

CHARLES D. BAKER Governor

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety & Security

Department of Correction PREA Division 50 Maple Street, Suite 2 Milford, MA 01757 Tel: (508) 422-3300 www.mass.gov/doc



CAROL A. MICI Commissioner

SHAWN P. JENKINS Chief of Staff

KELLEY J. CORREIRA PATRICK T. DEPALO, JR. ROBERT P. HIGGINS **MITZI S. PETERSON** THOMAS J. PRESTON Deputy Commissioners

RUSSELL CAISSIE Chief of PREA

KARYN E. POLITO Lieutenant Governor

TERRENCE M. REIDY Secretary

MEMO

Carol A. Mici Carul A Mica

THRU: Patrick T. DePalo, Jr, Deputy Commissioner of field

FROM: Russell S. Caissie, Chief of PREA Audits, Operations & Investigations Luciel & Course

DATE: June 22, 2022

RE: DOC 2021 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Annual Report

PREA standards 115.88 & 115.89 and the Department of Correction (DOC) policy 103 DOC 519.09 require the DOC to prepare an annual report relative to our agency's efforts to assess and improve the effectiveness of sexual abuse prevention, detection and response policies during the previous calendar year. Additionally, both the standards and the policy require that the enclosed report be posted on the DOC's website for public access. The attached report meets the requirements of the aforementioned standards and policy. Upon your review and approval, this report will be posted on the DOC's Internet and Intranet pages.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions and or concerns you may have with the information I have provided you

cc: All Facility Superintendents All Facility PREA Managers **All Facility Policy Coordinators**

Massachusetts Department of Correction Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) 2021 Annual Report



Carol A. Mici, Commissioner

Patrick DePalo, Deputy Commissioner of Field Services

Russell Caissie, Chief of PREA, Audits, Operations & Investigations

The Massachusetts Department of Correction Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Annual Report 2021

Table of Contents

| • | Background | 1 |
|---|---|----|
| • | Agency PREA Achievements for 2021 | 1 |
| • | Purpose | 3 |
| • | § 115.87; Data Collection | 3 |
| • | § 115.88; Data Review for Corrective Action | 4 |
| • | § 115.89; Data Storage, Publication, and Destruction | |
| • | Summary of PREA Data Collection Capabilities | 4 |
| • | Aggregated Data on Sexual Abuse Allegations and Comparison to Prior Years | 5 |
| • | Definitions | |
| • | Agency Overview for 2021 and Comparison to 2020 | |
| • | Percentage Breakdowns for 2021 and Comparison to 2020 | |
| • | Incident Overview by Facility and Type for 2021 | |
| | o Inmate/Inmate Sex Acts | 8 |
| | o Inmate/Inmate Sexual Abuse | 9 |
| | o Inmate-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 11 |
| | o Staff Sexual Misconduct | |
| | Staff-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 12 |
| • | Trends | 12 |
| • | Identified Problem Areas and Corrective Action in 2021 | 13 |
| • | Resolved Problem Areas from 2020 | 14 |
| • | Assessment of the Massachusetts Department of Correction's | |
| | Progress in Addressing Inmate Sexual Abuse | 14 |

Background

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) was signed into federal law in September 2003 following unanimous support from both parties in the United States Congress. The purpose of the law was to provide information, resources, recommendations, and funding to protect individuals from sexual abuse and sexual harassment in confinement facilities. PREA seeks to establish a "zero tolerance" policy regarding rape, sexually abusive behavior, and sexual harassment in federal, state, and local correctional systems. PREA also mandated the publication of standards to ensure compliance and to improve prevention, detection, and response strategies in addressing rape, sexually abusive behavior, and sexual harassment.

In August 2012, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) issued the final PREA standards for: Prisons and Jails, Lockups, Community Confinement Facilities and Juvenile Facilities. These standards required DOJ audits of all facilities under the agency's operational control of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Executive Branch, to include private facilities operating on behalf of the Executive Branch to house inmates. The first 3-year audit cycle began in August 2013. Failure to comply with the standards would result in a loss of 5 percent of identified federal grant funding.

