



The University of New Mexico

Bernalillo County Metropolitan Detention Center Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Report

November 2015

Craig Pacheco, BA
Paul Guerin Ph.D.
Philip Pierotti

Prepared for Bernalillo County
Public Safety Division

Introduction

Background

Bernalillo County's Metropolitan Detention Center (MDC), located in Albuquerque, New Mexico, is one of the 50 largest jails in the U.S. in terms of design capacity (2,236 beds and 48th largest in 2010), has historically been overcrowded (in 2010 was at 122% of capacity), and has a history of problems. In the past 18 months, for a variety of reasons the daily population has decreased and currently the facility is at about 67% of capacity,. The MDC has been under a federal consent decree since 1996 (McClendon v. City of Albuquerque, 100 F.3d 863, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 29985 (10th Cir. N.M., 1996)) for crowding and the treatment of mentally ill inmates.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA)

In September of 2003, the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA; Public Law 108-79) passed with unanimous support from both parties in Congress, and was signed into law by President George W. Bush (Struckman-Johnson, 2011). The National Prison Rape Elimination commission contends that the pressure of humanitarian treatment for persons in custody ultimately resulted in the passage of PREA (Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson, 2013).

The Act is designed to establish a zero-tolerance standard for the incidence of prison rape in prisons in the United States, make the prevention of prison rape a top priority in each prison system; develop and implement national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of prison rape, consequently improving the management and administration of correctional facilities; standardize the definitions used for collecting data on the incidence of prison rape; increase the accountability of prison officials who fail to detect, prevent, reduce, and punish prison rape; protect the Eighth Amendment rights of Federal, State, and local prisoners; increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal expenditures through grant programs such as those dealing with health care; mental health care; disease prevention; crime prevention, investigation, and prosecution; prison construction, maintenance, and operation; race relations; poverty; unemployment; and homelessness; and reduce the costs that prison rape imposes on interstate commerce (U.S. Congress, 2003). The final Department of Justice PREA Standards became effective on August 20, 2012.

The Rationale for Implementing PREA

Findings that influenced the implementation of the PREA included the lack of knowledge regarding prison rape by members of the public and government officials; the insufficient amount of research and data reporting the extent of prison rape; recognition that inmates with mental illness and young first-time offenders are disproportionately victimized; recognition that the majority of prison staff are not adequately trained to prevent, report or treat inmate sexual assaults; the notion that prison rape is often unreported; knowledge that HIV and AIDS are major public health problems within American correctional facilities; prison rape endangers public safety by releasing victimized inmates without proper treatment; exacerbates interracial tensions in prison and upon release; the recognition that prison rape increases the likelihood of violence against inmates and staff, and increases the risk of

revolts and riots; and recognition that the incidence of sexual assault within prisons, violate the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution (U.S. Congress, 2003).

Congress found that although there is insufficient research on prison rape, experts conservatively estimate that roughly 13 percent of United States inmates have been sexually assaulted in prison; some of which were repeatedly victimized. By these estimates, roughly 200,000 inmates that are currently incarcerated have been or will become the victims of prison rape. In evaluating the past 20 years, it is likely that the number of inmates who have been sexually assaulted in prison exceeds 1,000,000 (U.S. Congress, 2003).

In its first national inmate survey on sexual victimization in jails (“Sexual Victimization in Local Jails Reported by Inmates, 2007”), The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) named MDC as having a rate of sexual abuse nearly three times higher than the national average. Not only was MDC listed as one of the facilities with the highest rates of sexual victimization overall, it also appeared on the BJS list for facilities with the highest rates of abusive sexual contacts and nonconsensual acts – meaning that, in addition to rape, MDC has a serious problem with its staff failing to maintain professional boundaries with inmates. Since 2009, a number of officers have been indicted for having sex with inmates. One officer was charged both with raping two inmates and with helping another inmate, who was formerly a corrections officer at another facility, rape one of the same victims.

For these reasons, it is important to implement the PREA standards in the MDC. The goal of stimulating a meaningful and lasting culture change within MDC by establishing best practices in preventing and responding to sexual abuse can potentially be achieved through providing training on staff sexual misconduct prevention and the establishment and maintenance of professional boundaries between staff and inmates. Also by providing training on PREA, the national standards, and staff’s roles and responsibilities in preventing and responding to sexual abuse can be disseminated. It is important to assess MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers following PREA training on their knowledge, role and responsibilities in preventing and responding to incidents of sexual abuse. This study involves pre and post training surveys of all eligible MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers who participate in PREA trainings.

In March 2012 Bernalillo County in collaboration with Just Detention International (JDI) through the New Mexico Department of Public Safety (DPS), submitted a competitive grant announcement to the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). This competitive application was submitted under the *PREA Demonstration Projects to Establish “Zero Tolerance” Cultures for Sexual Assault in Local Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities*. The Institute for Social Research (ISR) was included in the application as the required research component. Staff from the ISR has been involved with the MDC since the 1990s and so is very familiar with the MDC’s population and history.

In late 2012 the New Mexico Department of Public Safety, Bernalillo County and JDI were competitively awarded and the contract with the federal Bureaus of Justice Assistance was concluded in mid-2013. The ISR is contracted to provide technical assistance surrounding data collection strategies and to

provide evaluation services. These evaluation services, which are human subject related, primarily revolve around evaluating a series of staff trainings, as noted earlier.

The PREA project is designed to implement PREA standards as a core tool in transforming the culture of MDC and reducing high levels of sexual victimization. The Institute for Social Research's (ISR) task in this grant is to assess MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers following PREA training on their knowledge, role and responsibilities in preventing and responding to incidents of sexual abuse. This will include a focus on the effectiveness of the training with recommendations. This study involves pre and post training surveys of all eligible MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers who participate in PREA training. This report includes several sections. Following this introduction we include a section describing our review of existing data maintained by the MDC to document PREA related incidents at the MDC. This is followed by a brief description of the development of the PREA trainings from our limited perspective. It is important to note we were not involved in developing the trainings, scheduling the trainings or providing the trainings. This description is very important because this process impacted our work. This is followed by the analysis of the PREA training pre- and post-surveys and finally a conclusion with recommendations.

