



During December 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,347 grievances. The OIG assessed the 1,347 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 100 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 94 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 70 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 16 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 86 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 77 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 101 times, failed to identify the need for a clarification interview nine times, and opened 31 new grievances solely to correct a mistake they made in a prior screening decision.

This document presents eight notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during December 2024.

**The OIG’s Assessment
of 1,347 Grievances for
December 2024**

Rating	No. of Grievances
<i>Superior</i>	0
<i>Satisfactory</i>	1,183
<i>Poor</i>	164

Note: 12% of the grievances our office monitored received a *poor* rating.

Source: Analysis prepared by staff of the Office of the Inspector General.

OIG Case Number
24-0095896-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 17, 2024, a counselor allegedly called an incarcerated person inappropriate names and used profanity toward him after the incarcerated person asked the counselor why he lied about the incarcerated person’s work hours. After the verbal altercation, the counselor allegedly followed the incarcerated person out of his office and threatened the incarcerated person. Once outside the office, the counselor allegedly challenged the incarcerated person to a fight, got in the incarcerated person’s face, bumped his chest against the incarcerated person, and then asked, “What [are] you going to do about it?”





Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's allegations that the counselor used unreasonable force, engaged in threatening behavior, and created an opportunity for harm to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately referred the allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and appropriately referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Also, following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team notified the hiring authority to initiate unreasonable force allegation protocols.

OIG Case Number
24-0096769-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On November 1, 2024, an officer allegedly discriminated against a wheelchair-bound incarcerated person by denying him the assistance of an incarcerated worker to push his wheelchair to an appointment.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's discrimination allegation against an officer to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's allegation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team routed to the hiring authority for a local inquiry the allegation that an officer discriminated against a wheelchair-bound incarcerated person by denying him the ability to receive assistance from an incarcerated worker. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer the discrimination allegation against the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.



OIG Case Number
24-0097084-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On November 3, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged a staff member introduced tobacco into the prison for other incarcerated people, and officers allowed other incarcerated people to smoke in the housing unit.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team originally misinterpreted the allegation as an allegation that officers were smoking in the housing unit and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that a staff member provided tobacco to incarcerated people to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that a staff member introduced tobacco into the prison for other incarcerated people, and therefore, failed to identify and make the required security risk notifications to the hiring authority. The Centralized Screening Team also mischaracterized the allegation that officers allowed incarcerated people to smoke in the housing unit as an allegation that officers smoked in the housing unit. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation that staff provided tobacco to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and referred the allegation that officers allowed incarcerated people to smoke in the housing unit for investigation, instead of a local inquiry, as the allegation was directly related in time and scope. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to apply face-value screening because they did not identify the allegation that a staff member introduced tobacco into the prison in the first place.

OIG Case Number
24-0097641-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On January 16, 2024, staff allegedly made an unprofessional comment to an incarcerated person. On January 25, 2024, an officer allegedly called the incarcerated person a slur while speaking to a second officer. On February 25, 2024, a third officer allegedly made a discourteous comment, and the incarcerated person requested staff review the audio-recording to corroborate his claim. On June 14, 2024, the Office of Appeals ordered a new grievance log number to be opened to address the three derogatory comments, but the prison only addressed the comment from



January 16, 2024. On November 5, 2024, the Office of Appeals ordered another grievance log number to be opened to address the derogatory comments that allegedly occurred on January 25, 2024, and February 25, 2024.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed allegations that an officer called an incarcerated person a slur and that another officer made a discourteous comment toward the incarcerated person back to the prison as routine issues. While the OIG concurred with the routing decision regarding the second officer’s discourteous comment, we did not concur with the routing decision for the first officer’s derogatory comment. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team claimed they had already referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following a secondary elevation, since all records indicated the Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation as a routine issue, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The department opened the grievance solely to address deficiencies in two prior grievances the incarcerated person submitted, which the department failed to completely process. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation that an officer called an incarcerated person a slur as an allegation of staff misconduct three times. Following the OIG’s dispute, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the alleged staff misconduct to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0098007-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 13, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged prison staff retaliated against her by issuing her multiple rules violation reports, delayed her disciplinary hearings, and kept her in the restricted housing unit for the same rules violation report. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged unknown staff or a lieutenant changed her classification status and reclassified a rules violation report multiple times for threatening staff which extended her restricted housing unit time frames. The incarcerated person also alleged during the clarification interview that staff ignored her mental health issues and wrongfully found her guilty of a rules violation report for greeting cards being laced with contraband.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the incarcerated person’s allegations of staff misconduct back to the prison as a routine issue. Prior to the OIG’s review, the Office



of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit disputed the initial routing of the grievance. The Centralized Screening Team agreed with the Office of Internal Affairs and opened a subsequent grievance log number to address the staff misconduct allegation they initially missed and referred the allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Office of Grievances disputed the decision, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed to route the allegations of staff misconduct as routine classification issues. The OIG did not concur and elevated the grievance for another review and clarification of the initial dispute. The Centralized Screening Team elected to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint but subsequently routed the allegations of staff misconduct back to the prison as routine classification issues. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify a rules violation report and a mental health issue following the clarification interview with the incarcerated person.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Prior to the OIG's review, the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit disputed the initial routing of the grievance as a routine issue. The Centralized Screening Team agreed and opened this grievance log number to address the missed allegations of staff misconduct and referred the allegations of staff misconduct to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Office of Grievances disputed the decision, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed to route the allegations of staff misconduct back to the prison as a routine classification issue. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team elected to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person and subsequent to the clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their decision to route the allegations of staff misconduct back to the prison as a routine classification issue. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify a rules violation report allegation and a mental health allegation following the clarification interview. The OIG disagreed with the decision to conduct a clarification interview because the Centralized Screening Team specifically opened this grievance log number to address the previous missed allegation of staff misconduct and still failed to refer the allegation appropriately.