The Massachusetts Department of Correction (DOC) was an early adopter of PREA and these standards. As a result, the DOC is in the forefront in meeting the standards (Prisons and Jails) set-forth by DOJ, and in fact is looked to and sought-out by many other agencies, not only across the Commonwealth, but across the county, as a model for implementing and meeting these standards.

The DOC made history in 2016 when the last of its 14 prisons underwent and successfully completed their respective DOJ PREA audit. It should be noted that all facilities audited achieved 100% compliance rating, without any corrective action plans needed. This accomplishment made the Massachusetts DOC one of few correctional agencies across the country which has all its facilities accredited by PREA, through the DOJ, and accredited by the American Correctional Association (ACA). The DOC continued to thrive in 2019, by successfully completing 4 facility DOJ PREA Audits with final reports indicating 100% compliance rating after corrective action taken on DOJ Standards 115.51 Inmate Reporting and 115.65 Coordinated Response.

Agency Achievements in 2021

- 1. In 2021 the PREA Division, as part of a 2020 bid search for new certified DOJ auditors chose a new auditor for the first time since the inception of required DOJ facility audits dating back to 2014. 2K Consulting was chosen to conduct the agency's audits for 2021 and beyond.
- 2. The DOC began its audit year 2 of cycle 3 (August 20, 2020, through August 19, 2021) DOJ audits. Selected facilities underwent a comprehensive and thorough DOJ PREA audit consisting of document and policy reviews, site tours and interviews with staff and inmates. Each facility achieved a 100% compliance rating, with each facility meeting on/or exceeding all forty-five DOJ Standards. The facilities that received DOJ audits in 2021 were as follows: MCI Norfolk, Boston Pre Release Center, Souza Baranowski Correctional Center.

- 3. As part of the DOC's annual Operational Audits which are overseen by the Policy Development and Compliance Unit, the PREA Division conducted site visits and tours at all DOC facilities that are subject to DOJ audits to ensure full compliance of the PREA standards.
- 4. In 2021 the DOC's PREA Division continued its efforts in training staff of both the DOC and State Police. In March of 2021 the PREA Division conducted a Sexual Assault Investigator Training class for thirty-five DOC Inner Perimeter Security staff. Other training provided included PREA Basic Training for DOC Recruit Training Classes 327A, 327B, and 328. PREA Training was also provided to the State Police 86th RTT class in July of 2021.
 - 5. The DOC received a PREA grant for \$88,000.00 from the Violence Against Women Act Stop Formula Grant Program for FFY 2021. The grant funds were used to pay for Victims Services Advocacy provider BARCC (Boston Area Rape Crisis Center). The DOC also received a FY 20 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Reallocation Funds, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program for \$131,063 which will be used to pay for DOJ Audits, Tableau Software and Surveillance Technology.
 - 6. As part of the effort to keep the agency up to date and informed with PREA, quarterly meetings were held with each of the institution's PREA Compliance Mangers in attendance and the meeting minutes have been documented.
 - 7. Planning and coordination with the DOJ Auditor and facility PREA Compliance Managers for the 2021 DOJ PREA audits began in January of 2021. In November of 2021 the PREA Division Coordinator and Assistant completed and submitted the Survey of Sexual Victimization to the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics.
 - 8. In early October 2021 and in collaboration with the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) and the DOC General Counsel's Office, the PREA Division assisted in preparing and providing documentation for the Governor's PREA Compliance Certification.

Purpose

The DOJ PREA standards require our agency to collect a defined set of data for every allegation of sexual abuse and sexual harassment. These standards further require the DOC to aggregate and review that data to assess and improve our effectiveness as an agency at preventing, detecting, and responding to PREA allegations. Standards related to the collection of data include: § 115.87 Data Collection, § 115.88 Data Review for Corrective Action and § 115.89 Data Storage, Publication, and Destruction. For reference purposes, they are included within this report.