Review of MDC PREA Related Data

To prepare for the trainings we conducted a review of available MDC data related to PREA. The completion of this review was important because it allowed us to more completely understand the issue of sexual victimization at MDC and it provided baseline information. For this review several potential sources of data were discovered and made available. The first source of data was of an "incident" database. In our original discussions with MDC staff we were told this incident database was designed to collect, organize, and maintain PREA related incidents. This database contained a large variety of "incidents" including use of force, inmate vs inmate assaults, inmate vs staff assaults, contraband, sexual assaults, sexual misconduct, damage to property, etc. The second source was disciplinary data in an electronic format that had been extracted from paper forms maintained by the assigned Disciplinary Officer. Disciplinary data were originally collected for another project and information that was collected for that study was fortuitously available for this study. Unfortunately, because these data were not specifically collected for this project some data including descriptions of any incidents that led to the discipline was not collected. In time for this study and because of a lack of resources we did not collect additional data from hard copy records. It is also important to note that disciplinary incidents often did not contain a sufficiently detailed description of the incident that would have allowed us to distinguish which incidents were PREA related. The third data source was data from kiosks available to inmates in the different jail pods and units. Kiosks are used to provide a variety of services to inmates including a method to file a grievance

Incident Data Review

We were provided incident data from MDC from January 2012 through March 20, 2015. During our study time frame MDC changed from one incident database to another and for this reason the CY 2012 data contains different variables compared to the January 2013 through March 2015 data. Table 1 lists the variables for each time frame.

Importantly for this review there was a large difference in the two databases and the variables. The CY 2012 database contained incident disposition information and importantly in the January 2013 to March 2015 database similar information did not exist. Because there is not a “final action” or disposition variable in the database for the January 2013-March 2015 time-frame it was not possible to determine the disposition of the incidents. Even for CY 2012, which included the “final action” variable, it was difficult to precisely determine the disposition of most incidents, due to categories (i.e. pending, no further action, and reprimand) that did not adequately describe the disposition.

The data provided for CY 2012 included employee misconduct incidents such as AWOL, conduct unbecoming, fraternization, inattentiveness, insubordination, overtime refusal, sick leave abuse, tardy, and unprofessional behavior. The January 2013 through March 2015 data did not include employee misconduct data. This is important because the CY 2012 employee misconduct data contained PREA related data. For this reason employee related reported sexual assaults and sexual misconducts are not reported for January 2013 through March 2015. We were not able to discover if this information was collected in another format and stored. We also believe the number of PREA related incidents are under-reported for the entire reporting period. This occurs because of the improper classification of incidents for the study time period. This is described in more detail later. For example, in 2012 there were 0 incidents that were categorized as a sexual assault. However, after reviewing the “comments” variable in the data, we found there were 11 incidents that could be categorized as sexual assault.

Table 1. Incident Database Variables

2012	2013-March 2015
Date Received	Supervisor
Type	Staff
Inmate Name	Inmate
Staff Name	Incident #
Comments	Type
Location	Date/Time
Investigative Supervisor	Shift Cmdr
PSU Case	Status
PSU Abuse	Completed Date
Staff Misconduct	
Photo Evidence	
Video Evidence	
Chemical Agent Used	
Seen By Medical	
Inmate Injured	
Staff Injured	
Audio Tape (Yes/No)	
BCSO (Yes/No)	
Final Action	
Shift	

Table 2 reports documented Sexual Assaults Sexual Misconducts incidents from January 2013 through March 20, 2015. These numbers only represent those instances that were reported and categorized as Sexual Assault or Sexual Misconduct in the incident database. Recall we are unable to report any incidents of employee PREA related incidents.

Table 2. MDC Reported Sexual Assaults and Sexual Misconduct

Year	Sexual Assault Cases	Sexual Assault Victims	Sexual Misconduct Cases	Sexual Misconduct Victims
2013	8	27	8	18
2014	21	100	40	119
2015 (through 3/20/2015)	6	18	2	3

The next two tables (Table 3 and Table 4) report related information from two sources. Table 3 reports information reported by the federal Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) by local jails and state prison systems. Table 4 reports information from the MDC incident database. Because the source of the BJS data and MDC originates from MDC the results should match.

Table 3 reports information that was reported in the 2012 Survey of Sexual Violence (SSV) report. The SSV is part of the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) National Prison Rape Statistics Program designed to

gather mandated data on the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault in correctional facilities, under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. This is an administrative data collection based on allegations of sexual victimization by other inmates or staff that are reported to correctional authorities. According to the 2012 SSV report MDC reported 2 nonconsensual sexual acts in 2012, with one being substantiated. There were 9 abusive sexual acts reported in 2012, with 0 being substantiated. There were 3 staff sexual misconduct allegations reported, with 0 being substantiated.

Table 3. SSV report 2012

Year	Nonconsensual Sexual Acts		Abusive Sexual Acts		Staff Sexual Misconduct	
	Reported	Substantiated	Reported	Substantiated	Reported	Substantiated
2012	2	1	9	0	3	0

Table 4 reports the PREA related data we received from MDC for CY 2012. Recall these data included the Employee Misconduct category. According to the MDC data, there were 0 incidents categorized as Sexual Assault, 26 incidents categorized as Sexual Misconduct, and 0 incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct.

We decided to confirm these data by reviewing the comments section for each of the 26 Sexual Misconduct incidents and by reviewing all 738 Employee Misconduct incidents for staff sexual misconduct.

First, we reviewed the “comments” section for each Sexual Misconduct incident which describes what occurred during the incident and we discovered that some of the incidents were categorized incorrectly. We found 11 of the Sexual Misconducts incidents were actually sexual assault incidents, 4 were incidents of consensual sex, 8 were incidents that involved reports of sexual misconduct by MDC staff, 2 were incidents of inappropriate touching between inmates, and 1 was an incident involving an inmate touching a medical staff member inappropriately.

Second, after reviewing the 738 reported incidents of Employee Misconduct we found 28 to review in more detail that could be PREA related due to wording in the comments section such as “conduct unbecoming.” MDC provided the reports for those 28 incidents to review. Of the 28 cases reviewed, 7 were determined to be PREA related, under the definitions of staff sexual misconduct and staff sexual harassment on the SSV. In 2 of the incidents, the MDC employee was terminated. For other cases the final outcome was not clear from the database as well as from reviewing the report.

We expected the incident data would match the data reported in the SSV which was provided by the MDC. This did not happen and we don’t know why. In time for this report we did not have the time our resources to pursue this issue. This is an important issue that brings into question the collection and reporting of PREA related incidents at the MDC by MDC staff.

Table 4. 2012 MDC Sexual Incidents

Category	MDC Categorized	Actual (from review of "comments" variable)
Sexual Assault	0	11
Sexual Misconduct	26	7
Staff Sexual Misconduct	0	8

Disciplinary Data Review

This section reports on a review of disciplinary data for January 2013 through March 2015 focusing on PREA related incidents. Disciplinary incidents are maintained in paper files by the MDC Disciplinary Officer and are records of every inmate disciplinary incident during the review time frame. As noted earlier these hard copy files had been automated for use in a different study and were available to us for this study. The majority of disciplinary incidents maintained in paper files contained limited information describing the incident and what was available was not collected for the other study and so was not available for our review. We had hoped to compare our findings using disciplinary data to the incident data as a method to further check the quality of the incident data. In theory each PREA related incident in the disciplinary data should match to the incident data. In time for this study we were not able to complete this comparison.

