are very clear on what ailment or condition they have, how it is to be treated both now and in the future, and how the inmate needs to care for themselves.

5. Allow note-taking by inmates about their condition and treatment during the medical visit with clarification and support by medical staff to do this.

6. Inmates need to be given written information about their prescriptions at least upon the first use – such as side effects to watch for, what to avoid. This will assist them in partnering in their treatment and recovery. This is something everyone in the community is given when picking up prescription. This information does not have to have any identifying information of an inmate on it (the argument against this practice from USP has been that inmates receiving certain medications could be strong-armed by others to give away or sell their meds). Dosage and side effect information could be given to inmate as a printout by doctor during the visit or by pharmacy when prescription is dispensed.

7. Informed Consent. Every inmate has the right to clearly understand whatever procedure they are to undergo, the risks and benefits. Whether at the prison site or at the U of U Medical Center, or any other medical facility that is off prison grounds.

8. Every inmate should be aware of how to obtain a Verbal Medical Release of Information form and how to get one signed for their family or other designated support system to be able to communicate about concerns related to their medical condition. Every Case Manager as well as every medical staff person should be aware of this document, where to locate it in the system, what to do with it once inmate signs it, and how this is accomplished. They should also be willing to assist inmates in this process. These Releases should be the duration of at least one year and not merely 90 days as is currently the case.

9. If an inmate presents repeatedly for the same ailment, then Medical Staff needs to take them seriously and dig deeper and do more complete exams to figure

out what is wrong, rather than allow the condition to progress until a public health risk from an infectious disease occurs, or death is imminent before taking action to treat it.

10. Doctors and PA's need to actually LOOK at the condition the inmate presents, rather than sitting several feet away. This would apply to most conditions including but not limited to rashes, lumps, bumps, skin infections, sprains, breaks, other infections, etc.

11. UPAN has been told by USP that Medical operates in a manner compatible with what is available in the community. If this is the case then medical staff such as PAs, doctors, and nurses should be looking up the patient's case history in the computer when they see them and review it briefly so they know what the inmate is talking about, especially when the inmate is presenting with a recurring problem, but has been seen by several other providers in the past. Complaints that patients arrive in medical to be seen again for a chronic

condition that needs attention and rather than reviewing the history and see what has been done in the past, they start all over with the history from the patient.

12. Prescribing staff should complete a medication review while inmate is in the medical visit and check for medication contraindications and interactions before prescribing a new medication. This should be repeated by pharmacy staff, just as it is in the outside world.

13. It must be remembered that the inmates are in prison for a reason. They each have been unable to be successful in living their lives in the community for whatever reason, so there may be some communication deficits, emotional regulation problems, social or other skills lacking. That should never be an excuse for the lack of professionalism on the part of the medical providers and staff to act or communicate in a rude, condescending, hateful, or ridiculing manner.

Lots has been written about male facilities, but not so much for women.

Source: Piper Kerman (a former female federal inmate)

Women's Issues – Summary of June 2019 UPAN Meeting

by Molly Prince

This UPAN meeting was powerful, filled with stories of what formerly incarcerated women have endured in the Utah State Prison during imprisonment. Due to limited space, this article will be a short introduction to the basis of women's issues that need to be addressed in our prisons and jails. More details in July issue.

Britnee Webb, UPAN's Director of Women's Issues invites women and their families who are impacted by criminal justice and prison issues to join UPAN's Women's Issues Committee to work toward addressing the problems women are suffering in Utah's correctional facilities. She spoke on the first step of progress Utah had this legislative session; Stephanie Pitcher passed the Dignity Bill that dictates "no more shackling" women in labor and birth in USP and Utah's jails.* She put forth a request to learn more about the problems women in the custody of Utah Dept. of Corrections experience in USP Timpanogos facility and the county jails.

Shannon Miller-Cox, the founder and executive director of Journey of Hope in Salt Lake City, spoke first on Women's Issues. Journey of Hope's mission is: "To improve the lives of harmed and justice-involved women and girls by empowering them through gender responsive case-management and mentorship; and with social advocacy to the systems that serve them."

Utah's Criminal Justice Reform is not working for women. Shannon discussed that women are the poorest of all inmates in the prison system. There is an education barrier to women being able to access affordable education and the majority of women in USP

are there on non-violent drug offenses. She discussed the problems in our system of sending women to prison because there are not enough state funded substance abuse spots available in the community for them. For example, 60% of female inmates in USP are from Weber County. While Weber County has the second largest criminal justice population in the state, it only has 8 treatment beds. This leaves the majority of women convicted in Weber County being remanded to USP rather than getting the substance abuse and mental health treatment they need in the community.