§ 115.87 Data Collection

- (a) The agency shall collect accurate, uniform data for every allegation of sexual abuse at facilities under its direct control using a standardized instrument and set of definitions.
- (b) The agency shall aggregate the incident-based sexual abuse data at least annually.
- (c) The incident-based data collected shall include, at a minimum, the data necessary to answer all questions from the most recent version of the Survey of Sexual Violence conducted by the Department of Justice.
- (d) The agency shall maintain, review, and collect data as needed from all available incident-based documents, including reports, investigation files, and sexual abuse incident reviews.
- (e) The agency also shall obtain incident-based and aggregated data from every private facility with which it contracts for the confinement of its inmates.
- (f) Upon request, the agency shall provide all such data from the previous calendar year to the Department of Justice no later than June 30.

§ 115.88 Data Review for Corrective Action

- (a) The agency shall review data collected and aggregated pursuant to § 115.87 in order to assess and improve the effectiveness of its sexual abuse prevention, detection, and response policies, practices, and training, including by:
 - (1) Identifying problem areas.
 - (2) Taking corrective action on an ongoing basis; and,
 - (3) Preparing an annual report of its findings and corrective actions for each facility, as well as the agency.
- (b) Such report shall include a comparison of the current year's data and corrective actions with those from prior years and shall provide an assessment of the agency's progress in addressing sexual abuse.
- (c) The agency's report shall be approved by the agency head and made readily available to the public through its website or, if it does not have one, through other means.
- (d) The agency may redact specific material from the reports when publication would present a clear and specific threat to the safety and security of a facility but must indicate the nature of the material redacted.

§ 115.89 Data Storage, Publication, and Destruction

- (a) The agency shall ensure that data collected pursuant to § 115.87 are securely retained.
- (b) The agency shall make all aggregated sexual abuse data, from facilities under its direct control and private facilities with which it contracts, readily available to the public at least annually through its website or, if it does not have one, through other means.
- (c) Before making aggregated sexual abuse data publicly available, the agency shall remove all personal identifiers.
- (d) The agency shall maintain sexual abuse data collected pursuant to § 115.87 for at least 10 years after the date of the initial collection unless Federal, State, or local law requires otherwise.

PREA Data Collection Capabilities

Through use of our agency's intranet, a PREA database was designed to collect and record a uniformed set of data (and definitions) for each allegation investigated at every facility. PREA standard § 115.87 requires collecting, at a minimum, the data necessary to answer questions contained in annual "Survey of Sexual Violence" reports conducted by the DOJ. The DOC's PREA database was, in part, designed to provide the agency with that capability.

Aggregated Data on Sexual Abuse Allegations and Comparison to Prior Years

The DOC has a zero-tolerance policy for sexual abuse which is covered in detail in our 103 DOC 519 Sexually Harassment/Abuse Response Prevention Policy (SHARPP). As such, all reported allegations of sexual harassment and or abusive behaviors are fully investigated. Only after a full investigation is completed is an event defined as a PREA violation or otherwise. It should be noted that unauthorized, but consensual sexual activity between inmates does not qualify as a PREA incident. The PREA Prison & Jails standards provide definitions that guide the DOC in determining the outcome of allegations investigated. The following are a few of those key definitions:

| | <u>Definitions</u> |
|-----------------------|--|
| Evidentiary Standard: | The agency shall impose no standard higher than a preponderance of the evidence in determining whether allegations of sexual abuse or sexual harassment are substantiated. |
| Substantiated: | Substantiated allegation means an allegation that wa investigated and determined to have occurred. |
| Unsubstantiated: | An allegation that was investigated and the investigation produced insufficient evidence to make a final determination at to whether or not the event occurred. |
| Unfounded: | An allegation that was investigated and determined not to have occurred. |

The following charts reflect aggregated data from 2021 absent any allegations investigated and were determined not to constitute a PREA violation by definitions as outline in the Prisons and Jail Standards, 115.6.

Agency Overview for 2021

| Category | Investigative Outcome | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|------------|--|--|
| Category | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Line Total | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sex Acts | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 8 | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Abuse | 3 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 18 | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Harassment | .4 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 25 | | |
| Staff Sexual Misconduct | 2 | 6 | 23 | 0 | 31 | | |
| Staff-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 1 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 18 | | |
| Total | 11 | 35 | 53 | 1 | 100 | | |

*Note: There were a total, of 134 allegations made in 2021 (any), of which 34 cases were determined to be inmate unauthorized. Therefore, the allegations were determined not to constitute a PREA violation by the definitions outlined in the Prisons and Jail Standards put forth by the DOJ.