In discussions with MDC staff we were told there were three discipline codes that related to PREA incidents. MDC disciplinary data is divided into three classes based on the seriousness of the incident with 100 class incidents being the most serious, 200 class incidents being the next most serious and 300 class incidents being the least serious. According to the list of offenses that MDC staff provided us, there are 3 codes, one in each class, that relate to PREA incidents. The code and definition is shown in Table 5. Since these 3 codes are the only ones related to PREA incidents these were the only codes reviewed in the Disciplinary database. Given more resources and time we would have considered conducting a review of all discipline incidents during the time frame.

Given there were 169 sexual activities disciplinary incidents in the 27 month study period or 6.2 incidents a month that include sexual threats, which are a PREA related incident, it would be useful to review these incidents to determine how many are a PREA related incident. It may also be helpful to review all the 301 incidents to determine if any were PREA related.

Table 5. MDC Disciplinary PREA Related Offenses

Code #	Number of Codes	Definition
104	7	Forcible Sexual Assault
203	169	Sexual Activities (i.e., sexual intercourse, sexual threats or sexual proposals toward another person)
301	42	Indecent exposure or masturbation

Table 6 reports the 7 #104 incidents that occurred between January 2013 and March 2015. According to the Disciplinary records, there were 3 incidents in 2013 and 4 in 2014. Tracking the place of incident of

these occurrences, four occurred in F-Unit, one in D-Unit, one in the Segregation Unit, and one in CCP. One incident resulted in a 60 day disciplinary lock up in segregation, another resulted in a 30 day disciplinary lock up in segregation, two resulted in a 20 day disciplinary lock up in segregation, two resulted in a 21 day disciplinary lock up in segregation, and one was dismissed because the “time expired”. In our review we found no evidence that these disciplinary incidents categorized as forcible sexual assaults were reported to local police as new crimes. This deserves further study to determine if these should have been reported as new crimes and whether they were reported to local police. We don’t know if the MDC has a policy for reporting incidents in the facility that could be considered as new crimes.

Table 6. Disciplinary Offense #104

Year	Code	Place of Incident	Result
2013	104	Delta 5	60 days disciplinary lock up
2013	104	Seg 8	Dismissed
2013	104	CCP	30 days disciplinary lock up
2014	104	Fox 6	20 days disciplinary lock up
2014	104	Fox 6	20 days disciplinary lock up
2014	104	Fox 3	21 days disciplinary lock up
2014	104	Fox 3	21 days disciplinary lock up

Table 7 reports the frequency and place of incident for offense #203. Over half of the incidents (52.1%) occurred in the F-Unit, 11.8% occurred in E-Unit, 11.2% occurred in D-Unit and 9.5% occurred in Segregation. The place of incident was blank in the disciplinary file on 6.5% of the incidents. The results of this offense varied from a 7 day disciplinary lock up to a 40 day disciplinary lock up. Disciplinary incidents that concern sexual threats should be further studied to determine if they meet the definition of a PREA incident.

Table 7. Offense #203 Incident Place and Frequency 2013-2014

Place of Incident	Number of Incidents	Percent
F-Unit	88	52.1
D-Unit	19	11.2
E-Unit	20	11.8
Seg	16	9.5
PAC	10	5.9
RDT	3	1.8
Kitchen	2	1.2
-99	11	6.5
Total	169	100

Table 9 reports the frequency and place of incident for offense #301. Nearly a quarter of the incidents (23.8%) occurred in Segregation. This is followed by D-Unit (16.7%) and F-Unit and PAC (both at 14.3%). The place of incident was blank in the disciplinary file on 7.1% of the incidents.

Table 8. Offense #301 Incident Place and Frequency 2013-2014

Place of Incident	Number of Incidents	Percent
F-Unit	6	14.3
D-Unit	7	16.7
E-Unit	5	11.9
Seg	10	23.8
PAC	6	14.3
RDT	4	9.5
Kitchen	1	2.4
-99	3	7.1
Total	42	100

Kiosk Review

As noted earlier we also conducted a review of kiosk information from April 1, 2014 through May 30, 2014, which contained over 19,360 inmate requests. These data were provided by Bernalillo County Metropolitan Detention Center (MDC) staff in the form of a pdf file. Information provided included: request number, status (i.e. closed), location unit and pod, inmate number, inmate name, the date and time of the request, a description of the request, the response date and time to the request, and a status description of the request. Kiosks are located throughout the MDC in the housing Pods and Units. In most pods the kiosks are located in common areas. Inmates are able to make requests for a variety of things including clothing, court dates, help with medical problems, job opportunities, and file grievances. The primary objective of the review was to search for grievances among the thousands of requests. Two methods were used to search for and document grievances in the kiosk data and each method was designed to review the report in a different way. While the methods were different they were complementary. The first method relied on systematically manually reviewing a large sample of the requests and the second method relied on keyword searches.

The complete review was provided in a separate brief report and is not provided here. In summary we found no evidence of PREA related incidents in the kiosk data.

Summary

Based on our review, as of the writing of this report in November 2015 the MDC does not have a single reliable method for documenting and reporting PREA related incidents. As noted elsewhere we were originally told by MDC staff the Incident database included all PREA related incidents. Our review of the incident database found this was not the case. We found the Incident database contains a large variety of incidents including some that we believe should not be considered an incident for the purposes of this database. This includes employees who are late for work, refuse overtime, and are inattentive. Further, we found there is a general misunderstanding of what constitutes a PREA incident and that the database is not designed to collect the required information. This includes identified PREA allegations from the PREA form, inmate on inmate non-consensual sexual acts, inmate on inmate sexual harassment, staff on inmate sexual assaults, staff on inmate sexual harassment, results (substantiated, unsubstantiated, unfounded, and ongoing), gender of victims, gender of perpetrators, location of sexual

violence incident, if the allegation was reported to Law Enforcement, a clear description of the incident, and a clear explanation of the outcome for perpetrators (staff and inmate).

There is now a PREA button to be checked when entering incident data in the system, and a related PREA incident form. However, this method is not completely reliable, as it relies on the person entering the data to remember to check the button when it is appropriate and to correctly fill out the form. Staff responsible for this task need to be trained on when to appropriately check the button and how to completely fill out the form. As of the writing of this report the majority of staff has not been trained on PREA and there have been instances of the button being checked when not needed and not being checked when it was needed as well as the form not being filled out correctly. In addition, the required PREA data is not able to be extracted from the system. Further, the PREA Coordinator needs full access to the database. At the time of this report, the PREA Coordinator has limited and sporadic access to data that is needed, and can only pull data that is labeled as PREA in the incident database, potentially missing incidents that were categorized incorrectly.

Complicating, this issue of documenting and reporting PREA related incidents was the difficulty we experienced in obtaining the data and receiving assistance in interpreting the data and the database. Not all MDC staff readily or completely cooperated with our requests for information and assistance. This was unexpected. Our review of the kiosk data was completed as an alternative method to explore sexual incidents at the MDC. This review did not find PREA related incidents that were filed as grievances. The review of the disciplinary hard copy data was done to complement and further explore PREA related incidents. Because we had reason to believe the Incident database did not collect all the incidents and did not collect all the required PREA data we explored the use of the disciplinary data to more completely describe the issue. This review found incidents that appear to not have been captured in the incident database. This occurs, we believe, because of a lack of training, understanding of the issue and the design of the database.

In summary, there is currently no reliable and consistent method to collect, document, and report PREA related incidents at the MDC. While our research was not designed to review the PREA process at the MDC this finding is important. The successful training of staff at MDC will not resolve the lack of a process at MDC.

PREA Trainings

This section reports on the PREA trainings. As noted earlier we did not participate in the design, scheduling, or delivery of the trainings. We had informal and formal discussion with the MDC staff responsible for part of all of these tasks and we observed the trainings in which we surveyed participants use a semi-structured observation strategy. The original plan by MDC including training all the required staff by the end of the PREA grant period, this did not happen. Through discussions with the PREA Coordinator and Special Projects Coordinator, we learned the County was unable to provide the funding needed to pay overtime to staff to attend the meetings as well as all the funds to conduct all the trainings. In addition MDC staff was unable to schedule the necessary trainings in the time period.

Due to these factors, the required staff was not trained by the end of the grant period. Scheduled staff did not always attend the training for which they were scheduled. This section describes the trainings, our observations of the trainings, and the results of the pre- and post-surveys

PREA Training Analysis

According to the PREA standards for both prisons and jails (National PREA Resource Center) facilities are supposed to train all employees (this includes volunteers and contractors) who may have contact with inmates on:

- Its zero-tolerance policy for sexual abuse and sexual harassment;
- How to fulfill their responsibilities under agency sexual abuse and sexual harassment prevention, detection, reporting, and response policies and procedures;
- Inmates' right to be free from sexual abuse and sexual harassment;
- The right of inmates and employees to be free from retaliation for reporting sexual abuse and sexual harassment;
- The dynamics of sexual abuse and sexual harassment
- The common reactions of sexual abuse and sexual harassment victims;
- How to detect and respond to signs of threatened and actual sexual abuse;
- How to avoid inappropriate relationships with inmates;
- How to communicate effectively and professionally with inmates, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, or gender nonconforming inmates; and
- How to comply with relevant laws related to mandatory reporting of sexual abuse to outside authorities

This includes uniformed staff, civilian staff, administrative staff, contracted staff (i.e. medical, behavioral health, food services, etc.) and volunteers. At the time the trainings began this included approximately 550 MDC staff, 226 volunteers, 99 Correct Care Solution staff (medical and behavioral health services), and 44 Aramark staff (food and facility services).

Methods

Eligible survey participants were all MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers who attended one of the MDC PREA trainings. As part of the standard approach to assessing satisfaction and achievement of the objectives during trainings, pre-training (immediately preceding the training) and post-training (immediately following completion of the training) surveys were administered. The surveys were anonymous and each participant their own unique 4-digit code as a way of matching their pre and post-training survey responses.

The final PREA Act describes categories of MDC employees, contractors, and volunteers. The Act is specific about what each of these staff is responsible for knowing. We created surveys covering each staff category outlined in the Act. The surveys are based on the standard auditor questions described by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) on its National PREA Resource Center website. The auditor

questions evaluate the sections of the PREA that each category of MDC, staff, specialized staff, and contractors and volunteers must be trained to know. Our surveys track with the BJA audit questions, making certain the staff are evaluated on the portions of the PREA they are responsible for knowing and on which the auditors will be testing. These audit questions are part of the required PREA audit that occurs every three years and which must be completed to be considered compliant with the PREA standards.

The first page introducing the survey includes a statement that the completion of the survey served as consent for the study. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary and that they had the ability to terminate their participation at any time during the study. An ISR staff member was present to answer any questions the participant had after reading the informed consent, prior to beginning the pre and post training surveys. Approximately 15 minutes prior to the start of the training, the ISR staff member announced the pre-survey and explained the survey. If the potential participant wanted they completed the pre-survey, which took no longer than 15 minutes to complete. Immediately following the training, the ISR staff member passed out the post-survey to potential participants, and the same procedures used in the pre-survey were used.

A total of 15 PREA trainings were held and our staff attended and administered pre- and post-surveys at 13 trainings during the PREA grant period. We missed a volunteer training where the time of the training was changed and we could not attend and another training with MDC staff that was held on Memorial Day. Table 2 reports the attendance of staff at each training session. Trainings #1 and #2 were comprised of cadets, while trainings #3 through #8 consisted of security and administration supervision staff (Assistant Chiefs, Sergeants, Lieutenants, etc.). Training #9 consisted of MDC volunteers. Trainings #10-#13 were primarily of non-supervision security staff (Corrections Officers) and some supervision management security staff. MDC security staff were targeted to be trained first.

Table 9. Training Attendance

Training #	Training Type	Attended (From MDC Sign-In Sheet)	Completed Surveys	Percent
1	Cadet	15	15	100
2	Cadet	10	10	100
3	Staff	8	8	100
4	Staff	8	8	100
5	Staff	6	6	100
6	Staff	18	18	100
7	Staff	10	10	100
8	Staff	5	5	100
9	Volunteer	11	10	90.9
10	Staff	Not available	32	
11	Staff	24	23	95.8
12	Staff	23	18	78.3
13	Staff	22	16	72.7
Total		183	179	97.8

Analysis

The focus is on analyzing the gains or losses in competency scores on PREA knowledge. This was assessed by subtracting the pre-survey score from the post-survey score of each trainee who completed a pre-survey and post-survey. The analysis describes the population, mean scores on pre-surveys and post-surveys, and net gains in competency scores after PREA training.

Demographics

As part of the pre-survey, training attendees filled out a short demographics questionnaire. The following set of tables reports the gender, age, ethnicity, education, years worked in corrections, years worked for MDC, position classification, and supervision level. Table 10 reports the position classification of the PREA training attendees. The large majority of respondents were security staff (92.1%). As noted earlier MDC security staff was targeted to be trained first.

Table 10. Position Classification of Trainees

	Count	Percent
Security	164	92.1
Administration	3	1.7
Classification	1	0.6
Volunteers	10	5.6

Missing – 1

Table 11 reports the supervision level of trainees. Supervision Management consists of Security management (i.e., Lieutenants and Captains) and Administration (i.e., Assistant Chiefs). Non-Supervision staff consists of security staff (i.e., Correctional Officers) Supervision Management staff comprised 42.1% of the trainings, while Non-Supervision staff comprised 57.9% of the trainings.

Table 11. Supervision Level of Trainees

	Count	Percent
Non-Supervision Staff	103	57.9
Supervision Management	75	42.1

Missing – 1

Table 12 shows the mean and median of age, total years worked in corrections, and total years worked for MDC. The mean age of PREA training attendees was 25.7 and the mean years of total service was 6.1, with a mean of 4.7 years worked for MDC. The total mean years worked in corrections and MDC is impacted by the number of supervision management staff who participated in the trainings.

Table 12. Age and Years of Service: Mean and Median

		Age	Years Worked in Corrections	Years Worked for MDC
Non-Supervision Staff	Mean	23.3	3.3	1.8
	Median	28	4	3
Supervision Management	Mean	28.8	11.5	10.1
	Median	35	10	8
Total	Mean	25.7	6.1	4.7
	Median	32	6	6

Tables 13 and Table 14 report gender and ethnicity for the PREA Training survey participants. The large majority of trainees were male (67.2%) and 32.8% were female. Almost 25% (24.6%) of the participants were White, 56.4% were Hispanic, 8.4% were African American, 4.5% were Native American and 0.6% were Asian. The 10 trainees who marked other consisted of 7 who did not specify a category, one who wrote human, one who wrote Spanish, and one who wrote Spanish/German.

Table 13. Gender

Gender	Count	Percent
Female	57	32.8
Male	117	67.2

Missing – 5

Table 14. Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Count	Percent
African American	15	8.4
Asian American, Pacific Islander	1	0.6
White	44	24.6
Hispanic	101	56.4
Native American	8	4.5
Other	10	5.6
Total	179	100

Table 15 reports the education levels of the PREA training attendees. Nearly half of the attendees have completed some college (46.3%), followed by High School diploma or GED (29.7%) and completed college (20%).

Table 15. Education

Highest Level Education	Count	Percent
Completed College	35	20
High School diploma or equivalent (GED)	52	29.7
Master's degree	6	3.4
Some College	81	46.3
Some High School	1	0.6

Missing – 4

Descriptive statistics (mean averages) was used to examine the mean average scores of the sample population on their pre-tests and their post-tests. The total scores for all questions in the pre-test and post-test were summed and the average was calculated. The analysis showed that the average score for

the pre-survey was 74.5% and the average score of the post-survey was 84.4%, which is a 10.5% increase in scores on average from the pre to the post training survey.

Table 16. Pre and Post Training Scores

	Correct Answers (Mean)	Percent Score (Mean)
Pre-Survey	9.4 out of 13	74.5
Post-Survey	12.4 out of 15	84.4
Difference		9.9

Table 17 reports the mean pre-survey and post-survey scores for each training at which surveys were administered. Training #10 showed the most improvement, scoring 69.2% on the pre-survey and 83.8% on the post-survey, a 14.6% increase. This is followed by trainings #1 and #8 which showed a 12% increase and training #13 which showed an 11.8% increase. Pre-survey mean scores ranged from 69.2 to 81.6, with training #10 scoring the lowest and training #3 scoring the highest. The post-survey mean scores ranged from 82.6% to 92%, with training #11 scoring the lowest and training #8 scoring the highest.

Table 17. Pre and Post Training Scores by Training

Training #	Training Type	Pre-Survey Score (Mean)	Post-Survey Score (Mean)	Difference
1	Cadet	70.9	82.9	+12.0
2	Cadet	74.6	85.5	+10.9
3	Staff/Supervisor	81.6	87.7	+6.1
4	Staff/Supervisor	75.1	84.1	+9.0
5	Staff/Supervisor	75.8	83.3	+7.5
6	Staff/Supervisor	80.1	89.5	+9.4
7	Staff/Supervisor	74.7	84.1	+9.4
8	Staff/Supervisor	80	92	+12.0
9	Volunteer	79.9	83	+3.1
10	Staff/Non-Supervisor	69.2	83.8	+14.6
11	Staff/Non-Supervisor	72.6	82.6	+10.0
12	Staff/Non-Supervisor	74.1	84.2	+10.1
13	Staff/Non-Supervisor	76.1	87.9	+11.8
Total		74.5	85	+10.5

Table 18 reports the mean pre-survey and post-survey scores by staff training type. The four types of trainings types were for cadets, staff/supervisors, staff/non-supervisors, and volunteers. Scores from the pre-survey to the post-survey increased for each type of staff being trained. The cadets mean pre-survey score was 72.4% and mean post-survey score was 84%, for an 11.6% increase. The staff/supervisor mean pre-survey score was 78.1% and post-survey score was 87%, showing an 8.9% increase. The staff/non-supervisor mean pre-survey score was 72.3% and mean post-survey score was 84.3%, a 12% increase. The volunteer mean pre-survey score was 79.9% and mean post-survey score was 83%, showing a 3.1% increase. Pre-survey mean scores by training type ranged from 72.3% to 79.9%, with staff/non-supervisors scoring the lowest and volunteers scoring the highest. Post-survey mean scores ranged from 83% to 87%, with volunteers scoring the lowest and staff/supervisors scoring the highest.

Table 18. Pre and Post Training Scores by Type

Training Type	Pre-Survey Score (Mean)	Post-Survey Score (Mean)	Difference
Cadet	72.4	84	+11.6
Staff/Supervisor	78.1	87	+8.9
Staff/Non-Supervisor	72.3	84.3	+10.2
Volunteer	79.9	83	+3.1
Total	74.5	85	+10.5

Table 19 reports the mean pre-survey and post-survey scores by question. These questions all fell under the category of PREA Standards. The question, *Staff of the opposite gender might want to announce their presence when entering an inmate-housing unit*, showed the most improvement, scoring 33.1% on the Pre-Survey and 100% on the Post-Survey, displaying a 66.9% increase. This is followed by *Transgender inmates shall have the opportunity to shower separately from other inmates*, with a 21.7% increase and *Within 30 days of intake, MDC shall provide comprehensive education to inmates either in person or through video regarding their rights to be free from sexual abuse and sexual harassment and to be free from retaliation for reporting such incidents*, with a 17.4% increase. All PREA standard group questions displayed in increase except *Contract employees working at MDC are not obligated to comply with the PREA standards as long as MDC has adopted and complies with the PREA standards*, with decreased by 9.1% and *Only MDC officers with the rank of Sergeant should be trained how to conduct cross-gender pat-down searches*, which decreased by 12.9%. The question, *An agency shall have a written policy mandating zero tolerance toward sexual abuse and sexual harassment and outlining the agency's approach to preventing, detecting, and responding to such conduct*, stayed the same at 99.4%.

Table 19. PREA Standards Questions Pre and Post Scores

Question	Correct Answer	Pre-Survey Percent Correct	Post-Survey Percent Correct	Diff.
PREA is an acronym for:	Prison Rape Elimination Act.	85.0	93.3	+8.3
An agency shall have a written policy mandating zero tolerance toward sexual abuse and sexual harassment and outlining the agency's approach to preventing, detecting, and responding to such conduct.	True.	99.4	99.4	0
Contract employees working at MDC are not obligated to comply with the PREA standards as long as MDC has adopted and complies with the PREA standards.	False. Contract employees are obligated to comply.	97.0	87.9	-9.1
Staff of the opposite gender might want to announce their presence when entering an inmate-housing unit.	False. Staff should announce their presence.	33.1	100.0	+66.9
Only MDC officers with the rank of Sergeant should be trained how to conduct cross-gender pat-down searches.	False.	96.4	83.5	-12.9
MDC shall rely on inmates to interpret information to inmates who cannot speak English.	False.	96.4	98.8	+2.4
Within 30 days of intake, MDC shall provide comprehensive education to inmates either in person or through video regarding their rights to be free from sexual abuse and sexual harassment and to be free from retaliation for reporting such incidents.	True.	82.0	99.4	+17.4
Transgender inmates shall have the opportunity to shower separately from other inmates.	True.	74.6	96.3	+21.7
Mean		83.0	94.8	11.8

Table 20 reports the mean pre-survey and post-survey scores by question. These questions all fell under the category of PREA Reporting. The question, *You are required to report only about incidents of sexual abuse or sexual harassment you have witnessed, you should not make a report based on suspicious behavior or secondhand information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment*, is the only Reporting question that displayed an increase, scoring 87.3% on the pre-survey and 93.3% on the post-survey, displaying a 6% increase. The question, *Staff should report immediately any knowledge, suspicion, or information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment that occurred in a facility*, showed a decrease of 7.9%, from 98.8% to 90.9%. The question, *Staff shall not reveal any information related to a sexual abuse report to anyone other than a designated supervisor or official, and a witness of the officer's choice to the extent necessary*, scored low on both pre and post, scoring 12.7% on the pre-survey and 7.3% on the post-survey, displaying a decrease of 5.4%.

Table 20. PREA Reporting Questions Pre and Post Scores

Question	Correct Answer	Pre-Survey Percent Correct	Post-Survey Percent Correct	Diff.
You are required to report only about incidents of sexual abuse or sexual harassment you have witnessed, you should not make a report based on suspicious behavior or secondhand information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment.	False. Staff should report suspicious behavior and second hand information.	87.3	93.3	+6.0
Staff should report immediately any knowledge, suspicion, or information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment that occurred in a facility.	True.	98.8	90.9	-7.9
Staff shall not reveal any information related to a sexual abuse report to anyone other than a designated supervisor or official, and a witness of the officer's choice to the extent necessary.	False.	12.7	7.3	-5.4
Mean		66.3	63.8	-2.5

Table 20 reports the mean pre-survey and post-survey scores by question. These questions fall under the category of PREA Victims. Both questions in this category showed an increase from the pre-survey to the post-survey. The question, *Upon learning of an allegation that an inmate was sexually abused, you are the first security staff member on the scene, you are required to:*, scored 21.3% on the pre-survey and 56.8% on the post-survey, displaying a 35.5% increase. The question, *Staff shall not accept reports of sexual abuse from inmates made anonymously, but only in writing, and shall promptly document the report*, scored 84.4% on the pre-survey and 95.5% on the post-survey, or an 11.1% increase.

Table 21. PREA Victims Questions Pre- and Post-Survey Scores

Question	Correct Answer	Pre-Survey Percent Correct	Post-Survey Percent Correct	Diff.
Staff shall not accept reports of sexual abuse from inmates made anonymously, but only in writing, and shall promptly document the report.	False. Staff can accept anonymous reports.	84.4	95.5	+11.1
Upon learning of an allegation that an inmate was sexually abused, you are the first security staff member on the scene, you are required to:	Percent who choose the correct answers.	21.3	56.8	+35.5
Mean		52.9	76.2	+23.3

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study was designed to complete two tasks. First, to complete a review of PREA incidents at the MDC and second, to assess the trainings of MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers. During the course of this study not all staff was trained and so our review is limited to the trainings that occurred in which 19.2% of eligible staff attended training. In addition, because of delays in beginning the trainings we were not able to conduct follow up surveys of trained staff to measure retention of PREA training and use of PREA in their contacts with inmates.

The goal of project was to train all staff. As noted earlier there were several reasons the training of eligible MDC staff was not completed by the end of the project. The review and reporting of this is beyond the scope of this study and report, but this is an important issue.

As noted earlier, we found the MDC has not historically and does not currently have a reliable process to document and report PREA related incidents. This is an important finding and should be corrected. The MDC cannot comply with the PREA Act until this occurs. The current incident database does not collect all the required information and because not all MDC staff is trained they cannot properly report PREA related incidents. Further, and related to this finding, we believe MDC needs to be more committed to ensuring this occurs and the training of MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers continues. This finding is supported by our informal discussions with MDC PREA staff and our observations of the PREA trainings that occurred during the course of this study.

We recommend the MDC:

- Create a policy on how to collect and report PREA related data as well as all incident data.
- Disseminate this policy to all MDC staff, contractors, and volunteers.
- Train all staff on how to collect and report PREA related data as well as all incident data.
- Implement and maintain a Quality Assurance system to ensure data is accurate and reliable.
- Access to all MDC incident data must be granted to all relevant staff to ensure that PREA data, and incident data in general, is being collected and reported accurately.
- Have one place to collect and enter all data instead of 3 (incident, discipline and kiosk).

References

Beck, Allen J., and Paige M. Harrison. "Sexual Victimization in Local Jails Reported by Inmates, 2007: Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003." *PsycEXTRA Dataset* (2008): n. pag. Web.

McClendon v. City of Albuquerque, 100 F.3d 863, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 29985 (10th Cir. N.M., 1996

U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. *Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003*. Public Law 108-79. 108th Congress.

Struckman-Johnson, Cindy, and Dave Struckman-Johnson. 2013. "Stopping Prison Rape: the Evolution of Standards Recommended by Prea's National Prison Rape Elimination Commission." *Prison Journal*. 93.3: 335-354.

Struckman-Johnson, Cindy. 2011. *Research on prison sexual assault in Midwestern prisons: How findings relate to proposed policy standards from the National Prison Rape Elimination Commission*. Invited panel presentation at the 32nd International Congress on Law and Mental Health, Berlin, Humboldt University.

Appendices

Appendix A: Kiosk Data Identified Grievances

Method One Identified Grievances

Date	Request Number	Inmate Number	Notes	Category
4/1/2014	315398	100002217	Says they do not have any knowledge about items and should have been given to him on his arrival back from estancia	Claims theft of personal property including a personal radio and mail
4/6/2014	316837	100216962	Forward request to sicuris	Theft Claims phone account was broken into
4/9/2014	317281	100229519	Is told he saw his attorney today and to talk to Laura if he needs to talk	Claims he is not receiving the help he needs from COs and staff. Wants help for mental health issues
4/10/2014	318291	100234689	Told to speak to the counselor on her unit about issues	Claims being lied to and mistreated by doctor.
4/10/2014	318291	100234689		complaint novel
4/10/2014	318291	100234689		mistreatment
4/10/2014	318294	100070220	F3-NO LONGER IN SEGREGATION UNIT. PAM IS THE CASE MANAGER FOR D UNIT.	Says he got punched in the face and even though he didn't fight back he got put in Seg 1. Wants case manager to get him from seg unit when its time for court case. (NOT SURE IF THESE IS A GRIEVENCE)
4/10/2014	318294	100070220		punched
4/10/2014	318329	100196550	Notified the sgt	Claims being physically threatened by two inmates and wants them listed on keep away list
4/10/2014	318519	100064582	Will forward issue to her supervisor	Claims something was thrown at them by CO and not being allowed to use the kiosk.
4/10/2014	318603	100042473	(REQUEST WAS SENT ON 4/10/14) Says they were seen on 4/14/14 and if they still have problems to see sick call nurse for follow up	Claims medical staff is refusing to treat hernia.
4/10/2014	318619	100212033	Says this is not a grievance and not sure	Claims a staff member is not being respectful.

			what their issue is	
4/10/2014	318639	100091580	Says to submit as a grievance, that is the only thing they can think of to do	Claims not being sent to CCP even though granted by a judge.
4/15/2014	319747	100064582	Says they do not currently have books	Claims there are not books in the pod.
4/15/2014	319756	100222227	Told to contact the person at MDC cash accounting. Securis not responsible. Inmate not sure who to contact in next request. No response given, closed	Claims trust account should have funds and money was taken out of account
4/15/2014	319807	100130986	No response given. Only two user assigned changes	Claims during transport to MDC from UNMH she fell in the vehicle and staff would not help her get back in her seat.
4/15/2014	319816	100022568	Said complaint noted	Claims officer in pod is unprofessional
4/15/2014	319928	100174061	Says emailed Lt	Claims documents including legal papers were taken as well as commissary.
4/15/2014	319939	100003645	Says he has been allowed access to law library as per MDC policy on a fair and equal basis	Claims denied access to Law Library and copies of legal documents.
4/15/2014	319985	100005725	Says they will forward to grievances	Claims facility has failed to respond to his appeal to a grievance.
4/15/2014	320017	100011760	No response given, one user assigned change	Claims excessive force and sexual harassment by officers during a search of cell and strip search.
4/15/2014	320017	100011760		Harassment of an inmate, abuse
4/15/2014	320082	100108318	Says they will talk to the sgt about allegations	Claims officer took his personal pictures and being threatened with seclusion
4/15/2014	320095	100217537	Says they spoke to officer and she denies all allegations. Closed	Claims officer is harassing and creating a dangerous environment.
4/25/2014	323600	100129704	Says officer is no longer in pod	Claims officer is harassing.
4/25/2014	323622	100182716	Says since they were told another officer said this about them it	Claims officer is being discriminatory because of inmate's sexual orientation.

			will be dropped, but will speak to officer to make sure he doesn't discriminate	
4/25/2014	323625	100191490	Asks if the grievance is for them or someone else. If it is for someone else then they have to file themselves	Claims unnecessary force by officer.
4/25/2014	323658	100074345	User assigned change. No response from staff	Claims staff took money from account.
4/30/2014	325035	100003238	Asks if he has requested sick call for his medical problem	Claims officer threatened to mace him and tase him when he questioned officer. And has now developed circulatory problems after being moved to new facility
4/30/2014	325154	100050047	Says they have an extra one they will bring him	Claims property was taken during a "shake down" and was not returned. Missing thermal top
5/5/2014	326393	100232955	Says they will make sure there is the proper equipment to clean	Being forced to do work without proper equipment, eg mops and has to use personal towel to clean,
5/5/2014	326485	100172687	Says they will look into it, and then says that all items inventoried were returned to him	Claims personal property was taken when placed on disciplinary.
5/5/2014	326500	100206515	Says they will speak to the officer about this	Claims officer is not providing new uniforms and personal laundry as required. Misses the laundry and uniforms each week because he is scheduled in the yard at the same time.
5/5/2014	326543	100204585	First response is that they will pull him out so they can talk. The next one is that if he is still having issues he needs to see the Psychiatrist own life in GP from other inmates.	
5/9/2014	327582	100001820	Says they will check in to it	Claims officer tore up his "pink slip" that allows him a chair in his cell.
5/20/2014	330911	100212298	Asks when this happened. (No response from inmate)	Claims he was punched while sleeping.
5/30/2014	334211	100154506	User assign change. No response	Claims overhearing contract staff making derogatory racial slurs about him.

Appendix B: Pre-Survey for MDC Staff

PREA PRE-SURVEY for MDC Staff

This survey is for staff that work in the MDC facility

4-digit ID code _____

letter of mother's first name, First letter of mother's maiden name, First security number, Last digit in social security number)

(First digit in social

Instructions: Circle the best answer

PREA is an acronym for:

1. Q:
 1. Prevent Rape Eliminate Abuse
 2. Prison Rape Eradication Act
 3. Prison Rape Elimination Act

2. Q: 115.11a
115.32.b An agency shall have a written policy mandating zero tolerance toward sexual abuse and sexual harassment and outlining the agency's approach to preventing, detecting, and responding to such conduct.
True False

3. Q: 115.12 Contract employees working at MDC are not obligated to comply with the PREA standards as long as MDC has adopted and complies with the PREA standards.
True False

4. Q: 115.15d Sometimes staff of the opposite gender might want to announce their presence when entering an inmate-housing unit.
True False

5. Q: 115.15f Only MDC officers with the rank of Sergeant should be trained how to conduct cross-gender pat-down searches.
True False

6. Q: 115.16c MDC shall rely on inmates to interpret information to inmates who cannot speak English.
True False

7. Q: 115.33b Within 30 days of intake, MDC shall provide comprehensive education to inmates either in person or through video regarding their rights to be free from sexual abuse and sexual harassment and to be free from retaliation for reporting such incidents.
True False

8. Q: 115.42f Transgender inmates shall have the opportunity to shower separately from other inmates.
True False

9. Q: 115.51c Staff shall not accept reports of sexual abuse from inmates made

anonymously, but only in writing, and shall promptly document the report.

True False

10. Q: 115.61a You are required to report only about incidents of sexual abuse or sexual harassment you have witnessed, you should *not* make a report based on suspicious behavior or secondhand information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment.

True False

11. Q: 115.61a The agency shall require all staff to report immediately and according to agency policy any knowledge, suspicion, or information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment that occurred in a facility.

True False

12. Q: 115.61b Staff shall not reveal any information related to a sexual abuse report to anyone other than a designated supervisor or official, and a witness of the officer's choice to the extent necessary.

True False

Instructions: Circle the best answer(s)

Upon learning of an allegation that an inmate was sexually abused, you are the first security staff member on the scene, you are required to:

13. Q: 115.64a
1. Separate the victim and abuser
 2. Contact three or four additional officers to come to the scene and collect evidence.
 3. Request the victim not destroy evidence by doing something like, washing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, or smoking.
 4. Request the abuser not destroy evidence by doing something like, washing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, or smoking.

Please complete the following questions about your job or affiliation with MDC.

1. My current position falls under: *(Please select most appropriate and indicate with an 'X')*

- Security
- Classification
- Facility/Maintenance
- Administration (e.g., Admin, HR, Finance, Education)
- Medical or Mental Health

2. I am: *(Please select most appropriate and indicate with an 'X')*

- Supervision/Management
- Non-Supervision Staff

3. How many total years have you worked in the field of corrections? _____ years
(Please round up or down partial years – 6 months or more equals 1 year)

4. How many total years have you worked for MDC? _____ years
(Please round up or down partial years – 6 months or more equals 1 year)

5. How many years have you worked in your current job assignment? _____ years
(Please round up or down partial years – 6 months or more equals 1 year)

6. Sex/gender: (Please indicate with an 'X')

_____ Male
_____ Female

7. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity? Please indicate by placing an 'X' next to category or categories (you may choose more than one) that best describes you.

_____ African American (Black)
_____ Asian American, Pacific Islander
_____ Latino/a (Latin American) or Hispanic
_____ Native American or American Indian
_____ Caucasian (White)
_____ Other (please specify: _____)

8. How old are you? Please indicate your age: _____

9. Indicate your highest level of education you have completed, or the highest degree received.
(Please indicate with an 'X')

_____ Less than high school
_____ Some high school
_____ High school diploma or equivalent (GED)
_____ Some college
_____ Completed college, (i.e. B.A./B.S. degree)
_____ Masters degree (i.e. M.A./M.S./M.S.W degree)
_____ Professional degree/doctorate (i.e., M.D., J.D., Ph.D., Ed.D.)

Appendix C: Pre-Survey for MDC Staff

PREA POST-SURVEY for MDC Staff

This survey is for staff that work in the MDC facility

4-digit ID code _____

(First letter of mother's first name, First letter of mother's maiden name, First digit in social security number, Last digit in social security number)

Instructions: Circle the best answer

PREA is an acronym for:

1. Q: 4. Prevent Rape Eliminate Abuse
5. Prison Rape Eradication Act
6. Prison Rape Elimination Act

Instructions: Please circle either 'True' or 'False'

2. Q: 115.11a 115.32b An agency shall have a written policy mandating zero tolerance toward sexual abuse and sexual harassment and outlining the agency's approach to preventing, detecting, and responding to such conduct.
True False
3. Q: 115.12 Contract employees working at MDC are not obligated to comply with the PREA standards as long as MDC has adopted and complies with the PREA standards.
True False
4. Q: 115.15d Staff of the opposite gender must announce their presence when entering an inmate-housing unit.
True False
5. Q: 115.15f All MDC officers shall be trained how to conduct cross-gender pat-down searches.
True False
6. Q: 115.15a MDC staff can conduct cross-gender strip searches or cross-gender visual body cavity searches any time.
True False
7. Q: 115.16c MDC shall rely on inmates to interpret information to inmates who cannot speak English.
True False
8. Q: 115.42f Transgender inmates shall have the opportunity to shower separately from other inmates.
True False
9. Q: 115.33b Within 30 days of intake, MDC shall provide comprehensive education to inmates either in person or through video regarding their

rights to be free from sexual abuse and sexual harassment and to be free from retaliation for reporting such incidents.

True False

10. Q: 115.61a You are required to report only about incidents of sexual abuse or sexual harassment you have witnessed, you should *not* make a report based on suspicious behavior or secondhand information regarding an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment.

True False

11. Q: 115.61a You should always be certain an incident of sexual abuse or sexual harassment has occurred before reporting, even if it requires you to wait 24 hours before reporting.

True False

12. Q: 115.61b Staff shall not reveal any information related to a sexual abuse report to anyone other than a designated supervisor or official, and a witness of the officer's choice to the extent necessary.

True False

Instructions: Select one or more answer choices

When an inmate reports an alleged sexual assault, can he/she do so:

13. Q: 115.51c Anonymously – Yes No
Verbally – Yes No
As a third party – Yes No
In writing – Yes No

Instructions: Circle the best answer

14. Q: 115.61a Making a report based on what an inmate tells you could ruin the career of a highly trained professional. You should carefully weigh the possible outcomes before making a report to the person at MDC responsible for investigating sexual abuse.

True False

Instructions: Circle the best answer(s)

Upon learning of an allegation that an inmate was sexually abused, you are the first security staff member on the scene, you are required to:

15. Q: 115.64a 5. Separate the victim and abuser
6. Protect the crime scene until evidence can be collected.
7. Request the victim not destroy evidence by doing something like, washing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, or smoking.
8. Request the abuser not destroy evidence by doing something like, washing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, or smoking.