OIG Case Number
24-0098230-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 23, 2024, a canteen manager allegedly made a racially insensitive remark toward an incarcerated person. On November 25, 2024, the incarcerated person alleged the canteen manager tricked him into signing a work refusal for being sick and forced uncertified incarcerated persons to operate forklifts.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the work refusal allegation back to the prison as a routine claim. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the incarcerated person's allegation that a canteen manager made a racially insensitive remark toward the incarcerated person and forced uncertified incarcerated people to operate forklifts. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and opened a new grievance to address both allegations which they referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an incarcerated person's allegations that a canteen manager made a racially insensitive remark toward the incarcerated person and forced uncertified incarcerated persons to operate forklifts. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team took appropriate steps to amend their decision and referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0098988-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On November 28, 2024, an officer allegedly made disrespectful and racially inappropriate comments toward an incarcerated person when the incarcerated person reported having chest pains. A second officer allegedly called the incarcerated person a racial slur and unnecessarily "banged" him against a van during the medical event. A third officer allegedly called the incarcerated person a racial slur and told him to wipe with his sheets when the incarcerated person requested toilet paper. Officers allegedly failed to provide the incarcerated person his property following a transfer, gave him a tablet that did not work, provided him lunch with no bread or milk, provided a cold dinner that looked like someone took a bite out of, and failed to provide him a pen and toothpaste.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of unreasonable force and two allegations of racial discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, referred the third allegation of racial discrimination to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, and routed the property, tablet, meal, and toothpaste allegations back to the prison as routine claims. The OIG did not concur with referring the third allegation of racial discrimination to the hiring authority. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the third allegation of racial



discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, consistent with the incarcerated person's two other racial discrimination allegations.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. While the Centralized Screening Team identified and routed most of the allegations correctly, they were inconsistent when they referred two allegations that officers called the incarcerated person a racial slur to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit but referred a third allegation against another officer using the same racial slur to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's third allegation of racial discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0097112-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On April 20, 2024, an officer allegedly sexually assaulted an incarcerated person at gunpoint. On October 31, 2024, staff allegedly confiscated the incarcerated person's medical equipment and other incarcerated people allegedly took the leg rests from the incarcerated person's wheelchair. The other incarcerated people allegedly wanted the incarcerated person to bring drugs into the prison from an outside hospital. On November 1, 2024, staff allegedly falsified documents and failed to transfer the incarcerated person to an off-site hospital after she suffered a seizure. Between November 1, 2024, and November 6, 2024, staff allegedly violated the incarcerated person's confidentiality and transgender privacy rights when they housed her in a cell with unrestricted audio-video recording. On November 6, 2024, the incarcerated person alleged a nurse sexually assaulted her, staff allegedly violated sexual misconduct procedures and failed to reassign the nurse's work assignment, and staff allegedly threatened to post about the sexual assault on social media. A second nurse allegedly refused to provide medical care unless the incarcerated person masturbated on camera. A third nurse and officers allegedly watched video recordings to see the incarcerated person's genitals, and the officers allegedly told other incarcerated people the incarcerated person had a vagina so they would sexually assault her. The incarcerated person alleged another incarcerated person brought a gun into the prison, the gun remained in the prison, a physician sexually assaulted her, staff confiscated her property, and restrooms failed to meet the transgender privacy and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) wheelchair requirements. The incarcerated person requested a transfer and a tablet.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's allegations that a nurse sexually assaulted the incarcerated person, staff violated sexual misconduct procedures, a second nurse refused to provide medical care, staff violated confidentiality with audio-video recordings, a third nurse and officers watched video footage to see the incarcerated person's genitals, and that a physician sexually assaulted the incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team identified the allegations that staff falsified documents and confiscated the incarcerated person's medical devices as staff misconduct duplicative of prior complaints already referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations that staff failed to provide the incarcerated person appropriate medical care, ignored her safety concerns, confiscated her property, that other incarcerated people took the incarcerated person's wheelchair leg rests, and her requests for a prison transfer and tablet back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation, which was also a safety and security risk, that another incarcerated person possessed a gun inside the prison. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify the allegation that privacy screens for transgender women were missing in the dayroom restrooms and non-ADA compliant restrooms.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the incarcerated person's allegations that privacy screens for transgender women were missing in the dayroom restrooms and non-ADA compliant restrooms. Of greater concern, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the incarcerated person's allegation, which was also a safety and security risk, that another incarcerated person possessed a gun inside the prison. The OIG notified the Centralized Screening Team and the Office of Grievances of the missed security risk. The Centralized Screening Team did not respond, but the Office of Grievances notified facility staff. Out of an abundance of caution and due to the potential severity of the risk, the OIG also notified the hiring authority directly, who initiated an immediate interview with the incarcerated person with the investigative services unit. The incarcerated person reported there was not a gun in the prison, and the issue occurred in 2018.