Agency Overview for 2020

| Category | Investigative Outcome | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|------------|--|--|
| Category | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Line Total | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sex Acts | - 1 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 24 | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Abuse | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 3 | . 14 | 12 | 0 | 29 | | |
| Staff Sexual Misconduct | 3 | 4 | 56 | 0 | 63 | | |
| Staff-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 0 | 3 | 21 | 2 | 26 | | |
| A CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF TH | | Manual Parket | | AT LE LINE | | | |
| Total | 8 | 36 | 103 | 5 | 152 | | |

Comparison of PREA Cases - 2020 and 2021

The number of PREA investigations for 2021 decreased by 52 cases from 2020. The number of Substantiated allegations increased from 8 in 2020 to 11 in 2021. The number of Unsubstantiated cases decreased by 1, from 36 in 2020 to 35 in 2021. In the category of Unfounded, the number of allegations in 2020 was noted to be 103, which decreased in 2021 to 53.

Percentage Breakdown for 2021

| Cotono | Investigative Outcome | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|------------|--|--|
| Category | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Line Total | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sex Acts | 1% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 8% | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Abuse | 3% | 9% | 6% | 0% | 18% | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 4% | 9% | 11% | 1% | 25% | | |
| Staff Sexual Misconduct | 2% | 6% | 23% | 0% | 31% | | |
| Staff-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 1% | 7% | 10% | 0% | 18% | | |
| Total | 11% | 35% | 53% | 1% | 100% | | |

Percentage Breakdown for 2020

| | Investigative Outcome | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|------------|--|--|
| Category | Substantiated | Unsubstantlated | Unfounded | Pending | Line Total | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sex Acts | .65% | 8.55% | 4.60% | 1.97% | 15.77% | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Abuse | .65% | 1.31% | 4.60% | 0% | 6.56% | | |
| Inmate-Inmate Sexual Harassment | 1.97% | 9.21% | 7.89% | 0% | 19.07% | | |
| Staff Sexual Misconduct | 1.97% | 2.63% | 36.84% | 0% | 41.44% | | |
| Staff-Inmate Sexual Harassment | . 0% | 1.97% | 13.81% | 1.31% | 17.09% | | |
| Total | 5.24% | 23.67% | 67.74% | 3.28% | 100% | | |

Comparison of Investigative Outcomes - 2021 and 2020

PREA Investigative Outcomes for 2021 demonstrate some variations over the results noted in 2020, partly due to Covid-19. From a percentage standpoint, substantiated findings went up from 2020, along with Unsubstantiated and Pending. Unfounded went down percentage wise from 2020 to 2021. While a definitive explanation for these variations cannot be determined, it is probable that they can be attributed to the agency's continued educational efforts for staff, contractors, volunteers, vendors, and inmates. Additionally, improved investigative techniques, training and a strict adherence to the definitions established under the PREA standards are also possible contributing factors to the noticeable increases from the previous year.

Incident Overview by Facility and Type for 2020

Inmate/Inmate Sex Acts: Sexual abuse of an inmate, detainee, or resident by another inmate, detainee, or resident includes any of the following acts, if the victim does not consent, is coerced into such act by overt or implied threats of violence, or is unable to consent or refuse:

- Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however slight.
- Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva, or anus.
- Penetration of the anal or genital opening of another person, however slight, by a hand, finger, object, or other

| Enallify | Investigative Outcome | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-------|--|
| Facility | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Total | |
| BSH* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 | |
| BSPRC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| LSH* | . 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| MCI - Concord | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| MCI - Norfolk | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| MCI - Shirley medium | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| MCI Framingham | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| MCI-CJ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | . 2 | |
| MTC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| NCCI medium | 1 | . 0 | . 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| NECC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Non-DOC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| OCCC medium | 0 | . 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| PCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SBCC | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| SMCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| State Trans Unit ** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 8 | |

^{*}Note: These facilities are not subjected to a DOJ audit, but do undergo an agency internal audit by the Policy Development and

Compliance Unit (PDCU).

** Note: State Trans Unit, was added to show a case that occurred under the Inmate/Inmate Sex Abuse category. There was 1 case that was Unsubstantiated and reflected below.

Inmate/Inmate Sex Abuse: Contact of any person without his or her consent, or of a person who is unable to consent or refuse; and intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person.

 Any other intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or the buttocks of another person, excluding contact incidental to a physical altercation.

| Encille | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Facility | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Total |
| BSH* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BSPRC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LSH* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MCI - Concord | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MCI – Norfolk | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| MCI - Shirley medium | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| MCI Framingham | 0 | 0 | · 1 | 0 | 1 |
| MCI-CJ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MTC | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| NCCI medium | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| NECC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-DOC | 0 | 6 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OCCC medium | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| PCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 |
| SBCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SMCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Trans Unit** | 0 | . 1 | , O | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 3 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 18 |

Inmate-Inmate Sexual Harassment: Sexual Harassment includes—Repeated and unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or verbal comments, gestures, or actions of a derogatory or offensive sexual nature by one inmate, detainee, or resident directed toward another.

Written or verbal communication, gestures such as simulated acts of a sexual nature.

| English | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Facility | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Total |
| BSH* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BSPRC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 |
| LSH* | . 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MCI - Concord | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| MCI - Norfolk | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| MCI - Shirley medium | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| MCI Framingham | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| MCI-CJ | 0 | - 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| MTC | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| NCCI medium | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| NECC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-DOC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OCCC medium | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| PCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBCC | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| SMCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Trans Unit** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 25 |

Staff Sexual Misconduct: Sexual abuse of an inmate, detainee, or resident by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer includes any of the following acts, with or without consent of the inmate, detainee, or resident.

- 1. Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, including penetration, however slight.
- 2. Contact between the mouth and the penis, vulva, or anus.
- 3. Contact between the mouth and any body part where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire.
- 4. Penetration of the anal or genital opening, however slight, by a hand, finger, object, or other instrument, that is unrelated to official duties or where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire.
- 5. Any other intentional contact, either directly or through the clothing, of or with the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or the buttocks, that is unrelated to official duties or where the staff member, contractor, or volunteer has the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire.
- 6. Any attempt, threat, or request by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer to engage in the activities described in paragraphs (1)-(5) of this section.
- Any display by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer of his or her uncovered genitalia, buttocks, or breast in the
 presence of an inmate, detainee, or resident, and
- 8. Voyeurism by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer. Voyeurism by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer means an invasion of privacy of an inmate, detainee, or resident by staff for reasons unrelated to official duties, such as peering at an inmate who is using a toilet in his or her cell to perform bodily functions; requiring an inmate to expose his or her buttocks, genitals, or breasts; or taking images of all or part of an inmate's naked body or of an inmate performing bodily functions.

| English | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Facility | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Total |
| BSH* | 0 | 0 | . 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BSPRC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LSH* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| MCI - Concord | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| MCI - Norfolk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MCI - Shirley medium | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| MCI Framingham | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| MCI-CJ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MTC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NCCI medium | . 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| NECC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-DOC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| OCCC medium | 0 | 1 | 2 · | 0 | 3 |
| PCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 | 0 |
| SBCC | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 12 |
| SMCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Trans Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 6 | 23 | 0 | 31 |

Staff-Inmate Sexual Harassment: Repeated verbal comments or gestures of a sexual nature to an inmate, detainee, or resident by a staff member, contractor, or volunteer, including demeaning references to gender, sexually suggestive or derogatory comments about body or clothing, or obscene language or gestures.

Written or verbal communication, gestures such as simulated acts of a sexual nature.

| Facility | Investigative Outcome | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-------|--|
| racility | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Unfounded | Pending | Total | |
| BSH* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| BSPRC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| LSH* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| MCI - Concord | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| MCI - Norfolk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 | |
| MCI - Shirley medium | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| MCI Framingham | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| MCI-CJ | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| MTC | 0 | 0 | . 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| NCCI medium | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| NECC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 | |
| Non-DOC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| OCCC medium | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | |
| PCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SBCC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | |
| SMCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| State Trans Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total | 1 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 18 | |

Trends

Over a five-year period, the DOC averaged approximately 175.6 PREA allegations investigated. A review of the data from the PREA database revealed the number of PREA allegations investigated during 2021 was below the number recorded in the previous year of 2020 also below the numbers recorded in 2019, 2018 and 2017. A decreased difference of 52 allegations investigated from 2020. These numbers should also reflect the decrease in our inmate population. Over the past 5 years our inmate population has had a significant decreased. In 2017 the MADOC had a population of 9,496 in 2021 the population was noted as 6,848. As a reminder, all allegations are investigated, and only through the course of the investigation process was a determination of finding made.

Department of Correction PREA Database Tracking History and Analysis

| Total number of | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Five Year Average |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|
| cases | 171 | 254 | 201 | 152 | 100 | 175.6 |
| investigated | ı. | * | | | | |
| per year | (4) | | | | , | |

Statistical data over the past five years regarding the DOC's BJS/SSV reports demonstrate a variety of trends over the past 5 years. With a peak in numbers of annual cases reported form 2018 and 2019 from 2017 and then a steady and sharp decline over the past two years. This may be attributed to continuous education and training promoted by the agency and its approach to zero tolerance.

BJS - SSV Reports submitted by the Massachusetts DOC and Analysis

| Total number of SUBSTANTIATED cases per year* | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Five Year Average |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|
| Inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.6 |
| Inmate-on-inmate abusive sexual contacts | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3.2 |
| Inmate-on-inmate sexual harassment** | 5 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5.2 |
| Staff sexual misconduct | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1.6 |
| Staff sexual harassment | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| Total | 15 | 21 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 14 |

^{*}Note: These figures may vary from data reported in other areas of this/previous reports because it reflects a "snap-shot" of resolved cases when those reports were generated. Cases still pending and/or allegations not reported to DOC at the time of the incident may not be reflected in the data.

Identified Problem Areas and Corrective Action for 2021

PREA standards require a review of collected data to identify problem areas and establish plans of corrective action. Based upon statistical data alone, the Substantiated victimization rate within the DOC is relatively low compared to a review of available national data. The 2021 DOJ audits revealed that corrective action was identified by the auditor regarding standards 115.15 limits to cross gender viewing and searches, 115.33 inmate education, and 115.81 medical and mental health care. The PREA Division worked closely with the institutional

Resolved Problem Areas from 2020

Based on the auditor's interim and final reports for Old Colony Correctional Center, Massachusetts Treatment Center, Cedar Junction, and Pondville Correctional Center, there were no corrective action items identified or needed at these institutions regarding PREA standards 'compliance.

2020 Assessment of the Massachusetts Department of Correction's Progress in Addressing Inmate Sexual Harassment/Abuse Allegations

The DOC continues its work in improving in all aspects of the PREA process and continues to make great strides in the prevention, detection and response to inmate sexual assaults, abusive behaviors, and sexual harassment. With continued communication and networking within the agency and with our stakeholders by sharing information at quarterly meetings. The DOC continues to lead the way with specialized training for sexual assault investigators, welcoming law enforcement agencies within the Commonwealth. The agency continues to work closely with EOPPS, Legal, the PREA Compliance Managers, as well as institutional IPS staff in improving database enhancements that provide for efficient and effective record keeping.

We are proud of our staff at all levels throughout the Department as we have consistently demonstrated our agency's commitment to the adoption of PREA compliance by having all our facilities accredited through the DOJ PREA audit process. This accomplishment means that the DOC will be one of few correctional agencies across the country which has all its facilities accredited through the American Correctional Association (ACA) and the DOJ PREA audit process. In 2021, our facilities continued to meet all standards during the DOJ PREA audit process by accomplishing 100% compliance. All forty-eight DOJ standards were either met or exceeded compliance levels after a corrective action plan was completed.

The DOC is preparing to undergo its next cycle of PREA audits in 2022 at MCI Shirley, MCI Concord/NECC, North Central Correctional Institution and MCI Framingham. The PREA Division remains confident that the agency will be successful in passing these audits by meeting all standards set forth by the DOJ.

Russell S. Caissie Chief of PREA Audits, Operations, Investigations

Patrick DePalo, Deputy Commissioner of Field Services