98% of women caught up in the criminal justice system have experienced four or more traumatic injuries. Harmed girls and women tend to internalize their pain so they are not noticed until they start harming themselves or abusing alcohol and drugs. While boys are also traumatized and harmed, ending up with mental health issues, they typically get angry and act out in that manner after trauma, and girls end up with mental health issues that are untreated and end up in sexually exploitative situations.

Utah tends to not use trauma-informed interventions and many kids are misdiagnosed with ADHD when they are really suffering from trauma and Post Traumatic Stress Injury – which is injury to the brain and the limbic system that processes emotions. Repeated trauma wreaks havoc on an individual's ability to process, deal with, and heal from trauma in a healthy manner. Many women who have been traumatized may be misdiagnosed with bi-polar disorder or various personality disorders and then the prison tends to medicate them accordingly, often ineffectively. With the

failure to address the traumatic history they have experienced, this approach to intervention and treatment is rarely effective. It sets women up for further

trauma and injury. There is more. Please look to UPAN's July newsletter for the rest of the story.

About Solitary: *"That's how to best describe it: trying to live in a grave. You're trying to live 'cause you're not dead yet, but nobody hears you when you call out, 'Hey, I'm alive!'" Megan Sweeney, The Story Within Us.*

A Couple of Smiles and Maybe a Laugh

A teacher was talking about whales and said, "By the way, the whale's throat is too small for a person like Jonah to get thru it and live in the whale's belly." A student said, "I don't believe that. When I get to Heaven, I'll ask Jonah." The teacher said, "Suppose Jonah didn't go to Heaven?" The student replied, "Then you ask him."

A woman opens a bedroom door and announces, "It's time to get up and go to church." A man in the bedroom says, "I don't want to go, give me one good reason why I should." The woman answers, "I'll give you three! One, because I'm your Mother and I said so! Two,

you're 52 years old and you've been living here since you graduated high school. Three, because you're the pastor."

A 65 year old married couple are celebrating their 40th Anniversary and the wife finds a bottle on the beach. She opens it and a Genie pops out. "I'm here to give you your one very best wish." She says, "I've always wanted to travel around the world." Immediately a helicopter appears, picks her up and takes her to a cruise ship. The Genie turns to the husband who says, "I've always wanted a wife 30 years younger than I am." Immediately the man became 95 years old.

UPAN Writing Exercise Theme Song: Yakety-Flak, My Feedback -- By Warren Rosenbaum

Explanation of title and chorus: Yakety is lots of words, flak is opposition, strong criticism, feedback is a response.

NOTE: Sing the lyrics to the tune of Yakety-Yak, Don't Talk Back, recorded by The Coasters (late 1950s). **Here's two verses as a reminder to get you started:** 1) You just put on your coat and hat, And walk yourself to the laundromat, And when you finish doin' that, Bring in the dog and put out the cat, Yakety yak (Don't talk back) 2) Don't you give me no dirty looks, Your father's hip; he knows what cooks, Just tell your hoodlum friend outside, You ain't got time to take a ride Yakety yak (Don't talk back) Now use that tune to sing the following lyrics. Enjoy, Ed.

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sharpen my pencils and my brain, My writing will not be in vain; I may not be a writing whiz, Well, I'll just tell it like it is. Yakety-flak, my feedback.		I'll write my memories of this place, A frown may come upon my face; But when you see my great big smile, You'll know I've found my writin' style. Yakety-Flak, my feedback.					
A poem or essay I'll produce, Old writer's block is no excuse, I'll start by simply writing down, What I recall of my hometown. Yakety-flak, my feedback.		I find that writin's lots of fun, Sure is easy when once begun, My writing skill's a big surprise, With UPAN's Writing Exercise. Yakety-Flak, my feedback.					

Five Years of information in the UPAN Newsletter, and now we include jokes and song lyrics. That's cool!! Ed.

As Gandhi said, LET US BE THE CHANGE WE WISH TO SEE IN THE WORLD.

Utah Prisoner Advocate Network

President: Shauna Denos
Past-President & Treasurer: Molly Prince
Vice-president: Unfilled
Secretary: Unfilled
Director of Communications: Shane Severson
Inmate Newsletter Volunteer Coord: Deon Corkins
Director of Sex Offender Policy Issues: Faye Jenkins
Director of Women's Issues: Britnee Webb
Volunteer Coordinator: An Bradshaw
Newsletter Editor: Warren Rosenbaum

Utah Prisoner Advocate Network
P.O. Box 464, Draper, UT 84020
Website: UtahPrisonerAdvocate.org
Email: Utahprisoneradvocate@gmail.com
Facebook: Facebook.com/UtahPrisoner
(Note: go there to view recent UPAN meetings)

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead